



SUDAN COUNTRY BRIEF

THE STATE OF THE
HUMANITARIAN SYSTEM 2026

ANNEX: LIMITATIONS

Conditions in Sudan shaped who we could reach, how we could reach them and what respondents felt safe to share.

a. Security, access and data-collection constraints

- Some interviews were conducted remotely. Remote methods enabled us to include a wider range of respondents despite access restrictions, but participation depended on stable phone or internet access. This likely reduced the inclusion of people with limited connectivity or safe access to communications.
- Ongoing insecurity prevented engagement with some groups and areas, particularly ethnic minorities in Darfur. Findings therefore reflect the realities of the locations and populations we could access.

b. Coverage gaps in affected populations

- People in transit and those living outside camp settings were difficult to reach with remote and fixed-site approaches. This likely reduced the visibility of needs and protection risks affecting mobile populations and those in informal settlement arrangements.
- Host communities were not systematically included. As a result, host community dynamics were largely captured indirectly through the perspectives of IDPs and other stakeholders, which may have understated host community needs, tensions and coping strategies.

c. Stakeholder representation gaps

- Interviews with government personnel required formal approvals from the Humanitarian Aid Commission. These were difficult to secure during the research period, which limited access to government respondents. Only one government actor was interviewed. This restricted our ability to fully test and triangulate claims related to approvals, coordination decision-making, constraints imposed by authorities, and allegations of interference or diversion, especially where these issues vary by locality and controlling authority.

d. Sensitivity and response bias

- Several issues carry political and personal risk, particularly criticism of authorities or armed actors, and discussion of diversion or manipulation of aid. Some respondents may have withheld details, softened language or avoided attribution due to fear of repercussions, which may have led to partial or cautious reporting and conservative estimates of the scale of some issues.
- Stakeholders may have emphasised successes, downplayed challenges or presented their role in a favourable light, especially in a context where legitimacy, access and funding are contested.

e. Sampling limitations

- Participant selection relied on existing networks, feasibility under severe constraints and a rapid mapping of displacement hotspots. The mapping captured a time-bound snapshot of humanitarian presence. Given Sudan's fluid operating environment and security risks for participants and the research team, some locations and groups were less visible through this approach. This is particularly true for areas with tight movement restrictions, disrupted communications and rapid displacement.

