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**Introduction**

- VSF is implementing livestock interventions funded by BHA, SDC complemented by FAO pipeline for vaccine provision (In-kind LOA).

- Community Feedback assessment (meeting) is on of the project monitoring tools and approach recommended during project design.

- This tool and approach aims on gathering both qualitative and quantitative data through **(PRA)** participatory Rapid Appraisal methods/techniques.
Background

• Panyinjar was among the most flood affected Counties out of 33 counties.

• In August 2021- estimated population of 31,245 individuals (16,017 Female, 15,228 Male) affected (IRNA August 2021).

• The number of displaced households continue to increase as the water levels continue to increase due to heavy rainfalls.

• An estimated 192 Households and 824 Individuals migrated to Yirol East in search of protection, safety and food (IRNA Sept 2021).
Food Security Situation and Coping Strategies

• According to IPC classification, Panyinjar County is classified as emergency (IPC 4).

• Affected households have different coping strategies including but not limited to:
  – borrowing food,
  – relying on humanitarian assistance,
  – engaged in casual labor, selling households' assets,
  – hunting,
  – collecting firewood for sell and fishing.
  – other negative coping strategies such as reducing daily meals to one meal a day, relying on host communities etc
Objectives of Community Feedback Assessment/Meeting

• To understand and assess the impact of the floods on community’s livelihood,

• To assess the effects of floods on livestock assets and community livelihoods; especially the livestock-based livelihoods,

• To assess CAHWs performance and general animal health conditions

• To document lessons learnt for future planning and project designing and development.
Geographical Coverage and Targeted Beneficiaries

- Areas covered are Ganyiel, Dakom Cattle Camp and Thoarnhom. These areas are targeted because of high livestock population and availability of CAHWs within Ganyiel.

- Targeted beneficiaries are flood-affected livestock-owning households, cattle camps households and CAHWs for appropriate data collection and analysis.
Methodologies and Tools

• Methodology:
  – FGDs – using open-ended questions

• Participatory Rapid Appraisal (PRA) Tools
  – Proportional piling
  – Pair wise ranking
  – Triangulation and probing
Community Livelihoods

- Community livelihoods were interrupted as the results of the persistent flooding.
- During flooding communities shifted to Fishing and Training compared to livestock keeping, farming, hunting and trading before and after flooding.
Livestock Body Score and Condition

- Before flooding the livestock body score are good and health (55%).
- During flooding deteriorated (7%).
- After flooding the body condition keep improving gradually (38%)
Livestock Diseases _ Cattle

- Endemic cattle diseases remained seasonal.

- Newly identified disease (Paralysis) which is noted throughout the season - before, during and after flooding.
Livestock Diseases _ Shoats

- Circling and paralysis diseases also affect shoats.

- The Disease were investigated and revealed parasitic infestation as most cases responded to anti-parasitic drugs and nutritional deficiency attributed to high parasitic infestation.
Livestock Losses _ Season

- Mostly livestock assets were lost during the flooding period as the result of limited access to services and starvation.
Livestock Losses _ Quarterly

- Most losses were experienced in the first quarter of 2021 as carried forward effectives of 2019 and 2020 flooding.

- Losses gradually reduced towards the end of the year 2021 and the first QTR of 2022.
Livestock Losses _ Species (2020 – 2022)

- Cattle and goats were confirmed to be the most species lost during the flooding.
- Sheep and Poultry are less affected due to the resistance and poultry are light to be carried or moved to other places.
Livestock Losses by Years

- Years of 2020 and 2021 were noted to be the most devastating years (high losses of livestock assets experienced) compared to 2019 and 2022.
- 2022 figures will concretize once the year ends.
Causes of Livestock Losses

- Losses of livestock assets were mostly attributed to livestock diseases, Predators, raiding and drowning due to flooding.

- Most disease incidences are throughout the season, but magnitude differs.

- Raiding and theft are zero during flooding period.
CAHWS Performance

- CAHWs are reported to be effective and efficient before flood (rainy season) and after the flood (after rainy season) compared to flooding (rainy season).

- This is attributed to limited access, engagement in other activities such as farming.
Service (Vaccination) Coverage

- Better coverage are experienced before flood (rainy season) and after floods (after rainy season) compared to periods during flood (during rainy season).

- Reason same as above.
Drugs Availability and Sources

- Drugs are much available after the flooding and improved service delivery.
- Major sources of drugs are the NGOs (81%) and traders (19%).
Milk Availability

- Milk are more available before the flooding and after the flooding.

- Milk availability are reduced or low during and after flooding, these are attributed to:
  - Livestock losses,
  - Consistent livestock migration,
  - Inadequate access to animal health services.
Community Challenges

- Major challenges are Water/ Pasture sources, inadequate drugs and Livestock diseases
Lessons Learnt

• Most or mass interventions to conducted before and after floods or rainy seasons as rainy seasons remained a dormant period or with less activities.

• Communities have adopted some LEGS interventions such as provision of feeds by cutting grass for their livestock assets and destocking mainly commercial destocking.

• Linking conflict mitigation or resolution/ peace building in to livestock interventions to bridge effective service delivery.
Lessons Learnt Cont......

• Sustainability of livestock interventions remained a challenge. “can privatization be an option?”

• Adoption LEGS interventions and Standard Guidelines by partners and other stakeholders remained limited to protection of livestock assets through provision of animal health, training of CAHWs and restocking in other cases. “Can Assessment be a guiding tool for decision making?”

• Community Feedback Assessments is a vital tool and means of collecting information and data from most pastoralist communities, because it is simple, easy and friendly.
WHAT WE DO

Our goal:
Sustainable livestock based livelihoods

to promote
Environmental Health
to ensure
People’s Health
to support
Livestock Health
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