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Methodology

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) launched a household survey in Nigeria through the Data in Emergencies Monitoring (DIEM Monitoring) System to monitor agricultural livelihoods and food security. This third-round survey reached a random sample of 1,398 households during the beginning of the harvest period. The survey targeted the states of Adamawa, Boron, Katsina, Yobe and Zamfara.

Interviews for this third-round survey were conducted between 23 September and 24 October 2022 through computer-assisted telephone interviews. Data were weighted using population counts. The second-round survey, which has been drawn from to make comparisons throughout this brief, was conducted between 26 June and 8 July 2022.

Figure 1. Countries with established DIEM-Monitoring System


The final boundary between the Sudan and South Sudan has not yet been determined. Final status of the Abyei area is not yet determined. The dotted line represents, approximately, the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties.

About DIEM-Monitoring

FAO established the DIEM-Monitoring System to collect, analyse and disseminate data on shocks and livelihoods in countries prone to multiple shocks. DIEM-Monitoring aims to inform decision making by providing regularly updated information on how different shocks are affecting the livelihoods and food security of agricultural populations.

At the core of the DIEM-Monitoring System are country-level dashboards. Readers are encouraged to explore these dashboards to gain more insight into the context of Nigeria and other countries.

> Learn more at data-in-emergencies.fao.org/pages/monitoring
Income and shocks

Approximately 37 percent of surveyed households reportedly faced at least one shock during the three months preceding the survey. Primary shocks reported were violence and insecurity, particularly for those in Zamfara (12 percent) and Borno (10 percent) and flooding, especially for those in Adamawa (21 percent). Additionally, 9 percent of all household respondents reportedly experienced the shock of sickness or death of a family member.

Conflict and violent incidents in the North East region of Nigeria declined in 2022, which allowed for an increased engagement in agricultural activities and might have contributed to the perception of increased resilience to shocks among the respondents. This could explain the low percentage of respondents who reported to have experienced at least one shock in the three months preceding the survey.

Heavy floods affected the surveyed states from July to September 2022. These floods were reportedly the worst in a decade and led to a significant decline in 2022 wet season harvests.¹ The main sources of income indicated by respondents were the production and sale of staple crops (41 percent), the production and sale of cash crops (7 percent) and the production and sale of livestock (25 percent). Twenty percent of respondents reported a decrease in their main source of income in the 3 months preceding the survey, compared to the same period in a typical year.

Crops

Approximately 68 percent of households surveyed were crop producers. Difficulties with crop production were reported by almost half of household interviewed (45 percent). The most frequently reported difficulty across the survey area was access to fertilizer (42 percent). This difficulty was noted particularly in Zamfara (53 percent), Borno (43 percent) and Adamawa (42 percent). Other difficulties reported include crop damage (e.g., by pests, animals or bandits) other than plant disease during the growing season (22 percent), soil erosion (14 percent) that had a particular impact in Adamawa (23 percent) and Borno (17 percent), lack of rainfall or water for irrigation (11 percent) and plant diseases (10 percent).

¹ https://fews.net/west-africa/nigeria
When comparing round 3 findings with previous results, an overall reduction in the number of households experiencing crop production difficulties is observed. This may be because the previous round of data collection occurred at the beginning of the planting season when farmers were more in need of accessing fertilizer, high-quality seeds, access to machinery and extra labour (for example).
Crop sale difficulties were experienced by 22 percent of surveyed households and consisted of high transportation or marketing costs (43 percent), a low selling price (37 percent), difficulties accessing the market (24 percent) and usual traders or local customers not buying as much as usual (13 percent).

Livestock

Forty-five percent of households surveyed are livestock producers. Among them, 34 percent reportedly experienced production difficulties. The primary difficulty experienced was livestock disease or death (51 percent), most heavily reported in Katsina (62 percent), Borno (54 percent) and Adamawa (50 percent). This was followed by difficulty purchasing feed (30 percent, especially in Yobe [52 percent] and Borno [40 percent]) access to veterinary services (12 percent), veterinary inputs (12 percent and livestock theft (10 percent). Additionally, 39 percent of livestock producers reported a decrease in their number of livestock compared to the last year due to distress sale (13 percent) and because animals died of poor health, malnutrition or injury (12 percent). Livestock sale difficulties were reported by 17 percent of respondents, explained by low selling prices (41 percent), high transportation or marketing costs (36 percent), the usual traders or local customers not buying as much as usual (19 percent) and difficulties accessing the market (17 percent).
Livestock prices remained above average across the region due to strong urban demand. However, regional trade was negatively impacted by persistent insecurity in pastoral areas.2

A comparison with the previous round of data collection shows that livestock production difficulties were more relevant during the previous months, apart from livestock diseases or death. The previous round occurred at the onset of the rainy season, when pastures were yet to regenerate – pushing livestock keepers to investigate alternative feeding resources that were too expensive or unavailable. Typically, there is a general increase in livestock diseases/death from water and vector-born infections during the wet season, which may explain an increase in livestock disease or death during the current round.

### Figure 4. Livestock production difficulties

![Bar chart showing livestock production difficulties](image)


### Food security

Regarding the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) indicator,3 it was observed that 40 percent of respondents experienced moderate or severe recent food insecurity, and 6 percent experienced a prevalence of severe recent food insecurity. A comparison with the previous round shows that Zamfara and Katsina are increasingly becoming food insecurity

---

3 FIES results are subject to change, until the country scale is established for a more consistent comparability Zoey across rounds.
hotspots due to effects of heightened insecurity associated with widespread displacement and disruption of agricultural livelihood activities. The presence of insurgency in Borno that disrupts livelihood and market activities may have worsened the food security situation with respect to the previous round.

Figure 5. Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)

The Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) shows that approximately 67 percent of households interviewed have a high level of dietary diversity, followed by 21 percent of households that present a medium level of dietary diversity and 12 percent with a low level of dietary diversity. The HDDS has improved this round – in correspondence with the harvest season – offering opportunities to integrate a diversified diet.

According to the household hunger scale (HHS), 86 percent of households reported experiencing little to no hunger over the three months preceding the survey, 12 percent experienced moderate hunger and 2 percent experienced severe hunger. The HHS indicator shows an improved trend over the last round of data collection, which may also be explained by increased food availability due to the ongoing season.

The livelihood coping strategies put in place revolved around stress strategies (42 percent) involving households who spent their savings, borrowed money and/or sold their assets and goods, emergency strategies (14 percent) involving households begging or selling their house or land and crisis strategies (11 percent) involving households who withdrew children from school and sold productive assets or means of transport. In the current round, households were more oriented toward stress coping strategies and less toward emergency and crisis strategies. Once more, this is due to the benefits brought by the ongoing harvest season.
Three quarters of the population did not apply any coping strategy.

The unusually high number of respondents engaging in emergency and crisis coping strategies during the harvest period might be due to the impacts of shocks experienced by some households during the assessment period (floods, insecurity and displacement).

**Needs**

An expected need for assistance within the three to six months following the survey was reported by 82 percent of households. Approximately 85 percent reported the need for cash or food assistance, followed by the need for fertilizer (29 percent), loans (19 percent), tools (15 percent), pesticides (14 percent) and seeds (9 percent). Seventy-six percent of the respondents reported to have not received any assistance for the 3 months preceding the survey, and for those that received assistance this was primarily in form of food (4 percent) and cash vouchers (2 percent).
Figure 6. Main needs
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Recommendations

Short-term recommendations

> Food and cash assistance should be provided across all states, complemented with livelihood support to enable resilience building.

> Support should be provided to livestock producers to implement mass vaccinations of livestock, taking advantage of the presence of community animal health workers (para veterinarians). Para veterinarians should be equipped with relevant kits, refresher trainings and support to move around villages to vaccinate animals within livestock production clusters.

> Sensitize livestock farmers to cooperate with animal health workers by presenting flocks for vaccination.

Long-term recommendations

> Access to fertilizer should be improved across all states. This could be achieved through distribution mechanisms such as a smarter model of fertilizer delivery via accredited agro-input dealers. Additionally, farmers should be trained and linked with identified agro-input dealers.

> Increase farmer awareness on integrated pests and diseases management (IPDM), especially in Adamawa and Katsina.

> Efforts should be put in place to address market access challenges across all states. This could be done, for example, by organizing farmers into a producer association and by linking them with market outlets. Additionally, it would be useful to set up an agricultural market information system (AMIS) to enhance food market transparency and policy responses for food security.

> Support long term resilience-building livelihood-based interventions such as livestock restocking, the establishment of strategic seed banks for staple crops and the establishment of cereal/grain storage reserves in strategic locations.

> Conduct regular refresher trainings for community-based animal health workers.

> Enforce quarantine measures depending on specific animal disease outbreaks.
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