



## MULTI PARTNER REAL TIME QUALITY REVIEW

### IPC ACUTE FOOD INSECURITY ANALYSIS (SOUTH SUDAN, NOVEMBER 2020)

The IPC Acute Food Insecurity analysis was conducted in South Sudan from October 26th to November 16th, 2020. Due to breakdown in technical consensus in relation to the estimation of populations in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) in six counties, on November 17th, the IPC South Sudan Technical Working Group (TWG) partners requested the IPC Global Support Unit (GSU) to conduct a Real Time Quality Review (RTQR) to assess the presence of population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) in the counties of Akobo, Aweil South, Pibor, Tonj East, Tonj North and Tonj South. During this process, the county of Pibor was found to present a very concerning situation, with some indicators surpassing the IPC Reference Table thresholds for IPC Phase 5 (Famine) and concerns over the estimation of the nutrition evidence reliability. The RTQR proceeded with the activation of the Famine Review Process on November 19th, 2020, in accordance with the IPC Famine Guidance Note.

In accordance with IPC protocols, the IPC Global Support Unit (GSU) organized an external quality review related to all areas without consensus on populations in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). Several members from the IPC global partnership volunteered to participate in this process. A team of seven IPC food security experts from these organizations reviewed the analysis worksheets and available evidence, supported by two IPC acute malnutrition experts. Two staff members from IPC GSU who had not taken part in the country analysis coordinated the work of the RTQR team. The review concerned the following areas: Akobo, Aweil South, Tonj East, Tonj North and Tonj South, while Pibor has been reviewed by the Famine Review Committee.

### The conclusions of the RTQR team regarding the plausibility of populations in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe):

Area	Estimated population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe)		
	Current	1st Projection	2nd Projection
Akobo	5% in IPC Phase 5	5% in IPC Phase 5	5% in IPC Phase 5
Aweil South	5% in IPC Phase 5	10% in IPC Phase 5	10% in IPC Phase 5
Tonj East	5% in IPC Phase 5	5% in IPC Phase 5	10% in IPC Phase 5
Tonj North	10% in IPC Phase 5	10% in IPC Phase 5	10% in IPC Phase 5
Tonj South	5% in IPC Phase 5	10% in IPC Phase 5	5% in IPC Phase 5

In term of process, the RTQR team reviewed all available evidence provided by the IPC TWG for both food security and nutrition, as well as exploited the analysis, assumptions and conclusions provided by the IPC TWG. During the process, the RTQR received additional information about the Humanitarian Food Assistance, with more refined plans. The RTQR incorporated this information in the analysis.

The RTQR presents below its results in the format of RTQR matrixes, including assessment of evidence reliability, evidence levels, evidence convergence and recommendations to the IPC TWG. Furthermore, the RTQR would like to take advantage of this opportunity to provide technical recommendations to improve next IPC Acute Food Insecurity analyses.

### IPC Funding Partners



RTQR – AKOBO

Assessment of evidence reliability			Evidence Level	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
Food Consumption/Livelihood			Evidence Level CURRENT	<p><b>Food Security conclusions regarding population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe):</b></p> <p>Food security outcome indicators point to high levels of acute food insecurity, raising concerns about the possible occurrence of deprivation of food and severely affected livelihoods: (FCS: 32% poor; rCSI Phase 3+: 35%; HDDS Phase 4+: 33%; HHS severe 6% and very severe 6%) and converging towards having some population classified in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). Extreme food gaps converge with livelihood depletion and exhaustion, with 96% of households employing Emergency coping strategies. FSMNS shows that 6.4% of households could not sell/slaughter last cows/goats, 11% could not travel to other villages for begging and 15% could not collect debts/dowry from community leaders/courts. (AOK) 4% of households reported by KIs as not consuming any cereals, animal protein and dairy in the last seven days and with at least one member going an entire day and night without eating in the week prior to data collection. Almost half, 49%, reported the most common source of cereal being from HFA (AOK), 67%, according to FSNMS. Based on cross-tabulation, 6.4% of total households having very severe HHS do not have land for cultivation. Similarly, 6% of total households having very severe HHS do not own livestock. Despite this prevalence of households not having cultivated or not owning livestock, based on the FEWS NET convergence matrix of food consumption indicators with HHS very severe, 0.9% of households are in this condition, and when crossed with Emergency Livelihood Coping Strategies again, only 0.9% are in this condition. <b>Outcome indicators identify there are plausible conditions for some pockets of the population to be in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe).</b></p> <p><b>Contributing factors indicate that floods and insecurity/conflict, leading to displacements, are the primary drivers.</b> (FSNMS) 36% of the households had some member migrating for reasons unrelated to security, 20% migrated for lack of food. Around 59% of the population reported damaged shelter, completely destroyed for 13%, citing rain and floods as main reasons. <b>Livestock:</b> (AOK) Many reports of livestock deaths (disease &amp; shortage of fodder). (FSMNS) Around 30% of households do not own livestock, while 83% of livestock owners have a large decrease from the same period last year, citing disease outbreak (40%) and flooding (56%). Insecurity/conflict, raiding, lack of veterinary services, lack of grazing pastures and lack of water are reported as additional challenges for keeping livestock. Around 56% of the population is not able to consume milk. <b>Agriculture:</b> (IRNA) farms are flooded since July with limited harvest expected; households are experiencing hunger and currently eating cereals boiled with grass. (REACH AOK) 17% are new arrivals to Akobo, and did not plant/will not harvest in the current period. (FSNMS) Among residents and new arrivals, 27% did not plant this year, citing conflict, lost access to land; while planters cited floods, and another 27% lost access to land. Fall Armyworm and locusts cited as challenges by those who cultivated. <b>Market:</b> Households consuming staples from own production are supplementing with the market, HFA or borrowing/gifts: cereals (27% own production, food assistance 67%, and 5% borrowing/gifts), beans (own production 58%, food assistance 28%, borrowing/gifts from relatives 6%), milk (own production 72%, market 17%, 11% borrowing/gifts from relatives), meat/fish/eggs (own production 46%, market 13%, 12% borrowing/gifts from relatives), vegetables (own production 69%, market 9% and 9% borrowing/gifts from relatives). Access is difficult due to transportation and flooding in the past thirty days. Availability evidence indicates significant challenges for agricultural and agro-pastoralists in the region. Access evidence suggests barriers to market access, high food prices and shocks following COVID-19 restrictions. The SSP devaluation is the main constraint in market functionality, the exchange rate lost value from SSP 311 in September 2019 to SSP 520 in mid-September 2020, a 67% depreciation within one year. <b>Mitigating factors: Fishing:</b> Fish that could usually be a mitigating factor is available, though 40% declare they cannot access fish, most households due to lacking fishing equipment, unsafe areas or too far away. <b>Wild foods/hunting:</b> 47% of households went hunting in the past thirty days, while only 6% had hunting as a main source of meat in the past seven days. In comparison to the same time last year, 28% of households are eating more wild foods. Around 4% mostly ate or only ate wild foods for 5+ days of the previous seven, while 23% of households do not have a member physically capable of collecting and for 19% of households grounds are too far away. While small in number, households eating less wild foods this year compared to last year also did so due to no household member being able to collect (44%), areas too far away (17%), too much time needed to collect (9%), unsafe areas (15%) and (9%) sources exhausted. <b>Humanitarian Food Assistance:</b> HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show in the months of data collection 3% of the population on average received 34% of their kcal requirements. In the current period, 14% of the population on average will get 68% of their kcal requirements.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the current:</b></p> <p>The RTQR team found there is significant convergence of evidence from outcomes and contributing factors to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). Clearly, HHS shows that 6% are experiencing severe hunger (HHS very severe), 4% of the population mostly ate wild foods, 6% only have access to water streams, and livelihood depletion is evident for at least 5% of the population, with 27% of the population not planting this year and 30% not owning livestock. Considering this was the situation seen in September-October, with regular distribution provided since then covering only 14% of the population with two-thirds of the basket, the current period situation is likely very similar to survey conditions. <b>The RTQR team found a plausible estimation of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) would be at 5%.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 5% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>
Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium** Evidence Level:					
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
FSNMS	R1+	R1+			
GIEWS	R1+	R1+			
REACH	R1-	R1-			
FAO floods	R1-	R1-			
Nutrition					
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
SMART (WHZ)	R1-	R1-			
SMART (MUAC)	x	x			
Family MUAC	x	x			
Mortality					
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
SMART	R1-	R1-			

At least two pieces of R1 (+ or -) or one piece of R2 direct evidence for either food consumption or livelihood change outcome – this is provided by the FSNMS, which count 5 outcome indicators (FCS, rCSI, HHS, HDDS and LCS)

And

Five other pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence, with at least two of those from the season of analysis – the FSNMS provides above 20 indicators informing contributing factors on top of other contributing factors such as rainfall, prices, floods assessments, crop and livestock assessments.

RTQR – AKOBO			
TWG assumptions	Evidence Level Projected 1	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
<p>1. Conflict: Attacks are likely to pick up once flood waters recede, as they did in 2019 / early 2020 and are expected to continue well into the lean season / dry season ahead of the rains.</p> <p>2. COVID-19 effects appear minimal once initial disruption and travel restrictions were reversed in mid-2020. Some continued disruption to supply chains and effects of commodity prices reflected in source markets in neighboring countries to be expected in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>3. Food production: Flood affected counties in Jonglei expect to have significant reduction in own harvest and therefore reduced stocks going into the dry season.</p> <p>4. Status of livestock: Migration to further field pastures, disease burden, etc. expect a lack of available milk and reduced prices at the market to exchange for cereals.</p> <p>5. Wild foods/fish: Self-limiting behaviors expected to restrict access to deeper forest for wild foods due to fear of attack (2019 &amp; 2020 experience). Availability of fish expected to increase, but access to some traditional fishing grounds also expected to be restricted.</p> <p>6. Rainfall: Unpredictable, no one forecast six months ahead. The second year of major 40 year high rainfall and floods (driven as much by water levels in Lake Victoria &amp; Lake Albert and by rainfall in Ethiopia) and climate change. Indian Ocean Dipole effects suggests we can expect more prevalent extreme weather (between floods &amp; drought).</p> <p>7. Price trends: Would normally reduce in the harvest / post-harvest period as farmers sell on the market. This will be affected as less surplus to sell, prices to remain atypically high for now, food prices remaining high compared to 5 year average due to macro-economic crisis and will seasonally increase into the lean season as scarcity of cereals / challenges to transport in the 2021 rain season take effect.</p> <p>8. Purchasing power: Currency devaluation further causing price hikes of food stuff on the market; deteriorating terms of trade between livestock keepers and cereal sellers especially as we move into the 2021 lean season.</p> <p>9. Seasonality: Generally large losses across the state mainly due to flooding and dry season. Movement to lean season will always see a deterioration in household food security until the livestock begin to return to the homestead in May/June. Livestock ownership is skewed with many poorer/vulnerable households without animals who will not get this boost to their food consumption.</p> <p>The TWG assumptions indicate a deterioration of the majority if not all elements of food security, only mitigated by wild foods (eaten by 91% of households), hunting (done by 47% of households), fishing (63% do not have equipment) while the HFA will only benefit a small portion of the population (16%).</p> <p>HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show an average coverage of 16%, with a decrease in assistance from 14% to 11% of the population (covering 68% of daily caloric needs), with scale-up expected in March to cover 27% of the population with 58% of daily caloric requirements. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: In December, 6% of the population will be assisted with 111% of daily caloric requirements, 14% of the population with 67% of daily caloric requirements in January/February, and 34% of the population with 57% of daily caloric requirements in March.</p> <p>HFA deliverability: HFA is less likely to be affected, however, it is unlikely that violence will lead to the suspension of activities altogether. Rather, distributions may be delayed.</p>	<p><b>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium ** Evidence Level:</b></p> <p>IPC Current adhering to Evidence Level 2 +:</p> <p>Evidence used for current classification can be at most 12 months old at the end of projection period – FSMNS data collection happened in October 2020 therefore the dataset has less than 12 months at the end of the first projection period.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Five pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence presented with clear assumptions on forecasted trends – the assumptions were built by the IPC TWG</p>	<p><b>Food Security conclusions:</b></p> <p>Challenges to food availability continue and may further deteriorate from conflict or insecurity or other hazards. Concerning seasonality, cattle migrate and will not be available for entire period, therefore, limited/no milk in the projection period. Limited or off-season fishing activities are expected until the end of the projection period, though not all households will benefit due to distance, lack of equipment or capacity (12% of households are not able to fish (capacity), 63% do not have equipment, 12% grounds too far away and areas are not safe for 7%). Wild foods will be present, though insufficient to mitigate widespread large food consumption gaps, even if all households had access (23% of households do not have a member physically capable of collecting and for 19% of households areas are too far away); while 91% of households were eating wild foods in the data collection period (Sep-Oct). Challenges to food access continue and may further deteriorate from high prices and reduced purchasing power, with continuation of macro-economic pressures (high prices, unfavorable exchange rate). These disruptions may hamper market functionality or supply constraints that may further constrain household food access, during a period with increased reliance on markets expected. Households relying on borrowing or gifts from friends/relatives for staple consumption may see reductions as food sources decrease, while community support to cope with shocks may not be as reliable as during the current period. HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show an average coverage of 16%, with a decrease in assistance from 14% to 11% of the population (covering 68% of daily caloric needs), with scale-up expected in March to cover 27% of the population with 58% of daily caloric requirements. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: In December, 6% of the population will be assisted with 111% of daily caloric requirements, 14% of the population with 67% of daily caloric requirements in January/February, and 34% of the population with 57% of daily caloric requirements in March. Food security and livelihood evidence indicate a severe situation in the current period and the assumptions all highlight the likely deterioration during this period.</p> <p>Conflict: Sustained violence is likely in Jonglei in 2020, including in Akobo. However, such violence is generally (in Akobo) less likely to target civilians and the scale and intensity of such violence is normally much lower.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the first projection:</b></p> <p>The RTQR team found there is significant convergence of evidence with contributing factors and the assumptions to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) in the first projection period. Food availability and access constraints are likely to continue or even deteriorate with a reduction in HFA before scaling up at end of the projection period. Households already presenting large or extreme food gaps and Emergency or depleted coping strategies in IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) and IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will continue facing these conditions. The HFA planned will not cover the population in IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) of 50% and IPC Phase 3 (Crisis) of 20%, as it is only planned to assist 16% of the population. Even assuming perfect targeting, about 35% of the population in IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) will not receive any assistance, with a high likelihood of sliding into IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). <b>The RTQR team found that a plausible estimation of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) would be about 5%.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 5% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>

RTQR – AKOBO			
TWG assumptions	Evidence Level Projected 2	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
<p>1. Conflict: Attacks are likely to pick up once flood waters recede as they did in 2019 / early 2020 and are expected to continue well into the lean season / dry season ahead of the rains.</p> <p>2. COVID-19 effects appear minimal once initial disruption and travel restrictions were reversed in mid-2020. Some continued disruption to supply chains and effects of commodity prices reflected in source markets in neighboring countries to be expected in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>3. Food production: Flood affected counties in Jonglei expect to have a significant reduction in own harvest and therefore reduced stocks going into the dry season.</p> <p>4. Status of livestock: Migration to further field pastures, disease burden, etc. expect a lack of available milk and reduced prices at market to exchange for cereals.</p> <p>5. Wild foods/fish: Self-limiting behaviors expected to restrict access to deeper forest for wild foods due to fear of attack (2019 &amp; 2020 experience). Availability of fish expected to increase, but access to some traditional fishing grounds also expected to be restricted.</p> <p>6. Rainfall: Unpredictable, no one forecast six months ahead. The second year of major 40 year high rainfall and floods (driven as much by water levels in Lake Victoria &amp; Lake Albert and by rainfall in Ethiopia) and climate change. Indian Ocean Dipole effects suggests we can expect more prevalent extreme weather (between floods &amp; drought).</p> <p>7. Price trends: Would normally reduce in the harvest/ post-harvest period as farmers sell on the market. This will be affected as less surplus to sell, prices to remain atypically high for now, food prices remaining high compared to 5 year average due to macro-economic crisis and will seasonally increase into the lean season as scarcity of cereals / challenges to transport in the 2021 rain season take effect.</p> <p>8. Purchasing power: Currency devaluation further causing price hikes of food stuff on the market; deteriorating terms of trade between livestock keepers and cereal sellers especially as we move into the 2021 lean season.</p> <p>9. Seasonality: Generally, large losses across the state mainly due to flooding and dry season. Movement to lean season will always see a deterioration in household food security until the livestock begin to return to the homestead in May/June. Livestock ownership is skewed with many poorer/vulnerable households without animals who will not get this boost to their food consumption, especially as herd sizes are declining.</p> <p>The TWG assumptions indicate a seasonal deterioration of the majority of, if not all, elements of food security, with a possible decrease in conflict due to lower accessibility and scale-up of HFA from 16% to 29% of the population (covering 56% of daily kcal requirements).</p> <p>HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show regular assistance each month during the projection period for 29% of the population (covering 56% of daily kcal requirements), significant improvements are expected. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: 34% of the population will be covered with 57% of daily caloric requirements from April to July 2021.</p> <p>HFA deliverability: HFA is less likely to be affected, however, it is unlikely that violence will lead to the suspension of activities altogether. Rather, distributions may be delayed.</p>	<p><b>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium ** Evidence Level:</b></p> <p>IPC Current adhering to Evidence Level 2 +:</p> <p>Evidence used for current classification can be at most 12 months old at the end of projection period – FSMNS data collection happened in October 2020 therefore the dataset has less than 12 months at the end of the first projection period.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Five pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence presented with clear assumptions on forecasted trends – the assumptions were built by the IPC TWG</p>	<p><b>Food Security conclusions:</b></p> <p>During the second projection period, many of the mitigating factors (availability of food stocks, fish, wild foods, natural resources) available in previous period will remain largely unavailable. This projection period includes the peak of the lean season, during which period food availability will be seasonally low. Challenges to food availability continue and may deteriorate from conflict or insecurity. Concerning seasonality, access to livestock products is expected to increase mid to late projection period as cattle migration completes. Wild foods will be present, though insufficient to mitigate widespread large consumption gaps. Agricultural labor is expected to help increase household purchasing power. Challenges to food access continue and may intensify during the lean season. HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show regular assistance each month during the projection period for 29% of the population (covering 56% of daily kcal requirements) and significant improvements are expected. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: 34% of the population will be covered with 57% of daily caloric requirements from April to July 2021. Though, current levels of HFA plans may not be sufficient to prevent further deterioration of IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) into worse conditions, especially if disrupted.</p> <p>Conflict: Sustained violence is likely in Jonglei in 2020, including in Akobo. However, such violence is generally (in Akobo) less likely to target civilians and the scale and intensity of such violence is normally much lower.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the second projection:</b></p> <p>The RTQR team found there is significant convergence of evidence with contributing factors and the assumptions to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will remain in the second projection period. Despite the scale-up of HFA in the second projection, livelihoods are severely affected and coping strategies might exhaust in the lean season. The unusually low livestock possession indicate erosion of the most important source of income, which is likely to have further been affected by conflict escalation. Delays / disruptions of HFA are possible, and although potentially the HFA could cover all the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) and a good part of the population in IPC Phase 4 (Emergency), it is likely that a small portion of population would remain in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). <b>The RTQR team found that a plausible estimation of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) would be about 5%.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 5% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>

**RTQR – AWEIL SOUTH**

Assessment of evidence reliability			Evidence Level	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
Food Consumption/Livelihood			Evidence Level CURRENT	<p><b>Food Security conclusions regarding population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe):</b></p> <p>Food security outcome indicators point to high levels of acute food insecurity, raising considerable concerns about the occurrence of extreme deprivation of food and severely affected livelihoods: (FCS: 56% poor; rCSI Phase 3+: 52%; HDDS Phase 4+: 27%; HHS severe 10% and very severe 28%) and therefore converging towards having population classified in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). There is convergence with livelihood coping as 51% of households use Emergency coping strategies. FSMNS shows that 64% of households were not able to sell/slaughter last cows/goats, 75% could not travel to another village for begging and 24% could not collect debts/dowry from community leaders/courts. Based on cross-tabulation, 20% of total households have very severe HHS and a poor food consumption score, 20% of the total population have very severe HHS and do not own livestock, 20% having very severe HHS and did not receive assistance in past three months, 9% with very severe HHS have their main livelihood source as hunting/gathering, and 10% with very severe HHS have casual labor as their primary livelihood. Based on the FEWS NET convergence matrix of food consumption indicators, 20.4% of households pass IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) thresholds and when crossing food consumption indicators with Emergency Livelihood Coping Strategies, the percentage is also 20%. <b>Outcome indicators identify there are plausible conditions for some pockets of the population to be in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe).</b></p> <p><b>Contributing factors indicate drought and high food prices as the main drivers:</b> In June and July, rainfall fell below the 5-year average, which also resulted in a lower than average NDVI. This drought posed a challenge to 98% of households who engaged in agriculture, reportedly causing crop damage and delaying the harvest. Minor damage to crops from flooding was reported (FAO/NDVI). <b>Displacement/shelter:</b> 18% of households have destroyed shelter due to storms and rain, 19% have a household member migrating and 9% cited migration due to lack of food. <b>Agriculture (LZA07/Sorghum and Livestock):</b> Evidence of severe drought in Northern Bahr el Ghazal in July, mainly spanning Aweil North, West, and South. Although 92% planted this year, multiple production challenges were reported: shortage of rain, Fall Armyworm, which may indicate reduced yields. <b>Livestock:</b> Nearly half (47%) of the population do not own livestock, while 39% of owners having a large decrease since the same period last year. The lack of veterinary services, lack of water or lack of grazing pastures are additional challenges keeping livestock. Around 49% of the population does not consume milk, with 22% of those consuming relying on the market for purchases. <b>Market.</b> Households consuming staples from own production are supplementing with the market or borrowing/gifts: cereals (22% own production, market 59% and 14% borrowing/gifts), beans (own production 16%, market 74%, borrowing/gifts from relatives 10%), milk (own production 58%, market 28%, 14% borrowing/gifts), meat/fish/eggs (own production 10%, market 80%, 10% borrowing/gifts from relatives), vegetables (own production 83%, market 8%, borrowing/gifts from relatives 3%). Distance to markets or no transportation and COVID-19 restrictions in the past thirty days are notable barriers to market access. Following the COVID-19 restrictions in April, households faced unusually high food prices, sale of assets and borrowing from friends/relatives. The majority of households (62%) purchasing staples do so from the local community or market, while 19% of households purchase staples from neighboring areas/villages. Following COVID-19 restrictions, 27% of households bought less food/cereals (somewhat less 11%, much less 16%), while 12% were unable to purchase at all, citing price increase/unable to afford and no credit/cash as main causes. The price of sorghum is 254-403 percent higher than last year and 417-602 percent above five-year average; SSP devaluation is main constraint in market functionality, the exchange rate lost value from SSP 311 in September 2019 to SSP 520 in mid-September 2020, a 67% depreciation within one year. <b>Mitigating factors:</b> <b>Fishing:</b> the majority of the population (86%) are not able to consume fish with major constraints from grounds too far away (34%) or no equipment (25%). Around 80% of households consuming fish are purchasing from the market. Lack of equipment, preservation difficulties and COVID-19 restrictions are additional challenges for fishing. <b>Wild foods/hunting:</b> Around 32% of households went hunting in the past thirty days, though 0% reported hunting as source of meat in past seven days. About 59% of households are eating more wild foods than previous year, only 23% mostly ate or only ate wild foods for 5+ days in the previous seven, while 7% of households do not have a member physically capable of collecting and for 42% of households areas are too far away. Additional wild food difficulties included sickness among children and adults, with some sources exhausted (13%). While small in number, households eating less wild foods this year compared to last year also did so due to no household member being able to collect (41%), areas too far away (24%), (6%) too much time needed to collect and (6%) sources exhausted. <b>Humanitarian food assistance:</b> HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show no beneficiaries are assisted in the current period. There has been decreased HFA from June/July, with a distribution of only oil in October and no plans to resume until April 2021. HFA distributions were missed in August, September, and October. This coincided with a period when the harvest was severely delayed and reduced due to a previous dry spell. This combination of factors likely played a large role in causing extreme hunger in Aweil South at the time of FSMNS data collection. Around 24% of households declared receiving community support as a main coping strategy following COVID-19 restrictions.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the current:</b> The RTQR team found there is significant convergence of evidence from outcomes and contributing factors to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). Around 20% of households with very severe HHS do not own livestock, 9% of households with very severe HHS have hunting/gathering as income source with 7% of households lacking a member able to collect. FGD may suggest there are two groups for whom conditions may not have improved significantly: households who rely on food assistance as their main livelihood (1.9%), and households who rely on casual labor (10.2%). There has been decreased HFA from June/July with current plans showing no assistance until April 2021. <b>The RTQR team found a plausible estimation of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) at 5%.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 5% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS	<p><b>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium** Evidence Level:</b></p> <p>At least two pieces of R1 (+ or -) or one piece of R2 direct evidence for either food consumption or livelihood change outcome – this is provided by the FSMNS, which count 5 outcome indicators (FCS, rCSI, HHS, HDDS and LCS)</p> <p>And</p> <p>Five other pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence, with at least two of those from the season of analysis – the FSMNS provides above 20 indicators informing contributing factors on top of other contributing factors such as rainfall, prices, floods assessments, crop and livestock assessments.</p>		
FSNMS	R1+	R1+			
GIEWS	R1+	R1+			
REACH	R1-	R1-			
FAO floods	R1-	R1-			
<b>Nutrition</b>			<p>Source</p> <p>TWG RS</p> <p>RTQR Prep RS</p>		
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
SMART (WHZ)	R1-	R1-			
SMART (MUAC)	x	x			
Family MUAC	x	x	<p>Source</p> <p>TWG RS</p> <p>RTQR Prep RS</p>		
SMART	R1-	R1-			
<b>Mortality</b>			<p>Source</p> <p>TWG RS</p> <p>RTQR Prep RS</p>		
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
SMART	R1-	R1-			

## RTQR – AWEIL SOUTH

TWG assumptions	Evidence Level Projected 1	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
<p>1. Reported cases of COVID-19 in Aweil South will remain low, but the response to the pandemic (nationally and internationally) will affect food security by complicating international trade and placing constraints on humanitarian aid. Relatively little migration takes place into and out of Aweil South. This is not likely to change within the first projection period. Some of the shocks (FSNMS) will likely continue to affect food security by limiting the amount of stocks available. This includes the drought and crop pests/diseases reported, missed distributions, as well as high prices from the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>2. With the low yield in October, due to drought and plant disease, harvested crops will start to run out in December. Fishing and collecting grasses and firewood will remain available until February, at which point households will have to start relying almost exclusively on seasonal wild foods. The situation will deteriorate once harvested crops run out earlier than normal, as crop yields were reduced due to drought. During the current period, fish are available and households have access to livelihoods in the form of collecting firewood and grasses to sell at the market. However, due to the dry season, these options will become less accessible, at which point the only food source available to most households will be wild foods. In September 2020, 16.7% of households sold their last cattle or had exhausted their ability to do so. As a result, livestock products will be less available during the first projection as well.</p> <p>3. Macroeconomic trends, inflation, and the COVID-19 pandemic will cause price increases to continue, further limiting financial access to markets. No humanitarian aid distributions will take place during the first projection. Financial access to markets will continue to deteriorate due to changing macroeconomic conditions. Additionally, given the large decrease in the number of cattle prior to FSNMS data collection, households will have less cattle to sell in order to obtain food. At the same time, physical access will improve with the end of the rainy season. There will be no access to humanitarian food aid because no further distributions are planned. Financial access to markets will continue to deteriorate due to changing macroeconomic conditions. Additionally, given the large decrease in the number of cattle prior to FSNMS data collection, households will have less cattle to sell in order to obtain food. Households will still have access to wild foods. In September 2020, those most affected by a lack of food included households who rely on casual labor, gathering/hunting, and humanitarian aid as their main livelihood (approximately 34% of the population). These are the households who will likely have trouble accessing food again during the first projection.</p> <p>4. Food utilization will largely remain similar, although the end of the rainy season will lead to a decrease in water-borne diseases. The low degree of access to WASH and Health facilities will likely not improve significantly.</p> <p>5. The factors leading to an increased risk of deteriorating humanitarian conditions in Aweil South will likely be addressed by an increase in food availability in the first projection period.</p> <p>The TWG assumptions indicate a deterioration or continuation of aggravating factors, largely mitigated by fishing/wild food gathering as no HFA is planned during the period.</p> <p>HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show no assistance until April, therefore no large mitigating effect is expected during the period. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: no planned assistance during this period.</p> <p>HFA deliverability: Although there are conflict-sensitivity concerns, the chances that conflict will prevent HFA are negligible.</p>	<p><b>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium ** Evidence Level:</b></p> <p>IPC Current adhering to Evidence Level 2 +:</p> <p>Evidence used for current classification can be at most 12 months old at the end of projection period – FSNMS data collection happened in October 2020 therefore the dataset has less than 12 months at the end of the first projection period.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Five pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence presented with clear assumptions on forecasted trends – the assumptions were built by the IPC TWG</p>	<p><b>Food Security conclusions:</b></p> <p>Challenges to food availability continue. Low food availability from reduced production in prior season with food stock likely available until November 2020, no HFA distributions and food reserves may run out earlier than usual (in December). Limited or reduced livestock products during this period. Limited or off season-fishing activities are expected until the end of the projection period, however, many households are not expected to benefit due to distance, lack of equipment or lack of capacity: 11% are not able to fish (capacity), 24% do not have equipment, 25% grounds too far away. Wild foods will be present, though insufficient to mitigate widespread large food consumption gaps, even if all households had access (7% of households do not have a member physically capable of collecting and for 42% of households grounds are too far away); while 75% were eating wild foods in the data collection period (Sep-Oct); although food prices are expected to reduce in this period. Animal displacement following floods may limit hunting activities or normalization of these activities. Challenges to food access continue and may further deteriorate from high prices trends (more than 200% higher than previous year) and reduced purchasing power. These disruptions may hamper market functionality or supply constraints that may further constrain household food access. Income generation activities or the level of income may be reduced in this period with the onset of the dry season (as evidence shows reduced income from casual labor in the current period). The mitigating factors from the current period addressing the high acute food insecurity recorded in September 2020, will be unavailable in the second part of the first projection and will not be replaced. As a result, it is likely that food insecurity will be similar to the current for part of the first projection, with some deterioration towards the second half. HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show no assistance until April, therefore, no large mitigating affect is expected during the period. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: no planned assistance during this period. Despite some availability of food stocks and slight reduction of food prices as mitigating factors, food security and livelihood evidence indicate a severe situation in the current period and the assumptions all highlight the likely deterioration during this period. Households relying on borrowing or gifts from friends/relatives for staple consumption may see reductions as food sources decrease, while community support to cope with shocks may not be as reliable as during the current period.</p> <p>Conflict: Although there are conflict-sensitivity concerns, the chances that conflict will prevent HFA are negligible.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the first projection:</b></p> <p>The RTQR found there is significant convergence of evidence with contributing factors and the assumptions to indicate a portion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will increase in the first projection period. Food availability and access constraints are likely to continue or even deteriorate with no planned HFA until end of projection period. Households already presenting large or extreme food gaps and emergencies or depleted coping strategies in IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) and IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will continue facing these conditions. Humanitarian assistance is only planned from April 2021 onwards. <b>The RTQR team found that a plausible estimation of households in Catastrophe would be about 10%.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 10% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>

**RTQR – AWEIL SOUTH**

TWG assumptions	Evidence Level Projected 2	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
<p>1. Relatively little migration takes place into and out of Aweil South. Shocks reported during FSNMS round 26, including drought and crop pests/diseases, will continue to leave the population of Aweil South vulnerable, because harvested crops will have run out during the second projection. Prices will likely remain high or rise even further. The start of the rainy season may also result in flooding.</p> <p>2. Stocks of harvested foods will have run out. Due to the dry season, fish will not be available for some of the projection period. However, humanitarian food aid is planned from April onwards. Most households will rely on humanitarian aid and wild foods.</p> <p>3. Food stocks will have run out, as will livelihoods such as gathering grasses and fishing. Households will be heavily reliant on markets, but financial access will be low and will continue to deteriorate due to changing macroeconomic conditions. Additionally, given the large decrease in the number of cattle prior to the FSNMS data collection, households will have less cattle to sell in order to obtain food. However, households will have access to humanitarian food aid.</p> <p>4. Food utilization will largely remain similar. Although the dry season will lead to a decrease in water-borne diseases, WASH conditions will likely not improve significantly.</p> <p>5. Food security is likely to deteriorate in the second projection due to the extended period of time with no access to harvested crops.</p> <p>The TWG assumptions indicate a deterioration of the majority of, if not all, elements of food security, largely mitigated by wild food collection and HFA.</p> <p>HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show regular assistance each month during the projection period for 26% of the population (covering 31% of daily kcal requirements) from April to June 2021, with 40% of the population covered in July with 38% of daily caloric requirement, and significant improvements are expected. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: 20% of the population will be covered with 51% of daily caloric requirements from April to June and 40% of the population in July with 51% of daily caloric requirements.</p> <p>HFA deliverability: Although there are conflict-sensitivity concerns, the chances that conflict will prevent HFA are negligible.</p>	<p><b>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium ** Evidence Level:</b></p> <p>IPC Current adhering to Evidence Level 2 +:</p> <p>Evidence used for current classification can be at most 12 months old at the end of projection period – FSMNS data collection happened in October 2020 therefore the dataset has less than 12 months at the end of the first projection period.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Five pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence presented with clear assumptions on forecasted trends – the assumptions were built by the IPC TWG</p>	<p><b>Food Security conclusions:</b></p> <p>During the second projection, the mitigating factors (availability of food stocks, fish, natural resources) in previous periods will remain unavailable. This projection period includes the peak of the lean season, during which period food availability will be seasonally low and prices of food items are expected to seasonally increase, affecting the most vulnerable households reliant on daily labor for food access. Challenges to food availability continue. Wild foods will be present, though insufficient to mitigate widespread large consumption gaps. Challenges to food access continue and may intensify during the lean season. HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show regular assistance each month during the projection period for 26% of the population (covering 31% of daily kcal requirements) from April to June 2021, with 40% of the population covered in July with 38% of daily caloric requirement, and significant improvements are expected. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared, taking into account the feasibility of delivery: 20% of the population will be covered with 51% of daily caloric requirements from April to June, and 40% of the population in July with 51% of daily caloric requirements. However, planned levels of HFA may not be sufficient to prevent further deterioration of IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) into worse conditions.</p> <p>Conflict: Although there are conflict-sensitivity concerns, the chances that conflict will prevent HFA are negligible.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the second projection:</b></p> <p>The RTQR found it plausible there is significant convergence of evidence with contributing factors and the assumptions to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will remain present in the second projection period. Significant mitigating factors are present in this period, the increase of HFA, access to livestock products, seasonal fishing and continuation of wild foods, which are expected to prevent a further increase of populations in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). Given this is the lean season, people will rely more on markets, and the prices – already at unprecedented levels, will further increase, making access prohibitive for the many households classified in IPC Phase 4. Despite the scale-up of HFA, the prolonged use of negative coping strategies are expected to further strain livelihood coping options. <b>The RTQR team found that a plausible estimation of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) would be about 10%.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 10% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>

RTQR – TONJ EAST

Assessment of evidence reliability			Evidence Level	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
Food Consumption/Livelihood			Evidence Level CURRENT	<p><b>Food Security conclusions regarding population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe):</b></p> <p>Food security outcome indicators point to high levels of acute food insecurity, raising considerable concerns about the possible occurrence of extreme deprivation of food and severely affected livelihoods: (FCS: 35% poor; rCSI Phase 3+: 32%; HDDS Phase 4+: 13%; HHS severe 2% and very severe 13%) and therefore converging towards having some population classified in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). There is convergence with livelihood coping as 61% of households use Emergency coping strategies. FSMNS shows that 44% of households were not able to sell/slaughter last cows/goats, 59% could not travel to another village for begging, and 19% could not collect debts/dowry from community leaders/courts. Based on cross-tabulation, 5% of households having very severe HHS did not plant, 5% of households with very severe HHS do not own livestock, 5% of total households having very severe HHS rely on hunting/gathering as their main livelihood source. Based on the FEWS NET convergence matrix of food consumption indicators, 0.9% of households are in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) conditions, while crossing with Emergency Livelihood Coping Strategies, the percentage is 1%. Despite presence of households with a very severe HHS, the other indicators do not converge at the same level of severity with the FCS, rCSI is at a low to full IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) and the HDDS shows a possible IPC Phase 3 (Crisis). <b>Outcome indicators identify there are plausible conditions for some pockets of the population to be in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe).</b></p> <p><b>Combination of flooding, conflict, lack of access to the markets, shortage of food, oil prices and the fluctuations in the US dollar all combined to send prices very high in the markets with many households unable to afford basic food and NFIs.</b> Flooding in some areas completely destroyed crops and shelters. Many people were left with either very little or nothing at all. Displacement has been largely caused by conflict and flooding with (SSGID) 30,121 IDPs reported. Persistent inter-communal violence and cattle raiding has had a drastic effect on cultivation, as many people had their crops stolen, are too scared to cultivate, cultivated early and left or did not cultivate at all. Normal coping mechanisms have been diminished as many people are afraid to collect wild foods as it is dangerous and have had their usual support structures eroded. (AOK) 15% of households reported by KIs as being headed by either a child or an elderly person while 28% of households reported by KIs identified a displacement status of either IDPs, IDP returnees, refugee returnees, or refugees. The type of foods eaten at the time of visit were mainly vegetables with less cereals. Around 6% of households reported by KIs with no shelter and sleeping in the open to cope. (FSNMS) Around 16% of households migrated due to lack of food and 25% of the population has damaged shelter, 5% completely destroyed. <b>Agriculture:</b> (FSNMS) Around 7% of households did not plant this year, citing lack of inputs and labor. Farming challenges this year include shortage of rain, shortage of seeds and tools, insecurity and Fall Armyworm. Despite shocks, households consuming staple foods relied heavily on own production: cereals (96%), beans (88%), milk/dairy (89%), vegetables (72%) with the exception of meat/fish/eggs which is 100% reliant on the market. <b>Livestock:</b> 20% of households do not own livestock with half the livestock owners having a large decrease since same period last year. 50% of the livestock owners having a large decrease cited sale/slaughter, diseases and raiding as main causes. Around 42% of households are not able to consume milk, with 5% of those consuming receiving as gifts from relatives/friends. <b>Market:</b> Households consuming staples from own production are largely not supplementing with the market, except meat/fish/eggs: cereals (93% own production, market 2% and 1% borrowing/gifts), beans (own production 88%, market 4%, borrowing/gifts from relatives 2%), milk (own production 89%, market 11%, 0% borrowing/gifts from relatives), meat/fish/eggs (own production 0%, market 100%, 0% borrowing/gifts from relatives), vegetables (own production 72%, market 0%, 3% borrowing/gifts from relatives). Physical access (market too far away/no transport) was highest barrier to accessing markets in past 30 days. Nearly 82% of households reported sickness within the past two weeks. Barriers to market access in the past thirty days included physical access issues (too far away/no transportation); which is concerning as over half (53%) of households purchasing staples do so from neighboring villages. Following COVID-19 restrictions in April, 53% of households bought less food/cereals (somewhat less 10% and much less 43%), while 16% were unable to buy, citing unable to afford, no cash/credit, insecurity, or markets not operating/closed as causes for change. The SSP devaluation is the main constraint in market functionality, the exchange rate lost value from SSP 311 in September 2019 to SSP 520 in mid-September 2020, a 67% depreciation within one year. Multiple access constraints compounded by macro-economic pressure (high prices, currency exchange/devaluation) and growing reliance on market from seasonality. Only 2% cited the market as the main source of food for cereals. <b>Mitigating Factors: Fishing:</b> No households are able to consume fish, 54% citing areas too far away, 26% of households have no household member able to fish, while 7% have no equipment, with 7% not feeling safe. <b>Wild foods/hunting:</b> 0% reported hunting as main source of meat in the diet. About 11% of households reported hunting for food in the past thirty days. In comparison to same time last year, almost half (47%) are consuming more wild foods while eating bad tasting/less-preferred foods, facing sickness in adults/children, with some unable to due to wild food exhaustion. In the previous seven days, 6% mostly ate or only ate wild foods 5+ days a week, while for 18% of households the areas are too far away. While small in number, households eating less wild foods this year compared to last year also did so due to areas too far away (8%), while for 8% areas are unsafe and for 8% sources are exhausted. <b>Humanitarian Food Assistance:</b> HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show in the months of data collection 8% of the population on average received 28% of their kcal requirements. In the current period, no beneficiaries are assisted. In October-November 0% of the population analyzed is receiving HFA, therefore no mitigation of the food consumption levels is expected.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the current:</b> The RTQR team did find a convergence of evidence from outcomes and contributing factors to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). Considering this was the situation detected in September-October, the only month when there has been a (minimal) distribution, the situation in the current period is likely very close to the one portrayed by the survey. Around 5% of households having very severe HHS did not plant and 5% of households with very severe HHS do not own livestock, while 5% of total households having very severe HHS rely on hunting/gathering as their main livelihood source. <b>The RTQR team found a plausible estimation of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) at 5%.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 5% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
FSNMS	R1+	R1+			
GIEWS	R1+	R1+			
REACH	R1-	R1-			
FAO floods	R1-	R1-			
Nutrition					
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
SMART (WHZ)	R1-	R1-			
SMART (MUAC)	x	x			
Family MUAC	x	x			
Mortality					
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
SMART	R1-	R1-			

RTQR – TONJ EAST			
TWG assumptions	Evidence Level Projected 1	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
<p>1. The second wave of COVID-19 is already felt in neighboring countries and trade may be affected by movement restrictions. Persistent inter-communal conflict due to revenge and cattle raiding. Insecurity, violence, raiding and looting, that coupled with the impact of floods on crops has created the highest level of vulnerability amongst households. Thus, the food security situation is expected to remain worse during the projected periods.</p> <p>2. Food production is expected to be lower than that of 2019 due to persistent inter-communal conflict as well as flooding. Livestock are away from homestead, reducing access to livestock products (milk).</p> <p>3. Availability of milk supplies for households consumption is expected be normal at the start of the projection period as cattle are still near the homestead as a result of availability of pasture and water, though it will be reduced by mid-projection period due to cattle migration to Toch. Food availability expected to be worse due to exhaustion of own stocks, livestock products also expected to decrease as a result of cattle migration to Toch in search of pasture; hence, the food security situation may be worse.</p> <p>4. It is projected that access to seasonal wild foods will be maintained in the first projection period, such as Lalop fruit and seed and Lang. White sorghum (feterita) prices in Wau are expected to trend seasonally higher than last year and the five-year average from October 2020 through March 2021; though it is likely to decline from October to its lowest in the November-December period, due to increased local supplies at households and the market. However, it is anticipated to be fairly stable in the January-March 2021 period, due to the expected increase in import level from Uganda and Sudan, as a result of better feeder road conditions. The price is projected to be significantly higher than the same time last year and 54-134% above the five-year average, and likely to decline from 375 SSP/kg to 342 SSP/kg in the October-December period and anticipated to range from 343 SSP/kg to 299 SSP/kg in the January-March 2021 period. During the first projected period, a significant number of households will exhaust own production and this will increase their dependency on the market, which, coupled with the hiking of food prices, may be beyond reach for the poor households.</p> <p>5. Due to persistent conflict and displacement, the majority access drinking water from unsafe water sources. As long as awareness on hygiene and sanitation among the community is low, and water sources do not change, food utilization is expected to remain the same.</p> <p>The TWG assumptions indicate a deterioration or continuation of aggravating factors, largely mitigated by wild foods, initial livestock products and HFA.</p> <p>HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show negligible assistance until March, no large mitigating affect is expected during this period. As HFA plans indicate no assistance until March, no large mitigating effect is expected during the period. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: In December, 8% of the population will be assisted with 51% of daily caloric requirements, no assistance planned for January/February and 12% of the population with 51% of daily caloric requirements in March.</p> <p>HFA deliverability: Since increased violence is likely, HFA will likely be affected in the next three months, and alternative locations are hard to find.</p>	<p><b>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium ** Evidence Level:</b></p> <p>IPC Current adhering to Evidence Level 2 +:</p> <p>Evidence used for current classification can be at most 12 months old at the end of projection period – FSMNS data collection happened in October 2020 therefore the dataset has less than 12 months at the end of the first projection period.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Five pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence presented with clear assumptions on forecasted trends – the assumptions were built by the IPC TWG</p>	<p><b>Food Security conclusions:</b></p> <p>Challenges to food availability continue and may further deteriorate from conflict or insecurity. Agricultural production is estimated to be lower than 2019, raising concerns on food availability and food stocks moving away from the harvest. Regarding seasonality, cattle migrate and will not be available until June, therefore limited/no milk in projection period. Limited or off season-fishing activities are expected until the end of the projection period, though may not benefit all households, even if all households have access (areas are too far for 54% of households, 26% do not have household member able to fish (capacity) and 7% do not have equipment). Wild foods will be present, though insufficient to mitigate widespread large food consumption gaps, even if all households could access (areas too far away for 18% of households), while 93% were eating wild foods in the data collection period (Sept-Oct). Challenges to food access continue and may further deteriorate from high prices and reduced purchasing power. Alternative or supplemental income opportunities, bush products (firewood/charcoal), may fluctuate due to access or seasonal transition. These disruptions may hamper market functionality or supply constraints that may further constrain household food access, especially as reliance on the market increases during this period. Households relying on borrowing or gifts from friends/relatives for staple consumption may see reductions as food sources decrease, while community support to cope with shocks may not be as reliable as during the current period. HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show: negligible assistance until March, no large mitigating affect is expected during this period. Food security and livelihood evidence indicate a severe situation in the current period and the assumptions all highlight the likely continuation during this projection period. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: In December, 8% of the population will be assisted with 51% of daily caloric requirements, no assistance planned for January/February, and 12% of the population with 51% of daily caloric requirements in March.</p> <p>Conflict: The attacks in Tonj East since August had civilian casualties and displacement, a situation which has been exacerbated by a second year of severe flooding in the area. Humanitarian activities were suspended in Tonj East in October, and humanitarian items looted from the primary health care unit. With additional cycles of violence likely in the near term, coupled with the remoteness of the area, HFA is likely to be affected in the next three months. Alternative locations will be hard to find.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the first projection:</b></p> <p>The RTQR team found there is significant convergence of evidence with contributing factors and the assumptions to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will remain in the first projection period. Food availability and access constraints are likely to continue or even deteriorate with no planned HFA until the end of the projection period. Households already presenting large or extreme food gaps and Emergency or depleted coping strategies in IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) will likely slide into IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). <b>The RTQR team found that a plausible estimation of households in Catastrophe would be about 5%.</b></p>	<p><b>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 5% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</b></p>

**RTQR – TONJ EAST**

TWG assumptions	Evidence Level Projected 2	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
<p>1. Persistent inter-communal conflict. Insecurity, violence, raiding and looting that coupled with the impact of floods on crops has created the highest level of vulnerability amongst households. Thus, the food security situation is expected to become worse during the second projected period.</p> <p>2. Livestock are away from the homestead; reduced access to livestock products (milk). Availability of milk supplies for household consumption is expected to improve by mid-projection period as a result of cattle migration back to the homestead. Food availability expected to be worse due to exhaustion of own stocks. Intercommunal conflict amongst communities within the county resulted in cattle raiding, looting of assets, as well as destruction of properties, causing a shortage in food availability.</p> <p>3. The current food stock lasts within three months. With gradual increases in the number of households who depend on the market, moderate price increases are expected at the end of the first projection period. High prices are expected in the second projection period. The economic crisis will continue to remain the same and negatively impact the local currency. Normal onset of rains is expected. It is projected that access to seasonal wild foods will be limited in the second projection period. From April-July, most households will not have excess to own production, this is expected to increase dependence on the market and at the time when food prices are high, beyond the reach for the extremely poor households.</p> <p>The TWG assumptions indicate a deterioration or continuation of aggravating factors, only mitigated by wild foods, late arrival of livestock products and HFA.</p> <p>HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show regular assistance each month during the projection period for 16% of the population (covering 43% of daily kcal requirements), and some improvements are expected. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared, taking into account the feasibility of delivery: 12% of the population will be covered with 51% of daily caloric requirements from April to July 2021.</p> <p>HFA deliverability: Road conditions in the rainy season would also make it difficult to move prepositioned food to alternative locations, with air deliveries to these locations made only under extenuating circumstances.</p>	<p><b>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium ** Evidence Level:</b></p> <p>IPC Current adhering to Evidence Level 2 +:</p> <p>Evidence used for current classification can be at most 12 months old at the end of projection period – FSMNS data collection happened in October 2020 therefore the dataset has less than 12 months at the end of the first projection period.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Five pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence presented with clear assumptions on forecasted trends – the assumptions were built by the IPC TWG</p>	<p><b>Food Security conclusions:</b></p> <p>During the second projection period, many of the mitigating factors (availability of food stocks, fish, wild foods) available in previous periods will remain largely unavailable. This projection period includes the peak of the lean season, during which food availability will be seasonally low. Challenges to food availability continue and may deteriorate from conflict or insecurity. Concerning seasonality, access to livestock products is expected to increase mid to late projection period as cattle migration completes. Wild foods will be present, though insufficient to mitigate widespread large consumption gaps, even if all households had access. Challenges to food access continue and may intensify during the lean season, with high reliance on markets during this period while macro-economic pressures (high prices, currency, and an unfavorable exchange rate) continue. HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show regular assistance each month during the projection period for 16% of the population (covering 43% of daily kcal requirements), and some improvements are expected. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared, taking into account the feasibility of delivery: 12% of the population will be covered with 51% of daily caloric requirements from April to July 2021. However, current planned levels of HFA may not be sufficient to prevent further deterioration of IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) into worse conditions, especially if delays or logistical access is disrupted.</p> <p>Conflict: The attacks in Tonj East since August had civilian casualties and displacement, a situation which has been exacerbated by a second year of severe flooding in the area. Humanitarian activities were suspended in Tonj East in October, and humanitarian items looted from the primary health care unit. With additional cycles of violence likely in the near term, coupled with the remoteness of the area, HFA is likely to be affected in the next three months. Alternative locations will be hard to find.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the second projection:</b></p> <p>The RTQR team found there is significant convergence of evidence with contributing factors and the assumptions to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will increase in the second projection period, with only 12% of the population assisted. Some mitigating factors are present in this period, such as access to livestock products, seasonal fishing and continuation of gathering of wild foods; however, they are insufficient to reduce populations in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). <b>The RTQR team found that a plausible estimation of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) would be about 10%.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 10% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>

**RTQR – TONJ NORTH**

Assessment of evidence reliability			Evidence Level	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
Food Consumption/Livelihood			Evidence Level CURRENT	<p><b>Food Security conclusions regarding population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe):</b></p> <p>Food security outcome indicators point to high levels of acute food insecurity, raising considerable concerns about the possible occurrence of extreme deprivation of food and severely affected livelihoods: (FCS: 8% poor; rCSI Phase 3+: 9%; HDDS Phase 4+: 37%; HHS severe 4% and very severe 21%) and therefore converging towards having some population classified in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). Extreme food gaps converge with livelihood depletion and exhaustion, with 32% of households employing Emergency coping strategies. FSNMS shows that 22% of households could not sell/slaughter last cows/goats, 32% could not travel to other villages for begging and 8% could not collect debts/dowry through community leaders/courts. (AOK) 1% of households reported by KIs as not consuming any cereals, animal protein and dairy in the last seven days and at least one member going an entire day and night without eating in the week prior to data collection. Based on cross-tabulation, 3% of total households have very severe HHS and poor food consumption score, 5% of total households having very severe HHS did not plant, similarly, 6% of total households having very severe HHS do not own livestock and 6% of total households having very severe HHS rely on hunting/gathering as their main livelihood source. Based on the FEWS NET convergence matrix of food consumption indicators, 0.9% of households have very severe HHS and other food consumption indicators passing IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) thresholds, and when crossing with Emergency Livelihood Coping Strategies, the percentage is also 0.9%. <b>Outcome indicators identify there are plausible conditions for some pockets of the population to be in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe).</b></p> <p><b>Contributing factors indicate that floods and insecurity/conflict, leading to displacements, are the primary drivers.</b> Flooding in some areas completely destroyed crops and shelters and forced people to either sleep out in the open or move to different areas within Tonj North; further increasing vulnerability. Around 30% of the population reported damaged shelter from storms or rain. Conflict has been the major driver of both food insecurity and displacement in Tonj North. It has cost people their harvests, which were either looted, destroyed or cultivated early, with many others, forced to leave due to destruction of shelter. <b>Conflict:</b> (IRNA) As reported by the IDPs on the ground and witnessed by the assessment team, the conflict has resulted in the displacement of 3,865 households (Awul 2,201, Rualbet 932 and Kirik Payam 732), claiming the lives of 26 people, including two children, wounding eight people, and displacing 108 villages (hosted in 26 villages). Additionally, 715 houses were burned with the majority of the burned villages in Awul Payams (e.g the entire village of Agany and Aporlok of Awul Payam), properties were looted, farm crops were destroyed by either attackers or weeds and animals with cattle raiding. The food security situation of the IDPs is deteriorating with the majority of IDPs coping with wild foods and begging. There is a high number of IDPs in the county (81,614, 32% of pop.), with recent displacement from insecurity or flooding. Food assistance has been limited during the past four months (3% - 7,287 households received 19% of daily caloric requirements). However, there are households that cannot meet their dietary requirements despite positive signs of improved food security in some parts of the population. <b>Migration (non conflict related)</b> Some 32% of households reporting partial migration (not related to conflict), with 13.9% indicating migration due to lack of food. <b>Agriculture:</b> Around 10% did not plant this year, while those unable to plant cited lack of labor, lack of seeds/fertilizers/tools and erosion/poor soil quality. For most households (98%), own production is the main source of cereals consumed. <b>Livestock:</b> Around 26% of households do not own livestock, while 41% have seen a large decrease since the same period last year, citing disease outbreak, armed groups/intercommunal raiding and flooding. Around 56% of the population is not able to consume milk. Based on REACH AOK, around 1% of households had super critical living standard gaps, indicating the household was not consuming any cereals, protein, and dairy in the last 7 days of the analysis and with at least one member going to bed hungry. Around 10% of households reporting critical living standard gaps reported no food in the house any day of the week prior to data collection, and 11% of households reported anyone going to bed hungry in the past week. <b>Market:</b> Households consuming staples from own production are not supplementing with the market, except meat/fish/eggs: cereals (98% own production, market 0% and 2% borrowing/gifts), beans (own production 94%, market 1%, borrowing/gifts from relatives 3%), milk (own production 93%, market 7%, 0% borrowing/gifts from relatives), meat/fish/eggs (own production 18%, market 67%, 3% borrowing/gifts from relatives), vegetables (own production 91%, market 1%, borrowing/gifts from relatives 1%). Access to markets is difficult due to distance from markets, transportation and difficulties from COVID-19 restrictions or closures in the past thirty days. Availability evidence indicates significant challenges for agricultural and agro-pastoralists in the region. Households purchasing food from markets were affected by increase of food prices (MEB value increased by 26% since last year), as well as reduction in income (casual labor wages reduced from 1,000 SSP to 800). Following COVID-19 restrictions in April, 20% of households were unable to purchase at all, citing price increase/unable to afford, no credit/cash, COVID-19 restrictions and limited transportation to the market as main causes. The SSP devaluation is the main constraint in market functionality, the exchange rate lost value from SSP 311 in September 2019 to SSP 520 in mid-September 2020, a 67% depreciation within one year. Combination of food shortages, floods removing road access in other parts of Warrap, oil prices impacting the cost of fuel and goods on the market, have resulted in food and NFIs too expensive for the most vulnerable people. <b>Mitigating factors: Fishing</b> that could usually be a mitigating factor is available, even if accessible to all households, may not benefit all (grounds too far for 58%, 18% have no equipment, 4% of households don't have household member capable of fishing (capacity), with 1% not feeling safe). <b>Wild foods/hunting:</b> 3% of households reported hunting in the past thirty days. In comparison to the same time last year, 28% of households are eating more wild foods, however, in the previous seven days, only 2% mostly ate or only ate wild foods for 5+ days, while 1% do not have a member physically able of collecting, and for 2% the areas are too far away. While small in number, households eating less wild foods this year compared to last year also did so due to no members capable of collecting (5%), or too far away (5%). <b>Humanitarian food assistance:</b> HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show in the months of data collection 3% of the population on average received 19% of their kcal requirements. In the current period, no beneficiaries are assisted. Therefore, no mitigation of the food consumption levels is expected.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the current:</b> The RTQR team found there is significant convergence of evidence from outcomes and contributing factors to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). HHS shows that over 20% are experiencing severe hunger (HHS very severe), while 5% of total households having very severe HHS did not plant, similarly, 6% of total households having very severe HHS do not own livestock and 6% of total households having very severe HHS rely on hunting/gathering as their main livelihood source; 10% of the population did not plant with 14% of migrating households citing lack of food as cause. Considering this was the situation detected in September-October, the only month when there has been a (minimal) distribution, the situation in the current period is likely very similar to the one portrayed by the survey. <b>The RTQR team found a plausible estimation of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) at 10%.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 10% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
FSNMS	R1+	R1+			
GIEWS	R1+	R1+			
REACH	R1-	R1-			
FAO floods	R1-	R1-			
<b>Nutrition</b>					
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
SMART (WHZ)	R1-	R1-			
SMART (MUAC)	x	x			
Family MUAC	x	x			
<b>Mortality</b>					
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
SMART	R1-	R1-			

**Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium\*\* Evidence Level:**

At least two pieces of R1 (+ or -) or one piece of R2 direct evidence for either food consumption or livelihood change outcome – this is provided by the FSNMS, which count 5 outcome indicators (FCS, rCSI, HHS, HDDS and LCS)

And

Five other pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence, with at least two of those from the season of analysis – the FSNMS provides above 20 indicators informing contributing factors on top of other contributing factors such as rainfall, prices, floods assessments, crop and livestock assessments.

## RTQR – TONJ NORTH

TWG assumptions	Evidence Level Projected 1	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
<p>1. The second wave of COVID-19 is already felt in neighboring countries and trade may be affected by movement restrictions. Persistent inter-communal conflict with cattle raiding.</p> <p>2. Food production is expected to be lower than that of 2019 due to persistent inter-communal conflict as well as flooding. Livestock are away from the homestead; reducing access to livestock products (milk). Availability of milk supplies for household consumption is expected to be normal at the start of the projection period as cattle are still near the homestead as a result of the availability of pasture and water, but reduced by mid-projection period due to cattle migration to Toch.</p> <p>3. It is projected that access to seasonal wild foods will be maintained in the first projection period, such as Lalop fruit and seed and Lang. Price of white sorghum (feterita) in Wau is expected to trend seasonally higher than last year and the five-year average from October 2020 through March 2021, but it is likely to decline from October to its lowest in the November-December period due to increased local supplies at households and the market. However, it is anticipated to be fairly stable in the January-March 2021 period due to an expected increase in import level from Uganda and Sudan as a result of better feeder road conditions. The price is projected to be significantly higher than the same time last year and 54-134% above the five-year average, and likely to decline from 375 SSP/kg to 342 SSP/kg in the October-December period and anticipated to range from 343 SSP/kg to 299 SSP/kg in the January-March 2021 period.</p> <p>4. The dry season is expected to be normal.</p> <p>The TWG assumptions indicate a deterioration of the continuation of aggravating factors, only mitigated by initial livestock products, wild foods and HFA.</p> <p>HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show no assistance is expected until March, when 10% of the population will be provided with 51% of daily caloric needs. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: In December, 19% of the population will be assisted with 51% of daily caloric requirements, no assistance planned for January/February, and 15% of the population will be provided with 51% of daily caloric requirements in March.</p> <p>HFA deliverability: HFA is unlikely to be much affected, since the dry season also means much better access to roads; it is likely that HFA could be relocated temporarily or suspended for only short periods of time.</p>	<p><b>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium ** Evidence Level:</b></p> <p>IPC Current adhering to Evidence Level 2 +:</p> <p>Evidence used for current classification can be at most 12 months old at the end of projection period – FSMNS data collection happened in October 2020 therefore the dataset has less than 12 months at the end of the first projection period.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Five pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence presented with clear assumptions on forecasted trends – the assumptions were built by the IPC TWG</p>	<p><b>Food Security conclusions:</b></p> <p>Challenges to food availability continue and may further deteriorate from conflict or insecurity. Concerning seasonality, cattle migrate and will not be available until June, therefore limited/no milk in the projection period. Limited or off season-fishing activities are expected until the end of the projection period, and are not expected to all benefit, due to grounds being too far away 58%, no equipment 19%, households unable to fish (capacity) 4% and 1% felt unsafe. Wild foods will be present, though insufficient to mitigate widespread large food consumption gaps, even if accessible to all households (1% of households have no member capable of collecting, 2% areas too far away), while 85% were eating wild foods in the data collection period (Sep-Oct). Challenges to food access continue and may further deteriorate from high prices and reduced purchasing power. These disruptions may hamper market functionality or supply constraints that may further constrain household food access. Income generation activities may be limited or unfeasible in this period with the onset of the dry season. Households relying on borrowing or gifts from friends/relatives for staple consumption may see reductions as food sources decrease, while community support to cope with shocks may not be as reliable as during the current period. Food security and livelihood evidence indicate a severe situation in the current period and the assumptions all highlight the likely deterioration during this period. HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show no assistance is expected until March, with 10% of the population provided with 51% of daily caloric needs. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: December 19% of the population will be assisted with 51% of daily caloric requirements, no assistance planned for January/February, and 15% of the population will be provided with 51% of daily caloric requirements in March.</p> <p>Conflict: While the cycles of violence in Tonj North ended by August, most communities believe that the upcoming dry season (from December onwards) and the resulting seasonal cattle keepers will spark renewed violence.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the first projection:</b></p> <p>The RTQR team found there is significant convergence of evidence with contributing factors and the assumptions to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will remain present in the first projection period. Food availability and access constraints are likely to continue or even deteriorate with no regularly planned HFA until the end of the projection period. Households already presenting large or extreme food gaps and Emergencies or depleted coping strategies in IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) and IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will continue facing these conditions. <b>The RTQR team found that a plausible estimation of households in Catastrophe would be about 10%</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 10% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>

RTQR – TONJ NORTH			
TWG assumptions	Evidence Level Projected 2	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
<p>1. Persistent inter-communal conflict.</p> <p>2. Livestock are away from the homestead; reduced access to livestock products (milk). Availability of milk supplies for household consumption is expected to improve by mid-projection period as a result of cattle migration back to the homestead.</p> <p>3. The current food stock lasts within three months. With gradual increases in the number of households who depend on the market, moderate price increases are expected at the end of the first projection period. High prices are expected in the second projection period. The economic crisis will continue to remain the same and negatively impact the local currency. It is projected that access to seasonal wild foods will be maintained in the second projection period.</p> <p>4. Normal onset of rains expected.</p> <p>The TWG assumptions indicate a deterioration of continuation of aggravating factors, only mitigated by the late arrival of livestock products, wild foods and HFA.</p> <p>HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show regular assistance each month during the projection period for 16% of the population (covering 45% of daily kcal requirements) and some improvements are expected. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared, taking into account the feasibility of delivery: 15% of the population will be covered with 51% of daily caloric requirements from April to July 2021.</p> <p>HFA deliverability: HFA is unlikely to be much affected, since the dry season also means much better access to roads; it is likely that HFA could be relocated temporarily or suspended for only short periods of time.</p>	<p><b>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium ** Evidence Level:</b></p> <p>IPC Current adhering to Evidence Level 2 +:</p> <p>Evidence used for current classification can be at most 12 months old at the end of projection period – FSMNS data collection happened in October 2020 therefore the dataset has less than 12 months at the end of the first projection period.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Five pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence presented with clear assumptions on forecasted trends – the assumptions were built by the IPC TWG</p>	<p><b>Food Security conclusions:</b></p> <p>During the second projection period, many of the mitigating factors (availability of food stocks, fish, wild foods, natural resources) available in previous periods will remain largely unavailable. This projection period includes the peak of the lean season, during which food availability will be seasonally low. Challenges to food availability continue and may deteriorate from conflict or insecurity . Concerning seasonality, access to livestock products is expected to increase mid to late projection period as cattle migration completes. Wild foods will be present, though insufficient to mitigate widespread large consumption gaps, even if all households had access. Challenges to food access continue and may intensify during the lean season. HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show regular assistance each month during the projection period for 16% of the population (covering 45% of daily kcal requirements) and some improvements are expected. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared, taking into account the feasibility of delivery: 15% of the population will be covered with 51% of daily caloric requirements from April to July 2021. However, this period points to a continuation of very severe conditions and planned levels of HFA may not be sufficient to prevent further deterioration of IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) into worse conditions.</p> <p>Conflict: While the cycles of violence in Tonj North ended by August, most communities believe that the upcoming dry season (from December onwards) and the resulting seasonal migration by cattle keepers will spark renewed violence.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the second projection:</b></p> <p>The RTQR team found there is significant convergence of evidence with contributing factors and the assumptions to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will remain present in the second projection period. Some mitigating factors are present in this period, the increase of HFA, access to livestock products, seasonal fishing and continuation of wild foods, which are expected to prevent a further increase of populations in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). <b>The RTQR team found that a plausible estimation of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) would be about 10%.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 10% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>

**RTQR – TONJ SOUTH**

Assessment of evidence reliability			Evidence Level	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
Food Consumption/Livelihood			Evidence Level CURRENT	<p><b>Food Security conclusions regarding population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe):</b></p> <p>Food security outcome indicators point to high levels of acute food insecurity, raising concerns about the possible occurrence of extreme deprivation of food and severely affected livelihoods: (FCS: 41% poor; rCSI Phase 3+: 44%; HDDS Phase 4+: 21%; HHS severe 1% and very severe 16%) and therefore converging towards having population classified in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). There is convergence with livelihood coping as 63% of households use Emergency coping strategies. FSMNS shows that 32% of households could not sell/slaughter (exhaustion) last cows/goats, 53% could not travel to another village for begging, while 16% could not collect debts/dowry from community leaders/courts. Based on cross-tabulation, 5% of total households having very severe HHS have poor food consumption scores, 1% having very severe HHS did not plant and 6% having very severe HHS do not own livestock. Based on the FESWNET convergence matrix of food consumption indicators, 3.7% of households are in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe), the same prevalence of livelihood coping indicators (3.7%) of households are in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). <b>Outcome indicators identify there are plausible conditions for some pockets of the population to be in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe).</b></p> <p>Contributing factors indicate floods and conflict, causing displacements, and high food prices are the primary drivers. (IRNA) Flooding in the rainy season has forced 50,000 people to move to higher ground, abandoning their crops or cultivating early. People are gathering in small areas of high land to avoid the flooding. Additional displacement caused by security issues; these problems made the lean season particularly difficult to come out of due to inability to cultivate. Conflict, cattle raiding and inter-communal violence are present. High percentage of displacement in the region (between 43% and 77%) from floods and conflict, resulting in the destruction of homes and disruption of agricultural activities. Of migrating households in the last six months, 28% reported household members having migrated, with 11% having the entire household migrate, 3% of them because of lack of food. (IRNA) The area is an IDP receiving area with over 12,000 IDPs between January and March 2020, though not from lack of food, rather destruction of assets and protection of livestock (conflict related). (WFP) Higher than average rainfall in September exacerbated this problem and is making access to food stores and access in general very difficult. Around 6.5% have completely damaged shelter, citing conflict and floods/storm as main reasons. <b>Agriculture:</b> Only 4% did not plant this year, citing insecurity as largest challenge; though those who have own production have it as main source of cereal (93%). Despite shocks, households consuming staple foods relied heavily on own production: cereals (93%), beans (96%), milk/dairy (84%), and vegetables (83%) with the exception of meat/fish (27%). Food storage challenges remain from damaged or destroyed shelters, while some fishing households face fish preservation difficulties. <b>Livestock:</b> 27% do not own livestock and 58% of those owning reported large decrease of herds, due to disease outbreak and community raiding. Roughly 65% of the population is not able to consume milk, with 8% of those consuming milk as a gift from neighbors. Livestock disease has been reported as a problem for those few who still have cattle. <b>Market:</b> Households consuming staples from own production are minimally supplementing with the market, except meat/fish/eggs: cereals (93% own production, market 2% and borrowing/gifts 3%), beans (own production 96%, market 1%, borrowing/gifts from relatives 0%), milk (own production 84%, market 13%, borrowing/gifts from relatives 3%), meat/fish/eggs (own production 27%, market 67%, borrowing/gifts from relatives 0%), vegetables (own production 83%, market 1%, borrowing/gifts from relatives 1%). Evidence suggests some barriers to market access from high food prices and shocks following COVID-19 restrictions, though reliance on staple food consumption is low. Barriers to market access in the past thirty days included markets being too far away/no means of transport, conflict/violence, COVID-19 restrictions and robbery/crime. Rapid staple food price increase (flour since July and Sorghum +300% vs. 2019), with near doubling for fuel. In parallel, the cost of daily labor has plunged nearly in half vs. 2019, indicating dramatic deterioration of purchasing power. Following COVID-19 restrictions in April, 44% of households bought less cereals (somewhat less 6%, much less 38%), while 14% were unable to buy at all, citing unable to afford and insecurity as causes for changes. The SSP devaluation is the main constraint in market functionality, the exchange rate lost value from SSP 311 in September 2019 to SSP 520 in mid-September 2020, a 67% depreciation within one year. Market purchase of cereal is only 2%, so it is not clear if prices are a real shock. <b>Mitigating factors:</b> (TWG) The usual hunger coping strategies are not being utilized due to the dangers involved with collecting wild food, hunting, fishing and travelling. <b>Fishing:</b> 80% of households are not able to fish, with roughly half indicating availability issues (wrong season: 21%, too far away 24%) and access issues (no equipment: 24%, households unable to fish: 20%), while another 6% face unsafe conditions. Around 7% mentioned fishing as their main source of (fish, meat, eggs) and 9% of fish-consuming households source fish from gifts from relatives/friends. <b>Wild food and hunting:</b> About 28% of households reported hunting for food in the past thirty days, though 0% reported hunting as source of meat in the past seven days. In comparison to the same time last year, 38% of households are consuming more wild foods while eating bad tasting/less-preferred foods, facing sickness in adults/children and consuming non-seasonal wild foods. In the previous seven days, 9% of households mostly ate or only ate wild foods for 5+ days, while 2% do not have a member physically capable of collecting and for 10% areas are too far away. While small in number, households eating less wild foods this year compared to last year also did so due to no household member able to collect (9%), areas too far away (18%), areas are unsafe (27%), too much time needed to collect (9%) and sources exhausted (9%). <b>Humanitarian Food Assistance:</b> HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show in the months of data collection 4% of the population on average received 24% of their kcal requirements. In the current period there is no assistance planned.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the current:</b></p> <p>The RTQR team found there is convergence of evidence from outcomes and contributing factors to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). Considering this was the situation detected in September-October, following two minor distributions, the situation in the current period is likely very similar to the one portrayed by the survey. The prevalence of population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) converge to over 5% (4% did not plant and have very severe HHS, 3.7% have very severe HHS and have highest phase of food consumption indicators and 3.7% have very severe HHS and Emergency Livelihood Coping Strategies, 5% have very severe HHS and poor FCS, while 1% have very severe HHS and did not plant, and 6% have very severe HHS and do not own livestock). <b>The RTQR team found a plausible estimation of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) at around 5%.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 5% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
FSNMS	R1+	R1+			
GIEWS	R1+	R1+			
REACH	R1-	R1-			
FAO floods	R1-	R1-			
<b>Nutrition</b>			<p>At least two pieces of R1 (+ or -) or one piece of R2 direct evidence for either food consumption or livelihood change outcome – this is provided by the FSNMS, which count 5 outcome indicators (FCS, rCSI, HHS, HDDS and LCS)</p> <p>And</p> <p>Five other pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence, with at least two of those from the season of analysis – the FSNMS provides above 20 indicators informing contributing factors on top of other contributing factors such as rainfall, prices, floods assessments, crop and livestock assessments.</p>		
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
SMART (WHZ)	R1-	R1-			
SMART (MUAC)	x	x			
Family MUAC	x	x			
<b>Mortality</b>			<p>Five other pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence, with at least two of those from the season of analysis – the FSNMS provides above 20 indicators informing contributing factors on top of other contributing factors such as rainfall, prices, floods assessments, crop and livestock assessments.</p>		
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
SMART	R1-	R1-			

RTQR – TONJ SOUTH			
TWG assumptions	Evidence Level Projected 1	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
<p>1. Based on the past trends, it is unlikely the intensity and frequency of this violence and related insecurity will increase during rainy season, however persisting insecurity along trade route is likely disrupt access to market, humanitarian assistance and natural food sources.</p> <p>2. Given rise in water level in river and swampy areas, increased pasture and water availability and presence of livestock within homestead in Tonj South, access to livestock products and fish are expected to remain high through January 2021. Though limited in Tonj East due to insecurity.</p> <p>3. Equally, availability of and access to natural food sources such as game and wild leaves, fruits are expected to be at normal levels throughout February and likely to decline through February-May projection period. Based on the historical production trend over past years, and disruption to farming activities by intercommunal violence and floods in 2020 cropping season, it is likely that harvest will be similar to 2019, in Tonj South and or lower than last year in Tonj East and therefore expected to be depleted by February 2021 in most households. The prices of basic food stuffs have been experiencing dramatic increases in the past months</p> <p>4. Additionally, income from sales of natural resource including poles, firewood and charcoal are expected to be normal through projection periods although the sale price and quantity will likely to vary between the two projection periods due to demands and supply level.</p> <p>The TWG assumptions indicate a deterioration of the majority if not all elements of food security, only mitigated by wild foods, fishing, seasonal livelihood activities and HFA.</p> <p>HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show no assistance until March, therefore no large mitigating affect is expected during this period. Assumptions with food security and livelihood evidence highlight the likely deterioration during this period. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: December 13% of the population will be assisted with 51% of daily caloric requirements, no assistance planned for January/February and 24% of the population with 51% of daily caloric requirements in March.</p> <p>HFA deliverability: While a recurrence of violence in Tonj South in the 2021 dry season is of great concern, it is unlikely that such violence would lead to a suspension of HFA altogether. Nevertheless, delays in distributions are likely.</p>	<p><b>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium ** Evidence Level:</b></p> <p>IPC Current adhering to Evidence Level 2 +:</p> <p>Evidence used for current classification can be at most 12 months old at the end of projection period – FSMNS data collection happened in October 2020 therefore the dataset has less than 12 months at the end of the first projection period.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Five pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence presented with clear assumptions on forecasted trends – the assumptions were built by the IPC TWG</p>	<p><b>Food Security conclusions:</b></p> <p>Challenges to food availability continue and may further deteriorate from insecurity or loss of humanitarian space / operations. Migration of livestock will reduce access to livestock from January onwards and are not expected to return until June, therefore limited/no milk in projection period. Limited or off-season fishing activities are not expected to benefit all, especially for those with grounds too far away 24%, no equipment 24% and households unable (capacity) 20%. Some reduction in availability and access to wild foods/hunting from February onwards, though some households cannot consume, even if they have access (areas too far away 10% and 2% do not have a member physically capable of collecting), while 76% were eating wild foods in the data collection period (Sep-Oct). The harvest is expected to be depleted by February, also coinciding with other reductions in food availability/access, three months prior the lean season. Alternative or supplemental income opportunities, bush products (firewood/charcoal), may fluctuate due to access or seasonal transition. Challenges to food access continue as high prices and an unfavorable exchange rate restrict household purchasing power. Households relying on borrowing or gifts from friends/relatives for staple consumption may see reductions as food sources decrease, while community support to cope with shocks may not be as reliable as during the current period. HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show no assistance until March, therefore no large mitigating affect is expected during this period. Assumptions with food security and livelihood evidence highlight the likely deterioration during this period. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared taking into account the feasibility of delivery: December 13% of the population will be assisted with 51% of daily caloric requirements, no assistance planned for January/February and 24% of the population with 51% of daily caloric requirements in March.</p> <p>Conflict: The upcoming dry season is likely to see renewed violence, particularly as cattle keepers start migrating across county and state boundaries with their cattle. The continued presence of cattle keepers in the area in advance of the dry season will likely result in competition for resources and may trigger potentially violent confrontations between the two communities, particularly as the harvest season is set to start. As seen in previous years, such violence may potentially spill over into Tonj South and Tonj North.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the first projection:</b></p> <p>The RTQR team found there is significant convergence of evidence with contributing factors and the assumptions to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will increase in the first projection period. Food availability and access constraints are likely to continue or even intensify with no regular planned HFA until end of projection period. Households already presenting large or extreme food gaps and emergencies or depleted coping strategies in IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) and IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will continue facing these conditions. <b>The RTQR team found that a plausible estimation of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) would be about 10%</b></p>	<p><b>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 10% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</b></p>

**RTQR – TONJ SOUTH**

TWG assumptions	Evidence Level Projected 2	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
<p>1. Given the high level of intercommunal events in Tonj East, and the neighboring counties during the rainy season, it is likely the intensity and frequency of this violence and related insecurity will increase in the relatively calm county of Tonj South, with expected retaliatory attacks and cattle raiding activities in the January-May projection period. As a direct result of this, access to markets, humanitarian assistance and natural food sources is anticipated to be disrupted periodically through the projection periods.</p> <p>2. As water level goes down and livestock move away to dry season grazing areas from February through June, availability and access to these food and income sources are likely to be low to households. Equally, availability of and access to natural food sources such as game and wild leaves, fruits are expected to be at normal levels throughout February and likely to decline in the February-May projection period.</p> <p>3. Additionally, income from sales of natural resources including poles, firewood and charcoal are expected to be normal through the projection periods although the sale price and quantity will likely to vary between the two projection periods due to demands and supply level.</p> <p>The TWG assumptions indicate a deterioration of the majority of, if not all, elements of food security, only mitigated by wild foods, seasonal livelihood activities and HFA.</p> <p>HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show regular assistance each month during the projection period for 28% of the population (covering 44% of daily kcal requirements). This HFA is expected to substantially improve conditions. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared, taking into account the feasibility of delivery: 24% of the population will be covered with 51% of daily caloric requirements from April to July 2021.</p> <p>HFA deliverability: Potentially violent confrontations, particularly as the harvest season is set - the 2021 dry season is of great concern, however, it is unlikely that such violence would lead to a suspension of HFA altogether, though there will be possible delays.</p>	<p><b>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are at Medium ** Evidence Level:</b></p> <p>IPC Current adhering to Evidence Level 2 +:</p> <p>Evidence used for current classification can be at most 12 months old at the end of projection period – FSMNS data collection happened in October 2020 therefore the dataset has less than 12 months at the end of the first projection period.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Five pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence presented with clear assumptions on forecasted trends – the assumptions were built by the IPC TWG</p>	<p><b>Food Security conclusions:</b></p> <p>During the second projection period, many of the mitigating factors (availability of food stocks, fish, wild foods, natural resources) available in previous periods may remain largely unavailable. This projection period includes the peak of the lean season, during which food availability will be seasonally low. Challenges to food availability continue and may deteriorate from conflict or insecurity. Concerning seasonality, access to livestock products is expected to increase mid to late projection period as cattle migration completes. Wild foods will be present, though insufficient to mitigate widespread large consumption gaps and may be inaccessible due to insecurity, distance or lack of capacity. Challenges to food access continue and may intensify during the lean season, especially as conflict intensifies. Increase of frequency and intensity of conflict may compound access constraints with disruptions to market access, functionality and supply. Humanitarian space / operations may reduce due to conflict. HFA plans shared with the TWG at the time of the analysis show regular assistance each month during the projection period for 28% of the population (covering 44% of daily kcal requirements). This HFA is expected to substantially improve conditions. However, after requests for more refined information, a new HFA plan was shared, taking into account the feasibility of delivery: 24% of the population will be covered with 51% of daily caloric requirements from April to July 2021.</p> <p>Conflict: The upcoming dry season is likely to see renewed violence, particularly as cattle keepers start migrating across county and state boundaries with their cattle. The continued presence of cattle keepers in the area in advance of the dry season will likely result in competition for resources and may trigger potentially violent confrontations between the two communities, particularly as the harvest season is set to start. As seen in previous years, such violence may potentially spill over into Tonj South and Tonj North.</p> <p><b>RTQR conclusion for the second projection:</b></p> <p>The RTQR team found there is significant convergence of evidence with contributing factors and the assumptions to indicate a proportion of the population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will reduce in the second projection period; assuming humanitarian access will likely be good, proper identification/targeting and no disruptions in the planned HFA. Significant mitigating factors are present in this period, the increase of HFA, late access to livestock products and continuation of wild foods, which are expected to reduce the populations in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe). <b>The RTQR team found that a plausible estimation of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) would be 5%.</b></p>	<p><i>The RTQR team would recommend the IPC TWG an estimation of 5% of households in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) as the most plausible.</i></p>

**RTQR – PIBOR**

Assessment of evidence reliability			Evidence Level	Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Recommendations
Food Consumption/Livelihood			Evidence Level CURRENT	<p><b>Food Insecurity conclusions:</b> The evidence available for food consumption and livelihood change converges on extremely high levels of food consumption gaps and severely affected livelihoods. Outcome indicators point to a very high population accumulated in IPC Phase 4 and 5 (FCS: 75% poor, HDDS 1-2 groups: 60%, HHS: severe and very severe 13% &amp; 33%; LCS: 66% Emergency coping). All contributing factors are overwhelmingly pointing to IPC Phase 5 food security conditions as all availability, access, utilization and stability give evidence of a very dire situation in which high proportion of households are facing a severe level of destitution, multiple shocks, and running out of coping options. Hazards and Vulnerability evidence shows the Pibor population has been severely affected by multiple shocks: protracted conflict (30% reporting to be affected, 45% reporting to migrate, 15,000 recent IDPs) and past and recent effects of flooding (36%). Availability evidence shows a significant deterioration due to conflict impeding cultivation for a large proportion of households, and flooding that caused large crop losses to 66% of households. Additional inadequate Humanitarian Food Assistance reaching the area compounds these affects. HFA has not been distributed since May 2020, with the exception of a GFD in August for less than 10% of the population, as this has been impaired by severe access constraints to the area. Estimated HFA levels in the current are very low to mitigate the high level of acute food insecurity (27% beneficiaries with 14% Kcal coverage). Livestock stocks are well diminished. Access evidence shows area being affected by high food prices (SMEB in Pibor increased of 132% compared to October 2019, and is 62,342 SSP higher than the cost of national median SMEB (46730 SSP)). Prices further deteriorated recently due to overall food shortage due to reduced production, COVID-19 effects, and currency devaluation (SSP devaluation of 103% compared to 2019). Utilization evidence shows high levels of need in WASH and very high proportion (&gt;80%) reporting to have a member sick with difficulties accessing health facilities. All food security evidence on outcomes and contributing factors converges on a likely Phase 5 (Famine) situation, with a proportion plausibly reaching what has been proposed by the TWG (25% of households in this Phase).</p> <p><b>Nutrition conclusion:</b> Concerning nutrition, if taking into account the Family MUAC as R0, the prevalence seems to indicate rather a severe Emergency (IPC Phase 4) than an IPC Phase 5 (Famine) classification. The lagging expectation should be further explored, as aggravating factors have been present since May without any mitigation from HFA and very poor mitigation from the harvest. Nutrition conclusions are that the area should be classified IPC Phase 4 either if using historical evidence (as AMN analysis) or the Family MUAC. In terms of mortality, only historical evidence is available, besides newspaper qualitative reports.</p> <p><b>Conclusions for the current:</b> From a food security point of view, the situation converges towards Catastrophic levels to the extent indicated by the TWG. The food security experts concur with the TWG estimation of population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) at 25% of households. From a nutrition point of view, the elements are available to converge towards a very severe IPC Phase 4 as indicated by the TWG, and the nutrition experts concur with the TWG classification in IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) at area level. Considering the above conclusions, the RTQR Team recommends this area to be reviewed by the IPC FRC, and the following recommendations considered by the FRC.</p> <p><b>Further elements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mitigating factors such as access to wild foods and fishing activities should be explored in depth, but they are not available in the evidence provided.</li> <li>• Regarding the nutrition, at this point, the decision will be an expert opinion over the reliability of the data available (Family MUAC and other scattered screenings).</li> <li>• The FRC should conduct an analysis on interaction among food security and nutrition, with a nutrition situation seeming slightly less severe than the food security situation and to which extent this could be due to a lagging effect or other elements might concur to this lack of converge.</li> <li>• The FRC should further explore if the situation in the current might have evolved since data collection in October.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Recommendations for the current:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the FRC consider that the Minimum Evidence for Famine Likely are not met, but that food security and nutrition converge over famine at area level, then an option of employing the protocols for limited or no humanitarian access could be used under condition that the nutrition data is considered R0. Limited access to data collection is from both the COVID-19 restriction and actual difficulties to access linked to floods and insecurity.</li> <li>• Should the FRC consider that the Minimum Evidence for Famine Likely are not met, and that food security and nutrition do not converge over famine at area level, the question remains open on whether the protocols allow the classification of the area as IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) with more than 20% population in IPC Phase 5. The team estimated that reducing the portion of population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) will not be in line with the convergence of evidence in food security. However, it is understood that nutrition and mortality might not indicate the occurrence of Famine (as area classification), either due to a lagging effect, lack of evidence or because there are problems with the food security information. The IPC Famine Guidance note at page 4 is unclear on the direction to take, which is then referred to the FRC.</li> </ul>
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS	<p><b>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are met. However the severity of food insecurity indicating signs of famine conditions requires thorough checks on Evidence Reliability and Evidence Levels for Famine classification (nutrition and mortality in particular).</b></p> <p>These checks should be conducted by the Famine Review Committee.</p> <p>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are met. However the severity of food insecurity indicating signs of famine conditions requires thorough checks on Evidence Reliability and Evidence Levels for Famine classification (nutrition and mortality in particular). These checks should be conducted by the Famine Review Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum Evidence Level for Famine are not met, as none of the evidence is R2.</li> <li>• Minimum Evidence for Famine Likely are not met due to insufficient reliability of nutrition and mortality data.</li> <li>• Should the FRC think that the area presents famine conditions, the protocols for areas with limited or no access to data collection could be employed, due to the limitations imposed by COVID-19 restrictions to data collection, in addition to the actual limitations from floods and insecurity. Even with the employment of these protocols, the nutrition and/or mortality evidence should be considered at least R0. There is currently no confirmation that the nutrition data (Family MUAC, Facility screening) could be considered R0. Mortality qualitative information is also available.</li> <li>• Expert judgement is needed to assess the extent that the available information on nutrition could be considered R0, especially with regards to Family MUAC, for which there is no global guidance on employment for prevalence (only for screening and programming purposes).</li> </ul>		
FSNMS	R1+	R1+			
GIEWS	R1+	R1+			
REACH	R1-	R1-			
FAO floods	R1-	R1-			
Nutrition			<p>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are met. However the severity of food insecurity indicating signs of famine conditions requires thorough checks on Evidence Reliability and Evidence Levels for Famine classification (nutrition and mortality in particular). These checks should be conducted by the Famine Review Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum Evidence Level for Famine are not met, as none of the evidence is R2.</li> <li>• Minimum Evidence for Famine Likely are not met due to insufficient reliability of nutrition and mortality data.</li> <li>• Should the FRC think that the area presents famine conditions, the protocols for areas with limited or no access to data collection could be employed, due to the limitations imposed by COVID-19 restrictions to data collection, in addition to the actual limitations from floods and insecurity. Even with the employment of these protocols, the nutrition and/or mortality evidence should be considered at least R0. There is currently no confirmation that the nutrition data (Family MUAC, Facility screening) could be considered R0. Mortality qualitative information is also available.</li> <li>• Expert judgement is needed to assess the extent that the available information on nutrition could be considered R0, especially with regards to Family MUAC, for which there is no global guidance on employment for prevalence (only for screening and programming purposes).</li> </ul>		
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
SMART (WHZ)	R1-	R1-			
SMART (MUAC)	x	x	<p>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are met. However the severity of food insecurity indicating signs of famine conditions requires thorough checks on Evidence Reliability and Evidence Levels for Famine classification (nutrition and mortality in particular). These checks should be conducted by the Famine Review Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum Evidence Level for Famine are not met, as none of the evidence is R2.</li> <li>• Minimum Evidence for Famine Likely are not met due to insufficient reliability of nutrition and mortality data.</li> <li>• Should the FRC think that the area presents famine conditions, the protocols for areas with limited or no access to data collection could be employed, due to the limitations imposed by COVID-19 restrictions to data collection, in addition to the actual limitations from floods and insecurity. Even with the employment of these protocols, the nutrition and/or mortality evidence should be considered at least R0. There is currently no confirmation that the nutrition data (Family MUAC, Facility screening) could be considered R0. Mortality qualitative information is also available.</li> <li>• Expert judgement is needed to assess the extent that the available information on nutrition could be considered R0, especially with regards to Family MUAC, for which there is no global guidance on employment for prevalence (only for screening and programming purposes).</li> </ul>		
Family MUAC	x	x			
Mortality			<p>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are met. However the severity of food insecurity indicating signs of famine conditions requires thorough checks on Evidence Reliability and Evidence Levels for Famine classification (nutrition and mortality in particular). These checks should be conducted by the Famine Review Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum Evidence Level for Famine are not met, as none of the evidence is R2.</li> <li>• Minimum Evidence for Famine Likely are not met due to insufficient reliability of nutrition and mortality data.</li> <li>• Should the FRC think that the area presents famine conditions, the protocols for areas with limited or no access to data collection could be employed, due to the limitations imposed by COVID-19 restrictions to data collection, in addition to the actual limitations from floods and insecurity. Even with the employment of these protocols, the nutrition and/or mortality evidence should be considered at least R0. There is currently no confirmation that the nutrition data (Family MUAC, Facility screening) could be considered R0. Mortality qualitative information is also available.</li> <li>• Expert judgement is needed to assess the extent that the available information on nutrition could be considered R0, especially with regards to Family MUAC, for which there is no global guidance on employment for prevalence (only for screening and programming purposes).</li> </ul>		
Source	TWG RS	RTQR Prep RS			
SMART	R1-	R1-	<p>Minimum evidence for IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) are met. However the severity of food insecurity indicating signs of famine conditions requires thorough checks on Evidence Reliability and Evidence Levels for Famine classification (nutrition and mortality in particular). These checks should be conducted by the Famine Review Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum Evidence Level for Famine are not met, as none of the evidence is R2.</li> <li>• Minimum Evidence for Famine Likely are not met due to insufficient reliability of nutrition and mortality data.</li> <li>• Should the FRC think that the area presents famine conditions, the protocols for areas with limited or no access to data collection could be employed, due to the limitations imposed by COVID-19 restrictions to data collection, in addition to the actual limitations from floods and insecurity. Even with the employment of these protocols, the nutrition and/or mortality evidence should be considered at least R0. There is currently no confirmation that the nutrition data (Family MUAC, Facility screening) could be considered R0. Mortality qualitative information is also available.</li> <li>• Expert judgement is needed to assess the extent that the available information on nutrition could be considered R0, especially with regards to Family MUAC, for which there is no global guidance on employment for prevalence (only for screening and programming purposes).</li> </ul>		
SMART	R1-	R1-			

**RTQR – PIBOR**

Review of assumptions	Evidence Level Projected 1	RTQR Team view on Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Team recommendations to the FRC
<p>Most factors are going to significantly deteriorate as conflict is expected to escalate causing market access disruptions and continued supply constraints that can further hamper household food access as prices can still increase while purchasing power deteriorates more due to currency depreciation.</p> <p>The period of the lean season is exacerbated by diminishing livestock stocks or lack of it by poorer households.</p> <p>The only mitigating factor is the expected increase in HFA, but unclear if the levels are sufficient to reduce the area classification from Phase 5 to Phase 4 with a reduction on 10% of households in Phase 5 moving to Phase 4 (19% of households planned with a coverage of 50% of kcal needs).</p>	<p>Considering Evidence Level for Famine in the current period need to be met in order to allow a Famine/Famine Likely classification in the projection period, the decisions taken with regards to the current period will affect the meeting of evidence requirements in the projection. In terms of contributing factors, sufficient elements are available.</p>	<p><b>Food Insecurity conclusions:</b> Food Security and Livelihood evidence show a dire situation in the current period and the logical and clearly stated assumptions highlight the most likely deteriorating factors. Assumptions made seem to indicate that especially with the conflict expected to escalate and seasonality indicates the lean season period with diminishing or lacking livestock resources and with only a significant level of HFA as a mitigating factor, it is plausible to assume a slight reduction on population in Phase 5.</p> <p><b>Nutrition conclusion:</b> Seasonal deterioration is expected concerning the contributing factors (food dimension is expected to deteriorate. Diseases (diarrhea, malaria/fever, ARIs) expected to deteriorate; caring and feeding practices are expected to deteriorate. However, considering the starting point is difficult to determine with the current dataset, it cannot be said that this deterioration will imply a change in Phase. The extent of the deterioration will likely depend on the conflict dynamics.</p> <p><b>Note on seasonality for a better contextualization of projections:</b> In Pibor county, two main livelihood zones exist: a lowland area (LZ05 - corresponding to EASTERN SEMI ARID PASTORAL livelihood zone), where the lean season is usually between January and April.</p> <p>This zone shows traditionally more severe conditions, it has been hit by extremely severe shocks in 2018, and it is the area which has been hardly hit by the conflict in 2020. The other livelihood area, where Boma is located, is LZ03 - HIGH LAND FOREST AND SORGHUM, the highland. In this zone, the lean season is usually between June and August.</p> <p>This zone shows traditionally less severe conditions, because of its agro-ecological nature (more prone to agricultural activities) and diversity of livelihoods. However, not only this area has also been hit by floods this year, but it is also hosting a high number of IDPs from the lowland. For example, there are currently around 30,000 IDPs hosted in Maruwa Hills (which are located in the highland).</p>	<p><b>Conclusions for the projection:</b> The food security experts indicate the need for further analysis to be able to estimate to which extent the assumptions made (mostly all negative, regarding conflict, prices, limitation to market access, poor harvest, etc.) would be mitigated by the HFA plans, which includes 19% beneficiary coverage with about half ration. The TWG estimated a reduction from 25% to 15% in population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe), that is hard to justify only with the HFA mitigating effect.</p> <p>Nutrition: seasonal deterioration is expected concerning the contributing factors (food dimension is expected to deteriorate). Diseases (diarrhea, malaria/fever, ARIs) are expected to deteriorate, caring and feeding practices are expected to deteriorate. However, considering the starting point is difficult to determine with the current dataset, it cannot be said that this deterioration will imply a change in Phase.</p> <p><b>Recommendations for the projection:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A better analysis of price trends and market functionality in the two projection periods should be explored further, taking into account the current price trends (sharp increases), how prices will behave in the following periods. Linking with both the conflict dynamics, the very poor harvest and losses due to floods, and the rampant inflation.</li> <li>• Migration trends and the overall possibility for the population in Pibor to migrate to other areas should be further explored. In the past, Pibor's population had difficulties in displacing, both due to insecurity and ethnic motivation.</li> <li>• The projection assumptions seem to point to a deterioration while approaching the lean season, however, the estimation of the population goes in a different direction. It seems the only mitigating factor mentioned is HFA (while all assumptions go in the aggravating direction). Are we confident that half ration to 19% beneficiaries will revert the trend portrayed by the negative assumptions? To what extent will the HFA be deliverable, especially in the second projection period, considering what happened in 2019? Similarly, the disruptions of school feeding and other programs might exacerbate the nutrition situation.</li> <li>• The seasonal trend does not seem too clear in relation to Pibor, considering the presence of two livelihood zones. The TWG estimated that the peak of the lean season is located between the end of the current and the beginning of the first projection, however, evidence such as the seasonal calendar seems to contradict this statement.</li> </ul>

**RTQR – PIBOR**

Review of assumptions	Evidence Level Projected 2	RTQR Team view on Convergence of Evidence	RTQR Team recommendations to the FRC
<p>Most factors are going to significantly deteriorate as conflict is expected to escalate, causing market access disruptions and continued supply constraints that can further hamper household food access, as prices can still increase, while purchasing power deteriorates more due to currency depreciation.</p> <p>The period of the lean season is exacerbated by diminishing livestock stocks or lack of it for poorer households.</p> <p>The only mitigating factor is the expected increase in HFA, but it is unclear if the levels are sufficient to reduce the area classification from Phase 5 to Phase 4, with a reduction of 10% of households in Phase 5 moving to Phase 4 (19% of households planned to be provided with a coverage of 50% of kcals needs).</p>	<p>Considering Evidence Level for Famine in the current period need to be met in order to allow a Famine/Famine Likely classification in the projection period, the decisions taken with regards to the current period will affect the meeting of evidence requirements in the projection. In terms of contributing factors, sufficient elements are available.</p>	<p><b>Food Insecurity conclusions:</b> Food Security and Livelihood evidence show a dire situation in the current period and the logical and clearly stated assumptions highlight the most likely deteriorating factors. Assumptions made seem to indicate that especially with the conflict expected to escalate and seasonality indicates the lean season period with diminishing or lacking livestock resources and with only a significant level of HFA as a mitigating factor, it is plausible to assume a slight reduction on population in Phase 5.</p> <p><b>Nutrition conclusion:</b> Seasonal deterioration is expected concerning the contributing factors (food dimension is expected to deteriorate. Diseases (diarrhea, malaria/fever, ARIs) expected to deteriorate; caring and feeding practices are expected to deteriorate. However, considering the starting point is difficult to determine with the current dataset, it cannot be said that this deterioration will imply a change in Phase. The extent of the deterioration will likely depend on the conflict dynamics.</p> <p><b>Note on seasonality for a better contextualization of projections:</b> In Pibor county, two main livelihood zones exist: a lowland area (LZ05 - corresponding to EASTERN SEMI ARID PASTORAL livelihood zone), where the lean season is usually between January and April.</p> <p>This zone shows traditionally more severe conditions, it has been hit by extremely severe shocks in 2018, and it is the area which has been hardly hit by the conflict in 2020. The other livelihood area, where Boma is located, is LZ03 - HIGH LAND FOREST AND SORGHUM, the highland. In this zone, the lean season is usually between June and August.</p> <p>This zone shows traditionally less severe conditions, because of its agro-ecological nature (more prone to agricultural activities) and diversity of livelihoods. However, not only this area has also been hit by floods this year, but it is also hosting a high number of IDPs from the lowland. For example, there are currently around 30,000 IDPs hosted in Maruwa Hills (which are located in the highland).</p>	<p><b>Conclusions for the projection:</b> The food security experts indicate the need for further analysis to be able to estimate to which extent the assumptions made (mostly all negative, regarding conflict, prices, limitation to market access, poor harvest, etc.) would be mitigated by the HFA plans, which includes 19% beneficiary coverage with about half ration. The TWG estimated a reduction from 25% to 15% in population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe), that is hard to justify only with the HFA mitigating effect.</p> <p>Nutrition: seasonal deterioration is expected concerning the contributing factors (food dimension is expected to deteriorate). Diseases (diarrhea, malaria/fever, ARIs) are expected to deteriorate, caring and feeding practices are expected to deteriorate. However, considering the starting point is difficult to determine with the current dataset, it cannot be said that this deterioration will imply a change in Phase.</p> <p><b>Recommendations for the projection:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A better analysis of price trends and market functionality in the two projection periods should be explored further, taking into account the current price trends (sharp increases), how prices will behave in the following periods. Linking with both the conflict dynamics, the very poor harvest and losses due to floods, and the rampant inflation.</li> <li>• Migration trends and the overall possibility for the population in Pibor to migrate to other areas should be further explored. In the past, Pibor's population had difficulties in displacing, both due to insecurity and ethnic motivation.</li> <li>• The projection assumptions seem to point to a deterioration while approaching the lean season, however, the estimation of the population goes in a different direction. It seems the only mitigating factor mentioned is HFA (while all assumptions go in the aggravating direction). Are we confident that half ration to 19% beneficiaries will revert the trend portrayed by the negative assumptions? To what extent will the HFA be deliverable, especially in the second projection period, considering what happened in 2019? Similarly, the disruptions of school feeding and other programs might exacerbate the nutrition situation.</li> <li>• The seasonal trend does not seem too clear in relation to Pibor, considering the presence of two livelihood zones. The TWG estimated that the peak of the lean season is located between the end of the current and the beginning of the first projection, however, evidence such as the seasonal calendar seems to contradict this statement.</li> </ul>

### Recommendations to the TWG to improve next analyses:

1. For current situation analyses, the IPC South Sudan Analysis Team (AT) could improve the way evidence are supported by ground observations, particularly coming from field mission reports, and providing additional insight of how well qualitative field observations converge with quantitative data (FSNMS, Ministry sources, etc.) on contributing factor information. For instance, in the specific case for Akobo, the AT could have indicated whether the low levels of livestock ownerships (<50% of households own livestock) reported in recent data collection are observed in the area. Similarly, in the case of Aweil South, it would have been helpful for the TWG to comment on reports from REACH that suggest data collection occurred once harvests were already underway.
2. For the current situation, the AT should improve the way a narrative is provided, describing how the various drivers have evolved to result in the current situation. In the case of Akobo, for example, if it is true that <50% of households now own livestock, it would be helpful to understand what has occurred since 2018, when the livelihoods profiling exercise was conducted and suggested that, in general, households from all wealth groups owned livestock.
3. Related to both the current situation and projection periods, the AT could improve the way recent data are compared with historical data, including the food security and livelihood outcome indicators. For the current situation, this would help provide evidence of how much more/less severe current outcomes are to those from the past. For the projected periods, it may be helpful for better understanding how quickly and severely outcomes may deteriorate during the consumption year, which would assist with the projection of outcomes and estimations of populations facing more severe outcomes.
4. In the current situation and assumptions, the AT could better strive to comment on all sources of food and income that are typical for the area and time of year, even if as an opportunity to indicate why those sources may not be options in the current analysis year. For instance, in Akobo, several sources of income relevant to poor households (agricultural labor, charcoal sales, brewing, etc.) are absent from the assumptions made for the area.
5. For the Humanitarian Food Assistance (HFA) assumptions, the AT should do all effort to identify possible targeting issues resulting in non-coverage of some worst-affected populations, both in the current period and in the projection. This can help the AT to better understand whether the presence of IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) populations during the projection periods is the result of mere increases in populations in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) conditions, or whether issues of coverage are likely to result in some worst-affected populations not receiving assistance. Issues related to targeting should also be explored, in cases were HFA have been provided, but still the presence of population in IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) is detected by indicators.
6. Finally, to the extent that HFA during the projection period(s) may result in a slower (or less severe) deterioration of outcomes than one might expect based on seasonality alone, the AT could make even more clearer if the assistance is the key mitigating factor, or otherwise explain why (in the context of what historical data might suggest) outcomes may not deteriorate as the consumption year progresses.
7. The interaction among food security conditions, together with WASH and access to health services, is essential in the corroboration of high levels of acute food insecurity, beyond the anthropometric measurements, especially when the reliability of anthropometric measurements is found poor. The IPC Acute Food Insecurity AT is invited to further enhance the interaction with the IPC Acute Malnutrition AT, as a regular interaction, but that becomes a priority when analyzing areas displaying acute food insecurity above IPC Phase 5 (Catastrophe) thresholds. The IPC Analysis Team is invited to bring to the analysis all available evidence on nutrition that can complement anthropometric measurements.