Since 2009, Northeastern Nigeria has been hit by a violent conflict which has led to continued large-scale displacements, disruption of basic services, food insecurity, malnutrition, and protection issues. As a matter of fact, the extreme violence caused by non-state armed groups (NSAGs) has resulted in the forced displacement of several millions of civilians from their homes and total loss of their livelihoods.

Agricultural livelihoods have been devastated through the destruction of irrigation and farming facilities, the loss of livestock, reduced access to fishing grounds, the collapse of extension services. The value chain for crops, livestock and fisheries has been also severely disrupted as a consequence of the ongoing conflict. Additionally, looting and fear of attacks have prevented farmers from working in their fields, leading to reduced harvests, loss of productive assets and extremely reduced purchasing power.

The impact of the conflict on agriculture was estimated at USD 3.7 billion in 2015, in a country where the agriculture sector provides livelihoods for about 90 percent of the rural population.

As a consequence of military operations, from December 2017 to October 2018, the number of IDPs in the Northeast of Nigeria has risen from 1,702,680 to 2,206,602 individuals (+29.6%). The October 2018 DTM also provides a clear picture of the number of returnees by State (Borno: 683,012; Adamawa: 780,571; Yobe: 177,327), giving a total of 1,640,910 in the Borno, Adamawa and Yobe States (BAY).

In addition to the massive displacements, chronic under-development as well as high rates of poverty, illiteracy and unemployment have been registered in the three above mentioned States.

The results of the November 2018 Cadre Harmonisé (CH) analysis indicated that around 2.7 million people may still face high levels of severe food insecurity between June and August 2019 in Adamawa, Borno and Yobe States (Phase 3 and above of the Cadre Harmonisé’s five-phase scale) if no adequate assistance is provided on time.

This data represents an improvement compared to the 3.7 million recorded in June – August 2018 in the March 2018 CH analysis. The improvement is mainly due to (i) massive humanitarian assistance - 1.4 million people received a monthly food ration in October 2018 and 1.8 million people received an emergency livelihoods assistance in 2018; (ii) the stabilization of the security situation; (iii) the improvement in farming conditions and access to inputs; and (iv) the slight improvement of trade and markets.

The situation is still extremely fragile as the majority of IDPs remains largely dependent on food assistance and would face a rapid deterioration of their food security and nutrition, if food and livelihood assistance are interrupted. It is, therefore, paramount to maintain humanitarian food and livelihood assistance to avoid the recipients of humanitarian assistance to fall back in critical food and nutrition insecurity.

The protracted conflict also continues to have a direct impact on people’s health and nutrition status that is further exacerbated by food insecurity, destruction of basic services, as well as meltdown of socioeconomic and development structures. Prevalence of acute malnutrition constitutes another concern. Stunting prevalence ranges between 25% and 40% in BAY States.

The November 2018 CH underlines moreover that the under-five mortality rate (USMR) is still high in BAY States with the incidences ranging from 0.05/10,000 to 2.35/10,000 children.

Although positive increases have been recorded in the 2018 agricultural season, harvests may remain substantially below average due to restricted access to land for most households.

The main drivers of food and nutrition insecurity and famine risk are the ongoing conflict, widespread insecurity and pervasive violence in which civilians are primarily targeted. An acute food security crisis has indeed unfolded as a result of the massive displacement, disruption of agricultural activities, lack of safe access to farmland and loss of livelihoods. Particularly vulnerable groups that suffer the most and whose vulnerabilities are the highest include children, elderly people, female-headed households (FHH), adolescent FHH, who are forced into a role as breadwinners, and disabled persons as they are less able to fend for themselves and likely to access services without assistance.

The situation is still extremely fragile as the majority of IDPs remains largely dependent on food assistance and would face a rapid deterioration of their food security and nutrition, if food and livelihood assistance are interrupted. It is, therefore, paramount to maintain humanitarian food and livelihood assistance to avoid the recipients of humanitarian assistance to fall back in critical food and nutrition insecurity.

The protracted conflict also continues to have a direct impact on people’s health and nutrition status that is further exacerbated by food insecurity, destruction of basic services, as well as meltdown of socioeconomic and development structures. Prevalence of acute malnutrition constitutes another concern. Stunting prevalence ranges between 25% and 40% in BAY States.

The November 2018 CH underlines moreover that the under-five mortality rate (USMR) is still high in BAY States with the incidences ranging from 0.05/10,000 to 2.35/10,000 children.

Although positive increases have been recorded in the 2018 agricultural season, harvests may remain substantially below average due to restricted access to land for most households.
The current crisis in the Northeast of Nigeria, which is fundamentally a protection of civilians crisis, has led to widespread forced displacement and violations of international humanitarian and human rights law. In fact, civilians still bear the brunt of a conflict characterized by massive and widespread abuse against civilians that include killings, rape and other sexual violence, abduction, child recruitment, burning of homes, pillaging, forced displacement, arbitrary detention, and the use of explosive hazards, including in deliberate attacks on civilian targets. 

High rates of GBV have been reported to be occurring in relation with food insecurity. The insecurity equally impacts access to fuel and energy for cooking, with 85 percent of women and girls reporting heightened protection risks when collecting firewood.

The civilian nature of the camps and informal settlements has been also seriously undermined. IDP camps and settlements face constant threats of attacks, leading to restrictive security measures around border areas and in refugee, returnee and IDP settlements.

Gender equality remains at the core of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations’ (FAO’s) mandate to achieve food and nutrition security for all by raising levels of nutrition, improving agricultural production and productivity; natural resource management, and improving the lives of rural populations.

In line with the 2016 Buhari Plan, Nigeria Gender Policy in Agriculture, FAO’s Lake Chad Basin Crisis Response Strategy, FAO Policy on Gender Equality, FAO Nigeria is committed to integrate gender issues into all facets of its work. Thus, in order to improve gender mainstreaming, preventing protection risks, including GBV and reducing gender inequality through FAO Northeast Nigeria’s interventions, a Rapid Gender Analysis (RGA) was conducted in BAY States.

The objectives of the RGA were the following:

- Analyse the gender division labour, access and control of resources, participation in decision-making of women, girls, men, and boys in livestock, fisheries/aquaculture and apiculture.
- Understand the main protection security risks faced by women, girls, men, and boys in livestock, fisheries/aquaculture and apiculture.

The analysis was also an opportunity to integrate Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) and Communication with Communities (CwC) aspects for the following reasons:

- Understand the real and priority communication needs of affected populations.
- Identify the best means to integrate their perspectives and feedback into FAO Northeast Nigeria livestock, fisheries/aquaculture and apiculture current and/or future interventions.

From November to December 2018, thirty-eight (38) FGDs were conducted in BAY States. Disaggregated groups of women (18-64 years old), girls (13-17 years old), boys (13-17 years old) and men (18-64 years old) were held. In some locations, however, discussions were conducted with mixed groups [women (18-64 years old) and girls (13-17 years old) or boys (13-17 years old) and men (18-64 years old)].

In all, 754 people, including IDPs, returnees and members of affected communities among FAO beneficiaries and non were able to share their views as follows:

- Women: married, widows, single, unmarried, lactating mothers, young women, youth and women-headed households.
- Girls: Orphans, unaccompanied, attending schools and not, child mothers, child-headed households.
- Boys: Orphans, unaccompanied, attending schools and not, child-headed households.
- Men: Married, widows, young men, youth and men-headed households.
- Most marginalized: Disabled, elderly people.
- People at-risk: Minorities groups (ethnic and religious).

The conduct of FGDs benefited from the support of FAO Northeast Nigeria staff and implementing partners, United Nations (UN) agencies, and national actors in the locations of the analysis.

All steps have been taken to ensure that the methodology of this RGA complies strictly with the ethical guidelines for evaluation established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) as well as those involving children, to which FAO Nigeria adheres. These directives involve in particular: respect for dignity, the principle of non-discrimination, rights, confidentiality and the prevention of prejudice.

See tables of the various FGDs conducted in BAY States on the next pages.
Table 1. Number of focus group discussions (FGDs) in Borno State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Village/ Location</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Total FGDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jere</td>
<td>Gongulong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jere</td>
<td>Dusuman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konduga</td>
<td>Jakara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwoza</td>
<td>GSS IDP Camp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Livestock and Fisheries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwoza</td>
<td>20 Housing Unit IDP Camp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Livestock and Fisheries</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blu</td>
<td>Mainahari</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blu</td>
<td>Mainahari</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blu</td>
<td>Tum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monguno</td>
<td>Abbankari</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monguno</td>
<td>Water Board IDP Camp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FGDs</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Number of participants per focus group discussion (FGD) in Borno State (disaggregated by sex, age and location)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Village/ Location</th>
<th>Men (18-64)</th>
<th>Boys (13-17)</th>
<th>Women (18-64)</th>
<th>Girls (13-17)</th>
<th>Total participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jere</td>
<td>Gongulong</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jere</td>
<td>Dusuman</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konduga</td>
<td>Jakara</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwoza</td>
<td>GSS IDP Camp</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwoza</td>
<td>20 Housing Unit IDP Camp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blu</td>
<td>Mainahari</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blu</td>
<td>Mainahari</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blu</td>
<td>Tum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monguno</td>
<td>Abbankari</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monguno</td>
<td>Water Board IDP Camp</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants in percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: % of men, women, girls and boys consulted across Borno State

Table 3. Number of focus group discussions (FGDs) in Adamawa State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Village/ Location</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Total FGDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yola South</td>
<td>Malkohi I IDP Camp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yola South</td>
<td>Malkohi II IDP Camp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girei</td>
<td>Demare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FGDs</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Number of participants per focus group discussion (FGD) in Adamawa State (disaggregated by sex, age and location)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Village/ Location</th>
<th>Men (18-64)</th>
<th>Boys (13-17)</th>
<th>Women (18-64)</th>
<th>Girls (13-17)</th>
<th>Total participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yola South</td>
<td>Malkohi I IDP Camp</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yola South</td>
<td>Malkohi II IDP Camp</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girei</td>
<td>Demare</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants in percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: % of men, women, girls and boys consulted across Adamawa State
CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

- **Focus Group Discussions**: Due to the volatility of the security and time constraints, in some locations, discussions were conducted with mixed groups (women (18-64 years old) and girls (13-17 years old) or boys (13-17 years old) and men (18-64 years old)) instead of separated groups. As a consequence, people may have been restrained from sharing personal or sensitive information in group settings, and group pressure could have suppressed contrary opinions because of the format of the FGDs. Moreover, because of the few number of female researchers for the conduct of FGDs, some female FGDs were conducted by male FAO staff. This could have also inhibited frank discussion on sensitive issues.

- **Privacy**: It was not always possible to hold FGDs in a fully secluded and safe space because of the difficulty to manage the crowd. This situation may have influenced the answer of the respondents on particular sensitive issues.

- **Rapid Gender Analysis Interview Guide**: Due to the security and time constraints as well, the initial guide of the analysis was shortened. This consequently reduced the spectrum of the study.

### Table 5. Number of focus group discussions (FGDs) in Yobe State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Village/location</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Total FGDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damaturu</td>
<td>Kukareta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalsako</td>
<td>Dacha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalsako</td>
<td>Dacha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fune</td>
<td>Damagum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6. Number of participants per focus group discussion (FGD) in Yobe State (disaggregated by sex, age and location)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Village/location</th>
<th>Men (18-64)</th>
<th>Boys (13-17)</th>
<th>Women (18-64)</th>
<th>Girls (13-17)</th>
<th>Total participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damaturu</td>
<td>Kukareta</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalsako</td>
<td>Dacha</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalsako</td>
<td>Dacha</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fune</td>
<td>Damagum</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 3: % of men, women, girls and boys consulted across Yobe State

### Figure 4: % of men, women, girls and boys consulted across BAY States
LIVESTOCK

1. Introduction

Northeastern Nigeria encompasses several livelihood zones: the Lake Chad shores and open water, a large Sahel belt with livestock and dryland cereals production, a secondary more humid belt with cereal, cassava and sesame and one large much more productive area where many food and cash crops grow easily.

Prior to the escalation of violence, food security in Northeastern Nigeria was based on a very complex set of agricultural, livestock and fishery production systems providing food for the communities. However, the livestock sector still constitutes an important pillar of the Lake Chad economic system and an integral component of Nigeria’s agriculture.

2. Impact of the crisis

The conflict has had a significant impact on livestock, the main source of household wealth, livelihood and food and nutrition security for most of the area’s rural households.

People depending on livestock value chain, as well as the availability of highly nutritious food, such as meat, milk and eggs have been or are highly affected.

Respondents to the FGDs mentioned the following impacts of the crisis on livestock activities: abandon, killing, looting, confiscation, rustling, burning of animals; destruction/closure/disruption of livestock markets, feedlots and slaughtering houses by NSAGs; shortage of livestock feed.

But, also, restriction of grazing area, destocking of livestock, increased livestock diseases and mortality, protracted grazing, negative coping mechanisms of selling of animals, decreased animal value due to hunger and malnourishment, increased theft and violence, loss of confidence in investing in the animals, high medication and labour costs, negative impacts on feed and fodder prices, reduced food consumption and nutrition, migration/displacement because of the violence.

3. Gender division of labour

The main actors in livestock value chain identified during the diverse FGDs are the following:

For bull: (i) Livestock farmers, (ii) marketers [dealers (middlemen), livestock owners, buyers] (iii) processors [butchers, meat smokers and roasters], retailers and transporters, (iv) livestock veterinary/extension service providers.

For small ruminant (goat, sheep): (i) rearers, (ii) marketers (buyers, sellers and dealers (middlemen) livestock owners, buyers) (iii) processors [butchers, meat roaster, sellers, retailers], (iv) veterinary/extension service providers.

For poultry: (i) poultry farmers, (ii) marketers (egg sellers, broiler sellers, pullet sellers, middlemen (iii) processors [poultry processors], (iv) feed producers and sellers, (v) veterinary/extension service providers.

All these categories earlier highlighted are including men, women, youth, boys, disabled persons and elderly.

As mentioned in the table 7 below, women are mainly involved in the production of small ruminants (goat, sheep) and poultry keeping as individuals or jointly with their children and husbands.

Their preference are on the indigenous breeds (low external inputs, well adapted to local conditions, lesser health problems, good market demand), animals that they can easily handle, manage, disease resistant and that therefore do not increase their workload.

While men and boys dominate the production of large ruminants (cattle, camel) and goat, sheep and poultry as well secondarily.

Table 7. Livestock production according to gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small ruminants (goat, sheep)</td>
<td>Large ruminants (cattle, camel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All zones</td>
<td>North West, North East and North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry keeping</td>
<td>Horses and donkeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All zones</td>
<td>North East and North West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig, rabbit production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East, North Central, South West and North West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Protection risks

Interviewees highlighted that children are involved in livestock and poultry activities. And, this do not prevent them from going to school.

Even if the link between the involvement of children in herding or livestock activities and their ability to attend school was not made by the respondents, the truth is that these activities are demanding and could negatively impact their schooling, health, and security. And, therefore, exposing them to child or forced labour.

In fact, child labour is "often defined as work that deprives children of their childhood, their potential, and their dignity, and that is harmful to physical and mental development". The term refers to "work that:

- is mentally, physically, socially or morally dangerous and harmful to children; and
- interferes with their schooling by:
  - depriving them of the opportunity to attend school;
  - obliging them to leave school prematurely; or
- requiring them to attempt to combine school attendance with excessively long and heavy work".

For FAO, child labour in agriculture is defined as: "work that is not age-appropriate and likely to be hazardous or interferes with their education". During the analysis, the research team observed herds of cattle managed by children, apparently below the age of 10 years.

Apart from child labour, children can be also involved in forced labour and human trafficking. According to the ILO Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (N° 29), forced or compulsory labour is: "all work or service which is exacted from any person under the threat of a penalty and for which the person has not offered himself or herself voluntarily." The definition encompasses "traditional practices of forced labour, such as vestiges of slavery or slave-like practices, and various forms of debt bondage, as well as new forms of forced labour that have emerged in recent decades, such as human trafficking." Here are some hazards and risks affecting children in relation to livestock activities: administering drugs, slaughtering or slaughterhouse activities, milking, herding cattle and grazing. In the current conflict context, some children also have to stay with the cattle overnight exposing them to the risk of attack, extortion, kidnapping, and killing.

Furthermore, health risks are mainly based on the close contact with animals that exposes them to diseases transmitted by animals and their substances.

As aforementioned, time-consuming activities, such as herding, can negatively influence formal school attendance. The conflict, the deterioration of the socio-economic conditions, and food insecurity are major underlying causes of child/forced labour.

It remains also critical to bear in mind that as children get older, traditional perceptions of gender roles may increasingly dictate the tasks they perform and, consequently the hazards to which they are exposed and the barriers they may face to benefiting from education.

Here are protection risks affecting adults:

- Kidnapping, killing, including targeted killing of herders when grazing.
- GBV cases such as domestic violence, sexual assault and violence, denial of resources and opportunities.
- Robbery, extortion, looting.
- Restriction on freedom of movement (grazing in area delimited by the trench surrounding the town allowed by Nigerian Security Forces for grazing).
- Conflict between famers and herdsmen over ownership and access to land.
- Snakes, insects bites and thorns picks.
5. Control and access to resources

As highlighted in the main findings of the Rapid Gender Analysis of Affected Populations in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe States, men (father, spouse, intimate partner) are the ones who incarnate authority within the household and are the decision makers in the family. They decide how family income has to be spent, which includes income earned by women and children. The consequence of this situation remains the fact that women have limited decision making powers regarding the products (manure, milk, draught power) and money (if the livestock are sold). Moreover, the women have no physical assets build-up and access to land for farming/cropping.

The small stock (chickens) they own are easily disposed, to meet family daily food and income requirements. Also, their incapacity of building-up physical assets means that they are compromised when it comes to accessing loans because of lack of collateral.

The livestock control situation in the households remains a source of gender based conflicts such as domestic violence, especially where one part is responsible for rearing, but has no control when it comes to benefits from the livestock resources generated.

Constraints highlighted were the following:

- Limited access to knowledge and skills, technologies, market information for both male and female involved in livestock activities. It is noteworthy that in many cases, women miss training opportunities because of the manner in which the training is planned and organized. More often, meetings and trainings are planned to begin very early, competing with women’s reproductive work.
- Lack of financial/capital and material resources to increasing livestock production.
- Discrimination against women, which restricts them from rearing certain types of animals.
- Socio-cultural norms and religious practices.
- Limited veterinary and animal husbandry extension services.

6. Participation and decision-making

During the course of the analysis, the research team did not have the opportunity to meet with livestock organizations or cooperatives. Consequently, the team was not able to evaluate the level of women participation in these structures.

During the course of the analysis, the research team did not have the opportunity to meet with livestock organizations or cooperatives. Consequently, the team was not able to evaluate the level of women participation in these structures.

Focus group discussion with women and girls in Gongolung village, Jere LGA, Borno State, November 2018 ©FAO Nigeria/Anne Judith Ndombasi

Focus group discussion with men in Kakarita village, Damaturu LGA, Yobe State, December 2018 ©FAO Nigeria/Anne Judith Ndombasi

Focus group discussion with men in Dachia village, Jukuske LGA, Yobe State, December 2018 ©FAO Nigeria/Anne Judith Ndombasi

Women who attended the focus group discussion in Damogum village, Fune LGA, Yobe State, December 2018 ©FAO Nigeria/Anne Judith Ndombasi

Youth who attended the focus group discussion in Damoturu village, Fune LGA, Yobe State, December 2018 ©FAO Nigeria/Anne Judith Ndombasi

RECOMMENDATIONS

- FAO to strengthen project beneficiaries’ technical skills in enhanced husbandry and animal rearing practices/animal management, processing and marketing of animals and livestock products.
- FAO to identify and train livestock organizations or cooperatives in commercial matters, training in hygiene, inspection, and safe production procedures for products of animal origin.
- FAO to reinforce technical capacities of its implementing partners capacity towards gender equality, women’s rights, protection, protection from gender-based violence (GBV) including sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) and AAP.
- FAO to engage with a critical mass of community, religious and traditional leaders favourable to the promotion and protection of women’s and children’s rights and economic empowerment, protection from GBV, including SEA as they are the ones who lead the people and can drive change at the community level.
- FAO to provide training to its implementing partners training on child labour issues and international policy to stakeholders, including governments and communities.
- FAO to support communities, livestock associations, and other local institutions, including those representing youth/children, to know their rights and to have voice in decision-making.
- FAO to complement livestock interventions with participatory community-level approaches such as Caisses de résilience (CdR), with a clear equality goal for capacity development and improved access to knowledge/information, services and decision-making through Farmer Field Schools and Association of Savings and Loans.
FAO NORTHEAST NIGERIA RAPID GENDER ANALYSIS IN LIVESTOCK, FISHERIES AND AGRICULTURE OF AFFECTED POPULATION IN BORNO, ADAMAWA AND YOBE STATES
NOVEMBER 2018 – DECEMBER 2018

It remains important to underline that in the locations of this “Rapid Gender Analysis”, groups consulted were not involved in fish farming. However, FAO Nigeria with the funding support from the European Union Trust Fund (EUTF) is currently fostering fish farming approach in Borno State.

1. Introduction

Artisanal fishing and aquaculture are also important livelihood activities of the northeast agro-ecological zone. In fact, until the current crisis, fisheries resources represent the foci of the livelihood activities and main source of sustenance, income and employment of the most communities in the region. For instance, in 2014, the overall fisheries production in Lake Chad was estimated between 80,000 and 100,000 tonnes/year, with an estimated value of between USD 54 million and USD 220 million.

2. Impact of the crisis

The conflict has also adversely affected fisheries and aquaculture in Northeast Nigeria.

Respondents to the FGDs indicated that the presence of NSAGs and embargo on fishing activities placed by Nigerian Security Forces has resulted in the displacement of fishing communities to safer place, abandonment of their primary activity, reduction access to fishing grounds and disruption of fishing and fish trade activities. Thus, depriving them of their main livelihood and income.

3. Gender division of labour

The main actors in the fisheries value chain identified during the diverse FGDs are the following: (i) Artisanal fishers, (ii) fish processors, (iii) fishers marketers/mongers (fresh fish buyers, fish retailers, fish sellers), (iv) fish net/hooks sellers, (v) net fabricator/menders, (vi) fish trap makers, (vii) boat builders, (viii) transporters, (ix) food vendors, (x) labourers, (xi) boat engine mechanics and x) smoked/dry fish actors.

All these categories mentioned are including men, women, youth, boys, disabled persons and elderly.

Men, youth male and boys are mainly involved in fishing. They are also engaged in processing (fish-cleaning/sorting, smoking, drying, roasting, frying, cooking), preservation of the fisheries products and marketing, which are the most prominent activity of women, youth female and girls in addition to their domestic work.

Female are also involved in making and mending nets for their spouses/intimate partners, and for commercial reasons.

It was equally noted that sons are following their fathers in fishing, while daughters accompany their mothers in fish processing and marketing.

4. Protection risks

Interviewees highlighted that children are already involved at the age of 7 in fishing activities. Concerning the ability of boys and girls involved in fisheries to go to school, respondents underlined that fishing activities do not prevent them to go to school.

The same concerns raised under the livestock section applies.
In the fishing communities consulted, boys are engaged in activities such as: boatbuilding, netmaking, preparing nets and baits, paddling, diving, casting/dragging nets, carrying loads/unloading, processing, marketing, and selling fish. Most of the time, they are fishing onboard vessels with no adequate safety protection, and are exposed to bad weather, water-borne diseases or threatened by wild animals (hippopotamuses and crocodiles).

Women and girls involved are particularly vulnerable to sexual abuse and assault, especially sexual assault and abuse, while marketing, selling their products.

It is also worth noting that women's access to natural resources as mean of subsistence and livelihoods is tailored by resource availability, income, power, access, and control over fishing resources.

Consequently, women and girls in socio-economic precarity could be trapped into fish-for-sex transactions. The term refers to particular “arrangements” between female fish traders and fishermen, in which they engage in sexual relationships in order to secure the supply of fish, which they then process and sell to support their families. This malpractice remains common within fishing communities.

Men and youth male underlined to be more exposed to killing and targeted killing while fishing.

As underlined under the Livestock section, some of fishing activities seen previously could also expose children to child or forced labour.

Other protection risks raised up during the diverse FGDs were:
- Embargo/disruption on fishing and fish trade activities placed by the Nigerian armed forces, the presence of NSAGs.
- Theft of their products.
- Attack from crocodiles, hippopotamuses, snake bites.
- Forcibly removing women and girls from fishing enterprise.
- Inadequate or lack of electricity and refrigeration facilities to store unprocessed or unsold fresh/wet fishes.
- Use of undersized mesh nets, for drag, cast net, etc. to fish in non-fishing zone area.
- Lack of capital, knowledge and skills (capacity gaps).
- Inadequate fishing inputs.
- Limited leadership skills to run a group.
- Limited financial management skills.

Their inaccessibility to credit have led them to depend on their personal savings, and are left with no choice, than looking for non-traditional financial institutions to fund their fishing projects such as relatives, friends, adashe (voluntary community savings and credit groups), money lenders etc.

In terms of constraints faced, it was highlighted the following:
- Seasonal flooding.
- Water waves during the rainy season.
- Drought.
- Depletion of resources due to poor management and over fishing/exploitation.
- Climate variability, which is shrinking the lakes/rivers/streams with consequence the decline of fish catches.
- Hazard from smoke during processing affecting sight of the eyes of the processors.
- Inadequate or lack of electricity and refrigeration facilities to store unprocessed or unsold fresh/wet fishes.
- Use of undersized mesh nets, for drag, cast net, etc. to fish in non-fishing zone area.
- Limited access to and ownership of land, particularly for aquaculture.
- Limited leadership skills to run a group.
- Limited financial management skills, and inadequate fishing inputs.

5. Control and access to resources

Access to financing among fishers is still largely unmet to expand their businesses. Compared with men, women often face more problems related finance due to high illiteracy, religious considerations and restrictions, lack of accurate information, poor financial and business literacy, and time issues.
6. Participation and decision-making

From the observation made, the majority of fishing cooperatives are composed by men. As a matter of fact, the research team identified only one mixed (male and female) fishing cooperative in Adamawa State. These groups are run by men and women’s involvement and leadership in decision-making is minimal.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- FAO to conduct the country sector review and value chain analysis.
- FAO to strengthen project beneficiaries’ technical skills in the sustainable management of fishing resources, in non-traditional female activities, business and leadership.
- FAO to provide training to its implementing partners on child labour issues and international policy to stakeholders, including governments and communities.
- FAO to reinforce technical capacities of its implementing partners capacity towards gender equality, women’s rights, protection, protection from GBV, including SEA and AAP.
- FAO to support communities, fisher and fish farmer associations, and other local institutions, including those representing children, to know their rights and to have voice in decision-making.
- FAO to engage with a critical mass of community, religious and traditional leaders favourable to the promotion and protection of women’s and children’s rights and economic empowerment, protection from GBV, including SEA as they are the ones who lead the people and can drive change at the community level.
- FAO, through its fisheries and aquaculture interventions, to introduce beneficiaries to its Thiaroye Processing Technique (FTT-Thiaroye), a new fish smoking technology pioneered by FAO reducing exposure to harmful smoke, saving time in processing, and requiring less fuelwood, thereby reducing the demand for child labour for fuelwood collection.
- FAO to complement fishing and aquaculture interventions with participatory community-level approaches such as Caisses de résilience (CdR), with a clear equality goal for capacity development and improved access to knowledge/information, services and decision-making through Farmer Field Schools and FAO-Dimitra Clubs and Association of Savings and Loans.
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APICULTURE

1. Introduction

In Nigeria, there are two types of beekeeping practices, traditional and modern. Honey hunting and traditional beekeeping constitute an age old tradition for Nigerians. The traditional beekeeping activities have been known to be extensively implemented in the northern states and some part of southern and western States of Nigeria, mostly using honey bees of African origin (Apis mellifera) in traditional man made hives.

2. Impact of the crisis

The honey bees provide pollination services, thereby playing a vital role in food production and overall agricultural productivity. Over 75% of all the crops in sub Saharan Africa, including northeast Nigeria benefit from pollination. Honey production has been identified as a source of income - through the sale of hive products (honey) - and employment for the beekeeping communities. FGDs participants highlighted the benefit of honey as source of food, and medicinal values (honey cures diabetes and stomach ulcers). But, they did not mention the virtues of its by-products such as beeswax, pollen, royal jelly, propolis, bee venom, queens, or that bees can also provide pollination services.

The conflict has had a significant impact on apiculture in Northeast Nigeria, the main source of livelihood for most of the area’s rural households. Beekeepers respondents highlighted that insecurity or its perception have prevented them from fully engaging in beekeeping activities. They initially used to go to the bushes in search of beehives but due to the crisis they can no longer go to a far distance for the search. In response to that they are now making beehives in the outskirts of their community, and not very far from their homes.

3. Gender division of labour

The main actors in the apiculture value chain include: (i) traditional beekeepers, (ii) honey processors and packagers, (iii) honey marketers. Men, women, youth and children are all involved in these activities.

In terms of division of labour, traditional beekeeping is still recognized as a male activity. Respondents indicated that hoisting beehives and harvesting honey is predominantly for men, youth male, and boys, while the women focused on tasks like honey processing, value adding and marketing of honey.

Female and young girls are usually involved in marketing and selling. Boys and girls are mainly involved in beekeeping activities as “helpers” or “guardians”.

Through the FGDs it emerged that traditional beekeeping still remains a male-dominated activity. Men consulted underlined the fact that traditional beekeeping can be labor-intensive during certain times of the year. For instance, hoisting the traditional bark hive requires physical strength and skills.

In fact, beekeeping is not considered as an appropriate activity for women as harvesting honey from the traditional hive required climbing trees, which is culturally and socially considered reprehensible in some cultures. These social and cultural constraints could justify why women and girls are hindered from performing apiary management practices.

As traditional hives are seasonally placed on the trees, it is important highlighting that some women place them on the ground. It allows these latter to harvest a certain quantity of honey and some kilograms of beeswax. But by doing so, they risk losing their beehives by vandals, and get low yield.

Moreover, honey harvesting from traditional beehives inhabited by the African bee requests long absences from home and could only be done at night when women are expected to carry out domestic work. This reality has also been seen in similar context such as Kenya.

FGDs participants reported that the use of outdated techniques of setting fire in production process, hoisting the traditional bark hive and harvesting honey are particularly dangerous tasks for boys.

4 Protection risks

On the ability of boys and girls involved in beekeeping activities to go to school, the majority of respondents underlined that these activities do not prevent them from going to school.

The same concerns raised under the livestock section applies here. As a matter of fact, traditional beekeeping is a very strenuous, laborious and demanding job. Moreover, as aforesaid, honey harvesting from traditional beehives inhabited by the African bee requests long absences from home and could only be done at night in unsafe places. Thus, apiary activities could negatively impact children's schooling and safety.


A beehive at Maina Hari village, Biu LGA, Borno State, December 2018 ©FAO Nigeria/Kyari Kauna

Focus group discussion with beekeepers at Maina Hari village, Biu LGA, Borno State, December 2018 ©FAO Nigeria/Kyari Kauna

A beehive at Maina Hari village, Biu LGA, Borno State, December 2018 ©FAO Nigeria/Kyari Kauna

Clay pot hive installed high in tree top at Maina Hari village, Biu LGA, Borno State, December 2018 ©FAO Nigeria/Kyari Kauna
The major protection risks experienced by beekeepers are:

- Attack/Kidnapping by NSAGs.
- Theft of hives and their products.
- Bush burning.
- Assault, especially sexual assault for youth female and young girls while marketing or selling their products.
- Snakes, bee stings and insects bites.
- Bees diseases.

In fact, attack and kidnapping by NSAGs was presented as one of the main protection risks reported by the different groups, as in most cases to get good honey harvest the beekeepers have to site the hive in the bush, far from, the secured locations.

5. Control and access to resources

As indicated under the Livestock section, men control the majority of income resources in households. Thus, even though women, youth female and girls play a major role in honey processing and marketing, they are hardly benefiting from the income generated.

Here are the main constraints highlighted by the respondents:

- Like men, women have limited skills in beekeeping.
- Lack of skills and knowledge on modern beekeeping practices.
- Limited access to bees inputs and services providers.
- Limited access to beehives due to security issues.
- Shrinking/declining of volume of harvest and forest trees, which affect pollination services provided by the bees.
- Bees health problems especially parasites and viruses.
- Presence of predators such as the termites.

In addition to the above mentioned, in 2015, others constraints were highlighted by the Federation of Beekeepers Association such as:

- Lack of formal Beekeeping Policy and Law.
- Deforestation.

Deforestation remains a problem as it reduces the availability of nesting sites for feral colonies and diminishes the amount, variety and quality of forage for honeybees. Also, beekeepers and honey hunters are sometimes perceived to cause damage to forests.

6. Participation and decision-making

Unlike fisheries, no honey producers/processors association or cooperative was identified. Therefore, the research team was not able to evaluate women involvement in decision-making on apiculture activities.
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RECOMMENDATIONS

- FAO to identify and train honey hunters and traditional beekeepers on modern beekeeping, management techniques in honey bee and honey production and processing (such as Langstroth hives that are hoisted near the ground), business and leadership. And, assist them organize themselves in associations or cooperatives.
- FAO to provide training to its implementing partners on child labour issues and international policy to stakeholders, including governments and communities.
- FAO to reinforce technical capacities of its implementing partners capacity towards gender equality, women ' rights, protection, protection from GBV, including SEA and AAP.
- FAO to engage with a critical mass of community, religious and traditional leaders favourable to the promotion and protection of women's and children's rights and economic empowerment, protection from GBV, including SEA as they are the ones who lead the people and can drive change at the community level.
- FAO to complement beekeeping interventions with participatory community-level approaches such as Caisses de résilience (CdR), with a clear equality goal for capacity development and improved access to knowledge/ information, services and decision-making through Farmer Field Schools and FAO-Dimitra Clubs and Association of Savings and Loans.
During the rapid gender analysis, FGDs participants were also given a voice to express their priorities in terms of information needed from FAO. Moreover, they were asked to inform the research team on the most appropriate and preferred channels they would like FAO to provide information, share their feedback (grievances or satisfaction) relating to the targeting criteria, distribution process, quality of the assistance received and the conduct of FAO staff or implementing partner.

On their priority information needs related to livestock, respondents wished to receive information on animal production, processing and health. For fisheries and aquaculture, participants requested to receive the information on fisheries, modern fish farming, food preservation methods and access to credits and loans. And, beekeepers members expressed their desire to receive information on modern beekeeping, management techniques in honey production and processing.

Concerning their preferred channels of communication, face-to-face interactions, through their traditional leaders and phone calls were their first choice, followed by billboards, pamphlets, flyers and radio programs.

The hotline number and FAO staff received most preference across the diverse FGDs, through which the participants would like to give their feedbacks, followed by FAO implementing partners, Extension agents and Camp manager.

- FAO to engage systematically with affected population on the relevance, design, implementation and review of its interventions in Northeast Nigeria, and, ensure that their views on their own needs are well reflected through all phases of the programme/project cycle.
- Needs assessments and feedback mechanisms to capture the opinions of women, men, boys and girls, including the most vulnerable and marginalized groups.
- Communicating in languages, formats and media that are easily understood, accessible, gender sensitive and culturally appropriate.
- Communication materials to be a mix of verbal, audio and other formats for the following reasons: (1) Audio is best understood by non-native and non-literate audiences, (2) clear and simple text or pictorial messaging offer the more permanent record needed for information retention and later reference, and (3) appears to be more effective than text alone.

Needs assessments and feedback mechanisms should capture the opinions of women, men, boys and girls, including the most vulnerable and marginalized groups.

Face-to-face interactions, traditional leaders and phone calls, were cited as the most-preferred channels to receive information from FAO, followed by billboards, pamphlets, flyers, and radio programs. And, the hotline number and FAO staff received most mention across the diverse FGDs, through which the participants would like to give their feedbacks, followed by FAO implementing partners, Extension agents and Camp manager.
The planning and implementation of gender-responsive projects and programmes start by taking into consideration the specific needs, interests, challenges faced by women, men, boys, girls, including marginalized and at-risk social groups in their reproductive, productive and community roles. A better understanding of the context and these gender-related differences and constraints avoid perpetuating or even accentuating gender inequalities.

This RGA gave us the opportunity to identify specific measures for a meaningful participation by women, men, boys and girls, including marginalized and at-risk social groups into FAO Northeast Nigeria livestock, fisheries/aquaculture and apiculture projects and programmes.

Integrating gender, protection, Accountability to Affected Populations and Communication with Communities aspects into its interventions will contribute to help affected communities to become more resilient in the face of violence, risk and uncertainty.


12. Ibid.


17. A Rapid Gender Analysis (RGA): “provides essential information about gender roles and responsibilities, capacities and vulnerabilities together with programming recommendations. It is used in situations where time is of the essence and resources are very scarce”. While a comprehensive gender analysis/assessment: “entails the examination of the different roles, rights, needs, and opportunities of women and men, boys and girls in a given project/program context. It is a tool that helps to promote gender - relevant entry points, policies and identify opportunities for enhancing gender equality in a particular project/program”. Cf. [https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/images/documents/rapid-gender-analysis/GIE-Guidance-Note-Rapid-Gender-Analysis.pdf](https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/images/documents/rapid-gender-analysis/GIE-Guidance-Note-Rapid-Gender-Analysis.pdf); [https://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/574712/Form_09_-_Gender_Assessment_and_Action_Plan_Template.pdf/3f468173-fbb2-4bc7-9bf9-9f182dad05c0](https://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/574712/Form_09_-_Gender_Assessment_and_Action_Plan_Template.pdf/3f468173-fbb2-4bc7-9bf9-9f182dad05c0).


19. The Buhari Plan aims to provide an integrated framework to coordinate and plan all initiatives for sustainable peace and development in the country’s North-East.


23. Christian Aid (Caïd), Damañsh Human Capacity Building Initiative (DHCBI)/ Borno and Yobe States, Civil Society Coalition for Poverty Eradication (CISCOPE)/Yobe State.
24. IOM.
25. Borno State Agricultural Development Programme (BOSADP), Yobe State Agricultural Development Programme (ADP-Yobe), Adamawa State Agricultural Development Programme (AD.ADP), Borno/Yobe/Adamawa State National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) and State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA).
28. Due to time constraints and security reasons, men from 18 to 64 years old and boys from 13 to 17 years old were together in Dusuiman, Jakana, Mainahari and Tum.
29. Due to time constraints and security reasons, women from 18 to 64 years old and girls from 13 to 17 years old were together in Dusuman, Jakana, GSS IDP Camp and Abbai.
30. The FGDs conducted with girls from 13 to 17 years old was only focused on livestock.
31. Due to time constraints and security reasons, men from 18 to 64 years old and boys from 13 to 17 years old were together in Malkohi II IDP Camp and Damare.
32. Due to time constraints and security reasons, men from 18 to 64 years old and boys from 13 to 17 years old were together in Kotakoto, Dachia and Damagum.
33. Due to time constraints and security reasons, women from 18 to 64 years old and girls from 13 to 17 years old were together in Kukareta, Dachiya and Damagum.
35. Idem.
41. Idem.
43. Idem.
44. Ibid.
45. ILO. What is forced labour, modern slavery and human trafficking. (Available at: https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/definition/lang--en/index.htm).
47. Idem.
50. Idem.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid.
54. The Caisses de Résilience” (CdR) approach: “an innovative community-centred approach which brings together three dimensions: a productive/technical dimension (i.e. sustainable agricultural practices), an economic/financial dimension (i.e. access to credit) and a social dimension (i.e. strengthening social cohesion through farmers’ group and women’s associations). The approach is innovative because the support involves these three simultaneous and complementary dimensions, thereby producing a broader range of opportunities for the beneficiaries as well as strengthening their preparedness to complex shocks and crises. CdR aims to assist food-insecure smallholder farmers and pastoralists, particularly vulnerable to shocks and crises by increasing and diversifying key assets and knowledge for a better resilience of livelihoods”. Cf. FAO. (2016). Caisses de resiliance: Consolidating community resilience by strengthening households’ social, productive and financial capacities through an integrated approach. Rome. FAO. Available at: (http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5869e.pdf); FAO. Op. Cit. (note 1). p. 32.

55. FFS are an interactive and participatory “learning by observation, doing and experimentation” approach involving groups of 20-25 farmers, pastoralists or fisher folk and a trained facilitator. Group members through the provision of key life skills and knowledge in agriculture and nutrition experiment with best practices and conventional methods while discussing challenges and solutions in their own local context. The three week long intensive workshop equipped experts supporting conflict-affected farmers in the BAY States with the knowledge in agricultural production and nutrition, including the skills to set up and run at least two farmer field schools per facilitator. Cf. also http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5296e.pdf.

56. “FAO Dimitra Clubs The Dimitra Clubs are spaces for dialogue and action at community level that enable their members – women, men and girls and boys – to discuss problems and needs, share concerns and take collective action to improve their living conditions, thus becoming agents of change and development both in agriculture and in important social aspects, such as HIV/AIDS, early marriage, social cohesion, gender equality and women’s rights to access resources. Local community radio stations broadcast programmes based on the discussions within the clubs, disseminating information on topics such as food and nutrition security, gender roles, and good practices in agriculture and health”. This platform provides also an opportunity to increase awareness on gender issues by addressing the root causes of GBV cases and empowering the participants to prevent and mitigate them by stimulating significant changes in gender roles and behaviors at individual, household and community levels. Cf. FAO. (2015). Dimitra Clubs: a unique approach. Rome. FAO. (Available at: http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4706e.pdf); FAO. (2016). Guidance Note Gender, food security and nutrition in protracted crises: Women and girls as agents of resilience. Rome. FAO. p. 12. (Available at: http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6630e.pdf); FAO. (2018). Good Practice: FAO Dimitra Clubs. March 2018. Rome. FAO. Available at: (http://www.fao.org/gender/projects/detail/en/c/1104337/).


60. Idem.

61. Idem.


70. Acceptance speech delivered at the inauguration of the Federation of Beekeepers Association of Nigeria (FEBKAN) by the National President, Mr. Bidemi Ojeleye, on 30th July, 2015 at the Nicon Luxury Hotels Abuja. (Available at: http://foodfarmnews.blogspot.com/2015/08/acceptance-speech-delivered-at.html).


Purpose of the tool:

a. Analyse the gender division labour, access and control of resources, participation in decision-making of women, girls, men, and boys in livestock, fisheries/aquaculture & apiculture.
b. Understand the main protection security risks faced by women, girls, men, and boys in livestock, fisheries/aquaculture & apiculture.
c. Understand the real and priority communication needs of affected populations and Identify the best means to integrate their perspectives and feedback into FAO Northeast Nigeria livestock, fisheries/aquaculture & apiculture current and/or future interventions.

I. LIVESTOCK

Impact of the crisis

1. What is the impact of the crisis on livestock and poultry activities (rearing, processing and marketing of poultry/livestock products [meat, milk, eggs, skins etc.])?
2. To what distance do you access grazing land, fodder production and water for livestock?

Gender division of labour

1. Who are the main actors in poultry value chain?
2. Who are the main actors in livestock value chain?
3. To what extent are widows, orphans, disabled persons and elderly also involved in poultry activities?
4. To what extent are widows, orphans, disabled persons and elderly also involved in livestock activities?
### 7. What different activities are carried out by women, girls, men, and boys in livestock and poultry production, processing, and marketing? (Tick the correct box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Women 18-64 years old</th>
<th>Girls 13-17 years old</th>
<th>Men 18-64 years old</th>
<th>Boys 13-17 years old</th>
<th>Time allocation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POULTRY PRODUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning the poultry house and equipments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egg collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POULTRY PROCESSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughtering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal of the wastes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling/transport to market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POULTRY MARKETING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on poultry keeping and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding/watering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing, tethering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fodder collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIVESTOCK PROCESSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughtering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making butter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grilling, roasting, smoking, sun-drying meat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIVESTOCK MARKETING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling of livestock products (milk, meat, animal dungs, hide and skin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on livestock production and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protection risks

8. Are the boys and girls involved in poultry activities able to go to school?  
   (If no, comments to be provided)  
   Comment:  
9. Are the boys and girls involved in livestock activities able to go to school?  
   (If no, comments to be provided)  
   Comment:  
10. Are the boys and girls carrying out livestock tasks that you consider dangerous (grazing, watering, medication, milking)?  
    (If yes, comments to be provided)  
    If so, which ones?  
11. Are you aware of boys and girls involved in forced labour in poultry/livestock activities?  
12. What are the main protection risks experienced by women, girls, men, and boys involved in poultry activities?  
13. What are the main protection risks experienced by women, girls, men, and boys involved in livestock activities?  

Control and access to resources or services

14. Does ownership of livestock by men, women, girls and boys limit their access to land and water?  
15. Which types of poultry do women and men prefer? Why?  
16. Which types of livestock do women and men prefer? Why?  
17. Which group of the community is more involved in poultry keeping (chicken, turkey, guinea fowl, ostrich etc)?  
18. Do women, girls, men and boys have access to veterinary and animal husbandry extension services?  
    (If no, why?)  
19. Do women and men have access to the resources (land, credit, capital)?  
    (If no, why?)  
20. Do women, girls, men and boys have access to training on livestock keeping?  
21. Are there poultry/livestock cooperatives in this community?  
22. Are women and men involved in livestock cooperatives?  
23. Do women own the animals they tend?  
24. Do women have control over or access to the income derived from the sale of meat, eggs, milk, etc.?  
25. Who controls crops fodder after harvest and how is it managed?  
26. What are the main constraints of poultry activities women, girls, men, and boys experienced in the community?  
27. What are the main constraints of livestock activities women, girls, men, and boys experienced in the community?
**Participation and decision-making**

28. Are women and men represented in producer, processing organizations or cooperatives?
29. Do women and men actively participate in decision-making bodies and processes?
30. Do women and men have leadership positions within these organizations or cooperatives?
31. Where do you meet? Why?

**Accountability to affected population (AAP), Communication with communities (CwC)**

32. What types of information do you need in relation to poultry, livestock? Comment:
33. How do you prefer to receive this information from FAO?
   a) Billboard b) Pamphlet c) face-to-face interactions d) Flyer e) Radio f) Town cryers g) Traditional leaders h) Religious leaders (mosque/church) i) Other:
   Comment:
34. How would you like to provide feedback to us?
   a. Hotline number
   b. FAO staff
   c. FAO implementing partner
   d. Extension agents
   e. Camp Manager or Officer
   f. Other (specify)
II. FISHERIES

*Impact of the crisis*

1. What is the impact of the crisis on fisheries and aquaculture activities (fishing/fish production, processing and marketing)?

*Gender division of labour*

2. Who are the main actors in fisheries & aquaculture value chain?
4. What different activities are carried out by women, girls, men, and boys in livestock and poultry production, processing, and marketing? (Tick the correct box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Women 18-64 years old</th>
<th>Girls 13-17 years old</th>
<th>Men 18-64 years old</th>
<th>Boys 13-17 years old</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FISHERIES/AQUACULTURE PRODUCTION, PROCESSING AND MARKETING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing (Drying, smoking, roasting, frying, cooking etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish farming/aquaculture (hatching, feed formulation, rearing, tending, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling, marketing (wholesalers, retailers, agents, transporters, loaders/off-loaders, sorters/packagers, rope seller, empty carton sellers etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trap making/weaving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food vendor (Selling food stuff to the fisher folks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net mending/maintenance of fishing equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe/boat building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarding fisheries/Aquaculture facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on fisheries/aquaculture management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protection risks

5. Are the boys and girls involved in fisheries/aquaculture activities able to go to school?
   (If no, comments to be provided)
   Comment:

6. Are the boys and girls carrying out tasks that you consider dangerous (deep-sea diving and dynamite fishing, etc.)?
   (If yes, comments to be provided)
   If so, which ones?
   Comment:

7. For whom boys and girls are working for?
   a. Family
   b. Third party independently
   c. Third party with their family members

8. At what age do individuals engage in fishing/aquaculture activities as a livelihood activity?

9. What are the main protection risks experienced by women, girls, men, and boys involved in fisheries activities?

Control and access to resources or services

10. Do women and men fish sellers/retailers have access to the market?

11. Do fishermen and fisherwomen have access to the market?

12. Are they facing any restrictions to sell their products?

13. Do women and men have fishing equipment, such as boats or nets? Do they depend on middlemen or traders for capital and equipment?

14. How do women and men access credit?

15. Do women and men fisher folk have enough skills in fishing, as required for sustainable fish harvesting/catching?

16. Which fishing methods are you using (unstainable or sustainable) for fishing?

17. Are you aware or implementing regulations to fisheries?
   (Which one?), specify

18. Are men and women involved in fish farming
   If no, why?

19. What are the main constraints of fisheries/aquaculture activities women, girls, men, and boys experienced in the community?
Participation and decision-making

25. Are women and men represented in producer, processing organizations or cooperatives?
26. Do women and men actively participate in decision-making bodies and processes?
27. Do women and men have leadership positions within these organizations or cooperatives?
28. Where do you meet? Why?

Accountability to affected population (AAP), Communication with communities (CwC)

29. What types of information do you need in relation to fisheries/aquaculture? Comment:
30. How do you prefer to receive this information from FAO?
b) Billboard b) Pamphlet c) face-to-face interactions d) Flyer e) Radio f) Town cryers g) Traditional leaders h) Religious leaders (mosque/church) i) Other:
Comment:
31. How would you like to provide feedback to us?
g. Hotline number
h. FAO staff
i. FAO implementing partner
j. Extension agents
k. Camp Manager or Officer
l. Other (specify)
III. APICULTURE

Impact of the crisis
1. What is the importance/scale of beekeeping/Honey activities in the community?
2. What is the impact of the crisis on apiculture activities?

Gender division of labour
3. Who are the main actors in apiculture value chain?
4. What different activities are carried out by girls and women and by men and boys in beekeeping, honey production, processing and marketing? (Tick the correct box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Women 18-64 years old</th>
<th>Girls 13-17 years old</th>
<th>Men 18-64 years old</th>
<th>Boys 13-17 years old</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HONEY PRODUCTION, PROCESSING AND MARKETING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Bee-farming (traditional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Bee-farming (modern)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey harvesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing/value adding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on Honey Bee-farming, production, processing, and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protection risks

5. Are the boys and girls involved in these activities able to go to school?  
   (If no, comments to be provided)
   Comment:

6. Are the boys and the girls carrying out tasks that you consider dangerous?  
   (If yes, comments to be provided)
   If so, which ones?
   Comment:

7. What are the main protection risks experienced by women, girls, men, and boys involved in apiculture activities?

Control and access to resources

8. Who are the ones controlling resources generated by beekeeping products in the family?

Access to services

9. Do women and men have enough skills in beekeeping?
10. What are the main constraints of beekeeping activities women, girls, men, and boys experienced in the community?

Participation and decision-making

11. Are women and men represented in producer, processing organizations or cooperatives?
12. Do women and men actively participate in decision-making bodies and processes?
13. Do women and men have leadership positions within these organizations or cooperatives?
14. Where do you meet? Why?

Accountability to affected population (AAP), Communication with communities (CwC)

15. What types of information do you need in relation to apiculture? Comment:
16. How do you prefer to receive this information from FAO?
   a) Billboard b) Pamphlet c) face-to-face interactions d) Flyer e) Radio f) Town cryers g) Traditional leaders h) Religious leaders (mosque/church) i) Other:
   Comment:
18. How would you like to provide feedback to us?
   a. Hotline number 
   b. FAO staff 
   c. FAO implementing partner 
   d. Extension agents 
   e. Camp Manager or Officer 
   f. Other (specify)