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Crop & Food Security Assessment Mission (CFSAM) Findings

2019/2020
Crop data collection

- About 60 CCMCs established countrywide
- More than 30 missions and 1,300 interviews conducted
- Additional satellite-based data e.g. NDVI, Drought Stress Index, Rainfall anomalies etc. additionally used
Crop data collection sites

- Counties in green assessed
- Counties in white faced access challenges or have no CCMCs established
National cereal production - 2019

1 075 000 farming households

818 500 tons of cereal produced; cereal deficit of 482 500 tons

10% higher than 2018

4% lower than the past five-year average

72% sorghum
20% maize
6% millet
2% rice
Cereal production/deficits (2019/2020)
Cultivated area (millions of hectares)

- Current levels similar to 2016 levels
- Planted area sharply declined in Northern Bahr El Ghazal and Upper Nile States due to floods
- Increases observed in Greater Equatoria, Unity, Western Bahr El Ghazal States – due to relative improvement in security
Cereal production trends (2014-2020)

- Decreases observed in Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Jonglei, and Upper Nile States
- Northern Bahr el Ghazal had the highest decrease (in absolute numbers i.e. 29 000 MT)
Cereal production trends (by Region)

- **Equatoria** – increased due to relative stability and favorable weather
- **Bahr al Ghazal** - decline but production is largely consistent – relative calm
- **Upper Nile** – crop production low (driven by the shock of conflict that disrupted livelihoods), but with slight increases over time
Greater Horn of Africa Climate Outlook Forum (GHACOF 54)

March – May 2020
Between March and May 2020, above normal to normal rainfall is expected; also, warmer than normal temperature conditions are expected across the country, with the exception of the southeastern part of the country (yellow zone).
Likely implications

• Early start of the agricultural season *(shorter lean season?)*
• Reduced incidences of Fall Armyworm (FAW)
• Water and pasture availability – improved access to milk & livestock products
• Increased fishing activity in areas where volumes of fish are dictated by water availability
• Wet and warm conditions likely to encourage reproduction of the desert locust
Recommendations

• Continuous monitoring – particularly flooding risk
• Enhance livestock disease surveillance systems for early detection, identification and reporting for timely intervention
• Timely distribution of livelihood support to take advantage of the early rains (agricultural and fishing kits)
• Early pre-positioning of multi-sectoral humanitarian assistance
• Scaling-up and timely delivery of supplies to health and nutrition centers
Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) Findings

January – July 2020
Sources of evidence

- FSNMS Data (demographics; food security indicators; assets holding; food and livelihood coping strategies; agriculture; livestock; fishing; humanitarian assistance)
- CLIMIS Portal data (markets, rainfall, exchange rates, trend data etc.)
- Crop production data
- Nutrition data (FSNMS-based; SMART surveys)
- Health data (admission rates; health-related shocks etc.)
- WASH data (collected via FSNMS survey)
- Multi-sectoral humanitarian assistance data (HFA, Livelihoods, Nutrition, NFIs etc.)
- Secondary / other data (FSL Reports, Trend data etc.)
FSNMS coverage

- 9 clusters selected per County
- 12 households interviewed per cluster
- 8,529 households interviewed
- Data collection from November 2019 to January 2020
January 2020

5.29 million people (45%) facing severe acute food insecurity
- 4.14 million in Crisis
- 1.11 million in Emergency
- 40,000 in Catastrophe

- Crisis: 51 Counties
- Emergency: 15 Counties
- Catastrophe: 0 Counties
Flood impact and January 2020 situation

Comparing the January 2020 with the flood-related cereal production loss map.

Areas heavily affected by floods are those that are worst hit by severe food insecurity (geographic concentration in most of GUN).
February - April 2020

6.01 million people (51%) facing severe acute food insecurity
- 4.515 million in Crisis
- 1.475 million in Emergency
- 20,000 in Catastrophe

Crisis: 50 Counties
Emergency: 22 Counties
Catastrophe: 0 Counties
May – July 2020

6.48 million people (55%) facing severe acute food insecurity

- 4.73 million in Crisis
- 1.745 million in Emergency
- 0 in Catastrophe

Crisis: 37 Counties
Emergency: 33 Counties
Catastrophe: 0 Counties
Food insecurity: Post-harvest trends

![Graph showing percentages for Phases 1 & 2 and Phases 3, 4 & 5 over different years.]

- **Jan 2017**: 68% (3.8m Phases 1 & 2, 32% Phases 3, 4 & 5)
- **Jan 2018**: 52% (5.4m Phases 1 & 2, 48% Phases 3, 4 & 5)
- **Jan 2019**: 46% (6.2m Phases 1 & 2, 54% Phases 3, 4 & 5)
- **Jan 2020**: 55% (5.3m Phases 1 & 2, 45% Phases 3, 4 & 5)

Levels almost similar to 2018.

However, number of people in IPC Phases 3, 4 and 5 continues to be very high (5 million +)
Levels almost similar to 2018.

However, number of people in IPC Phases 3, 4 and 5 continues to be very high at the peak of the lean season (6 million +)
Jonglei, NBeG, UNS, Lakes and Unity are above the national average in terms of proportion of population in Phases 3, 4 & 5, with 4 out of 5 of the States having more than 50% of their population in IPC Phases 3, 4 and 5.
Jonglei, NBeG, UNS, Lakes and Unity have more than 50% of their population in IPC Phases 3, 4 and 5 during the February to April 2020 period – typically the post-harvest period of the country.
Jonglei, NBeG, UNS, Lakes, Warrap and Unity have more than 50% of their population in IPC Phases 3, 4 and 5 during the May – July 2020 ‘peak of the lean season’ period.
Key drivers of food insecurity

• Climatic shocks (*floods, drought etc.*)
• Economic crisis
• Low crop production (*2 consecutive poor seasons in Southern Africa to increase cereal demand from surplus producers – Uganda and Tanzania*)
• Population movements (*returnees; distress migration etc.*)
• Isolated incidents of conflict & insecurity (*cattle raiding, inter-communal violence etc.*)
• Asset depletion associated with protracted crisis (*livestock etc.*)
Key drivers of food insecurity contd.

• Poor WASH conditions (affecting food utilization; increased morbidity)
• Limited access to health services
• Poor road networks (affects trade, limits physical movement)
• Threat of desert locust
Counties with IPC Phase 5 populations

Akobo, Duk & Ayod
At-risk counties – Akobo, Duk & Ayod

- January 2020
  Akobo (10%), Ayod (5%), Duk (5%)

- February-April 2020
  Akobo (5%), Duk (5%)

- May-July 2020
  None
Historical trends

• Similar geographic locations to the 1990’s hunger triangle – except for Western Ayod;
• Migration is key mitigating factor for all three locations – yet unable due to floods;
• Reliance on social networks for support strained and likely to continue to be marginal;
• Increased concern for Akobo West, Southern Nyirol, and Northern Uror sub-areas.
Akobo West - Barmach, Diror and Walgak Payams

• Flooding isolated communities, led to crop and livestock loss and cut off access to HFA for multiple locations;

• HHs characterized by exhausted coping capacity, negligible assets, and marginal access to services – including HFA;

• At time of the IPC current level of planned, funded and likely humanitarian food was insufficient to have any significant impact on the level of acute food insecurity;

• Continued reports of distress migration in search of food. Mixed indication on exact locations – Waat, Walgak, Duk and Akobo Town;

• Request for immediate scale up and in-depth HH survey to understand current and likely levels of severe food insecurity in projections.
Duk - Ageer, Dongchack, and Padiet Payams

- Flooding reportedly resulted both livestock and crop loss – 9% reduction in crop production → 1-2 months of expected food stocks;
- HHs in phase 5 are most likely households that lost most of their crop and/or do not own livestock and experienced difficulty accessing fish or milk;
- Data collected in January 2020 – most recent information for all counties;
- Non-RRM location;
- High concern for increasing malnutrition and morbidity given historical trends.

Trends of % of population in IPC Phases 3, 4 & 5
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Ayod - Kurwai, Wau, Pajiek Payams

- Limited engagement in livelihoods – 35% planted, 40% have no livestock;
- Unsustainable sources of food - 60% reported HFA as main source of food; 48% hunting/gathering as secondary source;
- High level of HFA – yet 5% convergence of Phase 5 HHs.

*Trends of % of population in IPC Phases 3, 4 & 5*
Way forward – Response strategy

• Counties with Phase 5 populations are priority
• Response to target all Phase 4 counties
• Phase 3 counties not to be neglected as they risk falling into Phase 4 (important to understand the food insecurity drivers for Phase 3 counties)
• Assessment mission planned for Akobo West from 04-18 March
• Mission planned for Ayod in the next 2 weeks
• Duk mission to be planned later as data used in analysis is very recent (collected in January 2020)
Way forward – Multi-sectoral response

• A more optimistic scenario likely to prevail given the current peace agreement can sustained;

• Immediate action to maintain livelihoods and increase resilience will have lasting impact;

• Urgent need to continue delivering multi-sectoral humanitarian assistance (*livelihood support*; *humanitarian food assistance*; *nutrition support*; *health support*; *WASH*; *protection* etc.);
Thank you!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3 Crisis</th>
<th>Phase 4 Emergency</th>
<th>Phase 5 Famine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Even with any humanitarian assistance at least one in five HHs in the area have the following or worse:</td>
<td>Even with any humanitarian assistance at least one in five HHs in the area have the following or worse:</td>
<td>Even with any humanitarian assistance at least one in five HHs in the area have an extreme lack of food and other basic needs where starvation, death, and destitution are evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food consumption gaps with high or above usual acute malnutrition</td>
<td>Large food consumption gaps resulting in very high acute malnutrition and excess mortality</td>
<td>(Evidence for all three criteria of food consumption, wasting, and CDR is required to classify Famine.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are marginally able to meet minimum food needs only with accelerated depletion of livelihood assets that will lead to food consumption gaps.</td>
<td>Extreme loss of livelihood assets that will lead to food consumption gaps in the short term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>