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As part of FAO’s global initiative and DIEM project, funded by USAID, FAO Lebanon in partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture in Lebanon implement an agricultural livelihoods and food security monitoring system in the context of COVID-19 and other shocks in 7 governorates (excluding Beirut).
Objectives of the Assessment

- Monitor the impacts of multiple shocks including COVID-19 pandemic, economic shocks and others that may affect the food security and agricultural livelihoods of the farmers.

- Provide early-warning information to support decision-making processes.
FAO Lebanon, in partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture, conducted a Computer-Assisted Telephone Survey in March-April 2022.

- The survey targeted the agricultural population using a sampling frame derived from the Lebanon Agricultural Production Survey.
- 150 households were targeted in seven governorates of Lebanon (Beirut excluded because it is predominantly urban).
- In total, 1050 surveys were completed of which 99% were identified as agricultural households.
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### Key Findings: Household Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HH characteristics</th>
<th>Percentages %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural household surveyed</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop producers</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock producers</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and crop producers</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of HH with no education</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of HH with primary education</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of HH with secondary education</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of HH with higher education</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HH characteristics</th>
<th>Percentages %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female head</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female income earner</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male head</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings: Incomes & Shocks

92.9% of HHs experienced shock in last 3 months.

Most reported shocks:
- High food prices (85.4%)
- High fuel prices (84.8%)

**Main shocks experienced %**

- Higher food prices than usual: 85.4% (Round 1), 84% (Round 2)
- Higher fuel prices than usual: 84% (Round 1), 84.8% (Round 2)
- Cold temperature or hail: 20.3% (Round 1), 17.5% (Round 2)
- Sickness/death of household member: 16.8% (Round 1), 10.4% (Round 2)
- Lost employment: 5.6% (Round 1), 10.4% (Round 2)
- Plant disease: 4% (Round 1), 5.6% (Round 2)
- Animal disease: 2.4% (Round 1), 8.3% (Round 2)
- Other economic shock: 2.3% (Round 1), 2% (Round 2)
- Could not continue business as usual: 2.3% (Round 1), 2% (Round 2)
- Pest outbreak: 0.7% (Round 1), 10.5% (Round 2)
- Other crop and livestock shocks: 6% (Round 1), 0.4% (Round 2)
80.3% of HHs reported a decrease in their main income source in last 3 months.

Almost all regions reported an exponential decrease of income with Baalbek El-Hermel (90.2%) having the highest decrease.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Income decrease varying by location %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baalbek-El Hermel</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Nabatieh</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Lebanon</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bekaa</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkar</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings: Incomes & Shocks

COVID-19 as a shock

33.6% of HHs were affected by Covid-19 restrictions.

Most common: Stay at home (15.2%)
64.2% of crop producers reported difficulties. Most common:
- Access to fertilizers (73.5%)
- Access to pesticides (55.2%)
- Access to fuel or electricity (35.9%)
54.4% expected a decrease in harvest with El Nabatieh and North reporting the highest decrease, with 69.9% and 79.6% respectively of the HHs interviewed expecting a decrease in their harvest.
Key Findings: Crop Production

43.9% of crop producers reported difficulty in selling their product.

- Crop sales difficulty

Reasons for crop sales difficulties %

- High transportation/other marketing costs
  - Round 1: 70.1%
  - Round 2: 76.30%

- Low selling prices
  - Round 1: 30.70%
  - Round 2: 54.8%

- Usual traders/local customers not buying as usual
  - Round 1: 44%
  - Round 2: 68.4%

- Difficulty processing product
  - Round 1: 5%
  - Round 2: 12.10%

- Difficulty accessing the market
  - Round 1: 9.5%
  - Round 2: 23.6%

- Other
  - Round 1: 5%
  - Round 2: 2.30%
Key Findings: Crop Production

Crop sales prices

Overall, about 59.5% reported a decrease in selling prices whereas 23.9% reported an increase.

Variation by region: South and El Nabatieh reported a decrease whereas Akkar reported an increase in sale price.

Changes in crop area remained the same for 70% of Agricultural HH compared to a normal year.
78.9% of livestock producers reported difficulties. Most common:
- Feed purchase (85.4%)
- Access to veterinary input (63%)
- Access to veterinary services (53%)
61.9% of HH expected a decrease in the number of animals they have compared to the previous year.

Key Findings: Livestock Production

Changes in number of animals

### Reasons for decrease in number of livestock %

- **Sold more than usual because of distress sales**
  - Round 1: 35.3%
  - Round 2: 38.6%

- **Animals died of poor health/malnutrition**
  - Round 1: 22%
  - Round 2: 26.7%

- **Sold more than usual due to good prices**
  - Round 1: 4.1%
  - Round 2: 12%

- **Animal escaped or was lost or stolen**
  - Round 1: 0.3%
  - Round 2: 3.9%

- **Sold more than usual because of distress sales**
  - Round 1: 2.8%
  - Round 2: 6%

- **Killed or gave away more animals than usual**
  - Round 1: 0.7%
  - Round 2: 4.6%

- **Other**
  - Round 1: 0.0%
  - Round 2: 0.0%
Livestock sales difficulty

40.2% of livestock producers reported difficulty in selling their product. Main reasons were lower price (72.7%), smaller profits (59.6%), low demand (55.2%).

Key Findings: Livestock Production

- Low selling prices: 72.7% (Round 1), 80.8% (Round 2)
- High transportation or other marketing costs: 59.6% (Round 1), 6.8% (Round 2)
- Usual traders or local customers not buying as usual: 55.2% (Round 1), 22.0% (Round 2)
- Difficulties to process product: 9.7% (Round 1), 8.0% (Round 2)
- Difficulty accessing the market: 18.2% (Round 1), 5.0% (Round 2)
- Other: 1.2% (Round 1), 4.2% (Round 2)
- Closure of slaughterhouses: 0.0% (Round 1), 6.8% (Round 2)
Overall, about 63.2% reported a decrease in selling prices whereas 25.7% reported an increase.

Variation by region: South and North reported the highest decrease.
• The prevalence of recent household food insecurity with severity levels equivalent to IPC Phase 3 or more was 5.2 % and ± 1.9 % margin of error.

• Whereas the prevalence of recent moderate or severe food insecurity experienced by HH were around 21 % with ± 3.8 % of margin error.
Key Findings: Food Security

- Overall, around 90% of HH experienced little to no hunger.
- 7.1% of HH experienced slight hunger whereas 2% of HH experienced moderate hunger.
Nearly all households (97.4%) were using coping strategies (CS) to meet food needs.  
- 85.5% employing crisis-level CS  
- 9.4% employing emergency level CS
Key Findings: Food Security

Livelihood Coping Strategies Index

- In comparison with the previous round, results of the livelihood coping strategies showed an increase in the crisis level in Round 2 compared to Round 1 (85.5% in Round 2 compared to 78% in Round 1).
Overall, 10.6% of HH reporting low dietary diversity.
HH from Baalbeck-El Hermel and Akkar had the lowest dietary diversity (24.6%, 20.1% respectively).
Key Findings: Needs

Needs in the near term

• Nearly all of the agricultural households surveyed indicated a need for assistance in the coming 3-6 months (91.8%). Overall, 50.2% of respondents expressed a need for cash support.

• 75%, 69% and 40.5% of crop producers reported a top need for fertilizers, pesticides and seeds respectively.

• About 22% of households received assistance in the three months preceding the survey.

• 33.8%, 27% and 26.1% of livestock producers reported a top need for animal feed, veterinary services and veterinary inputs respectively. These needs did not show any significant changes compared to Round 1.

• About 22% of households received assistance in the three months preceding the survey.
Recommendations

• **Short-term recommendation**
  1. Support the supply of crop inputs (seeds, fertilizers, etc.) by providing cash, voucher or in-kind assistance
  2. Strengthen the capacity of existing agricultural extension services to improve yields
  3. Support the supply of livestock feed and veterinary inputs by providing cash, voucher or in-kind assistance
  4. Strengthen the capacity of existing agricultural extension services to improve the prevention and control of the spread of animal diseases
  5. Support targeted food aids and/or cash assistance to the poor vulnerable agricultural HHs in collaboration with on-going food assistance programmes
  6. Continue to closely monitor the food security status of (agricultural) Lebanese households and support the development of a food security surveillance system

• **Medium/long-term recommendation**
  1. Support and encourage farmers to transition to solar energy and decrease reliance on fossil fuels
  2. Provide technical and financial assistance and support programs designed for small to medium holders (including but not limited to the promotion of good agricultural practices, grants schemes, etc..., to increase outcomes/agricultural productivity and generally improve food availability and access
  3. Support the adoption of good agricultural practices and modern technology in agricultural production
Discussion and Q&A
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