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Impacts of NE Crisis on Livestock Livelihoods
Livelihoods lost
- Killed
- Abandoned
- Confiscated
- Embargos

Livelihoods at risk
- Feed shortages
- Livestock diseases
- Movement restriction:
  - Coping strategy (transhumance) impeded
  - Livestock markets disrupted
How is FAO Livestock Responding to NE Crisis
To support the saving of lives and the saving of livelihoods through two key strategies:

1. To protect key livestock-related assets

2. To rebuild key livestock-related assets
Protecting key livestock-related assets

- Feed supplies: Emergency feeding in situ
  - 2016-2017 Cycle: 520 MT (4,860 HHs)
  - 2018-2019 Cycle: 1,512 MT (10,520 HHs)

- Veterinary Support: Mass medication/vaccination programmes:
  - 2016-2017 Cycle: 300,000 heads (30,000 HHs)
  - 2018-2019 Cycle: 120,000 heads (10,598 HHs)
Rebuilding key livestock-related assets

- **Provision of Livestock:**
  - Replacing livestock assets:
    - 2016-2017: 41,400 animals (11,100 HHs)
    - 2018-2019 cycle: 27,040 animals (7,010 HHs)
  - Building livestock assets:
    - 2018-2019 cycle: 34,920 animals (2,910 HHs)
Lessons Learned
Programme Design

1. Data limitations: very few need assessments
2. Funding cycle vs livestock cycle (narrow window for implementation)
   a. Breeding season
   b. Vaccination season
   c. Lean season
Targeting

- Time intensive
- Identity management (CBPP)
- Herder mobility
- Data limitations, herder locations often missed in humanitarian assessments
Input Quality

• Localization of inputs
• Quality assurance
• Logistical nightmare
• Kit Standardization vs diversity of inputs
Input distribution

• Transferring assets is cumbersome:
  – moving assets
  – physical assets
  – No shows

• Voucher vs market functionality
M&E

- Herder mobility: particularly medication/vaccination and feeding programmes
- Takes time for visible impacts
- What indicators should we measure?
FAO M&E Figures: Goat Restocking
Characteristics of targeted HHs

- Host: 56%
- Returnee: 22%
- IDP: 22%
Reproduction rate

55% yes
45% no
Reproduction rate by Household status

- **Yes**
  - Host: 58%
  - IDP: 76%
  - Returnee: 24%

- **No**
  - Host: 42%
  - IDP: 24%
  - Returnee: 76%
Frequency of Goat Kidding

- Once: 77%
- Twice: 23%
Total number of Goats (FAO goats and Offsprings)

- One goat: 8%
- Two goats: 18%
- Three goats: 30%
- Four goats: 15%
- Five goats: 20%
- Six goats: 9%
Goat lost besides selling

- Yes: 72%
- No: 28%
Income from Livestock Sales

- Payment for services such as school fees, healthcare etc: 43%
- Farm inputs or seed: 35%
- Non food items: 20%
- Food item: 3%

Payment for services such as school fees, healthcare etc
Farm inputs or seed
Non food items
Food item
Home consumption of Livestock

- Festivites: 55%
- Household Nutrition: 36%
- Goat was about to die: 9%
Daily HH milk production (Litres)

- One Litre: 79%
- Two Litres: 22%
HH Goat milk Consumption

- No: 68%
- Yes: 32%
Livestock contribution to HH Income

- To a great extent: 37%
- Somewhat: 34%
- Very little: 29%
HH experience of any protection issue?

92% No  
8% Yes
Beneficiary Experience of Domestic Violence?

86% No
14% Yes