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Methodology

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) launched a household survey in Bangladesh through the Data in Emergencies Monitoring (DIEM-Monitoring) System in October 2021 to monitor agricultural livelihoods and food security. This fourth-round survey utilized a random sample of 2,027 households representative at the admin 1 level for all divisions, and was complemented by interviews with extension officers, agricultural input dealers and food traders.

These data, collected in Bangladesh in October and November 2021, were weighted by the demographics of the division, urban/rural setting and type of toilet as a proxy for wealth.

Figure 1. Countries with established DIEM-Monitoring System


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 insights on the context in Bangladesh and other countries.

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

Similar to the third round of data collection in April and May 2021, 52 percent of households reported that they had experienced shocks in the previous three months. As in round 3, the most frequently reported shock was sickness or death in the family (by 18 percent). The frequency of other shocks, including loss of employment, food-price inflation and restrictions to curb the spread of COVID-19 (Figure 2), was also similar to the previous round. Rural populations were more seriously affected by these shocks than urban ones. Economic shocks such as loss of employment and high food prices were reported more frequently by respondents who were also affected by COVID-19 containment measures.

By livelihood profile, those most impacted were traders, agricultural labourers (of which 73 percent had a lower wage), and agricultural producers depending on “spot markets” (for vegetables and livestock), rather than bulk selling (rice). Income decreased more frequently for labourers (whether agricultural or not) than for other livelihood groups.

Figure 2. Households affected by COVID-19 restriction measures (percentage of respondents)

Crops

The survey data indicated that the majority of sampled farmers grow rice as their main food crop; the survey was conducted during the growing and harvest season for Aman rice. For the 95 percent of crop farmers that faced production difficulties, plant pests and diseases were a major concern. The most frequently cited difficulty was plant diseases (cited by 43 percent of crop producers), followed by crop loss (23 percent) and access to pesticides (17 percent).

Production expectations were positive for most respondents: 40 percent of farmers expected higher yields than last year, 40 percent expected the same level of production and only 20 percent excepted a decrease. The divisions of Chittagong, Mymensingh and Rangpur recorded the highest frequency respondents citing a drop in harvest compared to a typical growing season (Figure 3). Crop-marketing difficulties were reported by 83 percent of crop producers, and included low sale prices and limited access to markets; Rangpur and Dhaka divisions were most affected (Figure 4). Citing low prices as marketing difficulty was associated with COVID-related restrictions. For example, 91 percent of those affected by bans on gatherings cited low sale prices, compared to 56 percent who were not affected.

Figure 3. Crop-producers reporting a drop in harvest (percentage of respondent crop producers)
Livestock

In this round of data collection, livestock producers were better off than in the last round (April–May) in terms of income decreases and decapitalization due to coping and consumption gaps. The size of herds did not change significantly. Production difficulties were reported by 31 percent of livestock producers (in the previous round, about half of households reported them). While the main difficulty was with purchasing feed, diseases were also frequently mentioned – especially among poultry farmers.

Only 15 percent of households that sell livestock or livestock products reported issues with marketing (compared to 55 percent during the previous round). The most frequently reported livestock-marketing difficulties were similar to those cited April and May, and were related to low prices, lack of access to markets and low demand (Figure 5).
Figure 5. Predominant livestock-marketing difficulties, by division (percentage of respondent livestock producers)

Food security

The depletion of assets was more prevalent in this round of data collection than the previous round, suggesting a worrying deterioration in farmers’ food security. In this round 57 percent of households reported that they had adopted Crisis- and Emergency-level coping strategies in the month preceding the survey – a deterioration in coping capacity compared to the previous round. Being affected by a shock was associated with the adoption of coping mechanisms.

A deterioration in food security was also suggested by consumption indicators: Household Dietary Diversity Scores (HDDS) showed that, across geographic areas and livelihood profiles, approximately one fifth of households had low dietary diversity (Figure 6). This could be due to a seasonal effect since Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) results indicated that 40 percent of respondents had experienced recent moderate and severe food insecurity (4.4 percent severe) in the previous 30 days. These figures are similar to the third round (April–May). Both the HDDS and FIES were consistent in showing that since the previous round, food security had improved for livestock producers and deteriorated for crop producers.
Figure 6. Distribution of HDDS scores in round 3 and round 4 (percentage of respondents)


Needs

In addition to cash assistance, respondents cited the need for tools and marketing or transportation support. In the past three months, 19 percent had received some form of assistance. Although there was no statistically significant impact on recent food insecurity, assistance appeared to be associated with better outcomes in terms of HDDS and LCSI results.
Recommendations

> Given the crop-marketing difficulties reported by 83 percent of crop producers, interventions in agricultural marketing for smallholder farmers such as collective marketing and information systems are needed to strengthen farmers’ livelihoods, particularly among rice farmers in Khulna and mixed livestock/crop producers in Dhaka.

> To address persistent challenges with livestock production and marketing, interventions are needed to improve access to feed and veterinary services – especially for poultry farmers in Dhaka.

> With multiple shocks continuing to affect Bangladeshi households and deteriorating food security indicators, livelihood-support interventions such as asset building and restocking are urgently needed – particularly among households that only produce livestock in the divisions of Rangpur and Mymensingh.

> Results suggest that incomes among migrant wage labourers continue to be affected by economic shocks. It is therefore recommended to support migration in a manner that protects workers and assures safe transportation, along with alternative means of income generation.
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