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Methodology

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) conducted the fourth round of the Data in Emergencies Monitoring Survey (DIEM-Monitoring) between 1 September and 6 October 2022 to assess household livelihoods and food security in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The survey covered 2,781 agricultural and non-agricultural households in 11 of the country’s 26 provinces: Ituri, Kasai, Kasai-Central, Kasai-Oriental, Kwango, North Kivu, North Ubangi, South Kivu, South Ubangi, Tanganyika and Tshopo. Households were interviewed through computer-assisted telephone surveys. Weights for population size and household wealth were applied to ensure that the results were representative. The previous round of data collection took place in April and May 2022.

Figure 1. Countries with established DIEM-Monitoring Systems


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 the Democratic Republic of the Congo and other countries.

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

The percentage of households reporting no shocks in the three months prior to the survey increased from 28 percent in round 3 to 46 percent in round 4, an improvement of 18 percent. This was due to the lifting of some COVID-19 restrictions and the absence of major natural disasters during this time.

Among the main shocks reported, illness or death of a household member fell from 40 percent to 24 percent between round 3 and round 4, unusual increases in food prices fell from 11 percent to 6 percent and violence, insecurity and conflict fell from 8 percent to 6 percent. These shocks were most commonly reported in Tanganyika, North Ubangi, South Ubangi, Central Kasai, Eastern Kasai and Ubangi provinces.

Insecurity and armed conflict remain persistent in the east of the country, causing massive displacement of people from their land and other productive assets.

Figure 2. Main shock in the three months preceding the survey (percentage of households)

During the three months prior to the survey, the production and sale of staple crops (34 percent), non-agricultural activities and self-employment (17 percent) and public employment (12 percent) were the main sources of income for households surveyed. In terms of income diversification, more than 70 percent have no additional source of income. Furthermore, 44 percent of households reported a decrease in their main income; the provinces of Tshopo (50 percent), Kasai (48 percent) and Ituri (47 percent) were most affected by this decline.

Among crop-producing households, 69 percent reported production difficulties, unchanged from the previous collection round.

The provinces of Kasai-Central, Kasai Oriental and Nord-Ubangi (71 percent), as well as Ituri (72 percent), Sud-Ubangi (74 percent), Tanganyika (75 percent) and Sud-Kivu (79 percent) were more affected by these difficulties. These included poor access to irrigation water (22 percent), crop damage and loss (17 percent), plant diseases (15 percent) and access to agricultural labour
(14 percent) (Figure 4). In addition to these constraints, the most affected provinces also experience insecurity, and feeder roads are often impassable or non-existent.

**Figure 4. Difficulties in crop production (percentage of crop producers)**
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Difficulties in crop production are leading to a decrease in the area cultivated (reported by 42 percent of producers), a situation like that of the previous cycle (Figure 5).

**Figure 5. Change in cultivated area compared to a normal year (percentage of farmers interviewed)**
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In addition, 51 percent of crop producers reported difficulties in marketing their crops (52 percent in the previous round).
Livestock

The situation of livestock farmers has changed little compared to the results of the previous round. Small livestock (goats, sheep and small pets) and poultry remain the most common in the different provinces. Seventy-one percent of households experienced production difficulties (68 percent in May 2022) and 52 percent reported a decline in livestock numbers (48 percent in May 2022). These constraints are largely explained by the disease or death of animals (49 percent), access to animal feed (22 percent), inputs and veterinary means (15 percent) and theft of livestock (14 percent) (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Livestock production difficulties (percentage of livestock producers)

Fifty-two percent of the farmers surveyed reported a decrease in their herd numbers compared to the previous year. Reasons for this decline included the death of animals due to disease or injury (30 percent), higher selling prices (9 percent) and distress sales (6 percent) (Figure 7).

**Figure 7. Reasons for the decrease in the number of animals kept (percentages of livestock households interviewed)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Round 3 April-May 2022</th>
<th>Round 4 Sept.-Oct. 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animals died of poor health, malnutrition or injury</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold more than usual: good prices</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold more than usual: distress sales</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal escaped or was lost or stolen</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killed or gave away more animals than usual (household consumption, celebrations)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Thirty-five per cent of farmers reported difficulties in marketing their production. Lower selling prices (reported by 54 percent), transport and marketing costs (18 percent) and lower demand from regular buyers (18 percent) were the main reasons given.
Food security

Despite a slight improvement concerning the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), the food security situation remains alarming. Indeed, 56 percent of households are recently moderately or severely food insecure (compared to 57 percent in round 3), with 20 percent recently severely food insecure (compared to 25 percent in round 3). Households in Kasai-Central (73 percent) and Kasai (64 percent) provinces are the most food insecure.  

Figure 8. Prevalence of recent moderate or severe household food insecurity (FIES) – Rounds 3 and 4

Livelihood coping strategies were primarily oriented towards emergency strategies (49 percent), such as the migration of all household members (29 percent), begging (28 percent) or the sale of one’s house or plot (21 percent). Crisis strategies were adopted by 31 percent of the households surveyed and stress strategies were adopted by 12 percent of those surveyed.

1 FIES results are subject to change. The country scale will continue to evolve over additional rounds of data collection allowing for more consistent comparability across rounds.
Needs

Of the households surveyed, 92 percent expressed a need for assistance, including food or financial assistance (51 percent) and the provision of seeds (37 percent), tools (22 percent) and fertiliser (17 percent) (Figure 9).

Only 17 percent of the households surveyed had received assistance during the three months prior to the survey.

Figure 9. Main needs (percentage of households)

Recommendations

Short term

➢ Provide emergency assistance to vulnerable households through direct food aid or cash transfers, particularly in the provinces of Kasai-Central, Kasai, Kasai Oriental, North Ubangi, North Kivu and South Ubangi.

➢ Support crop production by providing agricultural tools, seeds and training according to the context and demand.

➢ Provide emergency agricultural assistance to the most affected households (in a crisis or emergency situation [IPC Phase 3+]), particularly in Kasai-Central and Oriental, North and South Ubangi, including the provision of improved seeds and disease and pest-resistant strains.

➢ Maintain agricultural feeder roads to facilitate the evacuation of produce to consumption centres.

➢ Encourage vegetable production to support household incomes, especially during periods of low agricultural activity and high demand for horticultural products.

➢ Provide veterinary services and feed supplements for livestock in the most affected pastoral areas.

➢ Support regular monitoring of key food prices, particularly in the most vulnerable provinces, and strengthen an early warning system if prices rise too much.

➢ Promote access to appropriate primary care in the different regions.

➢ Continue regular monitoring of food security and nutrition indicators across the country to enable a more rapid response if necessary.

Medium and long term

➢ Increase producers' incomes through the development of cash crops (coffee, rubber, palm oil, cocoa, tea, etc.), depending on the context of each area.

➢ Support households to respect gender, improve equality and empower women.

➢ Promote diversification and good food practices throughout the country.

➢ Encourage the regulation of market price systems by involving relevant government services.
> Support agricultural and pastoral resilience: improve seed quality and availability of short-cycle varieties and provide farmers with inputs to enable them to make the transition to intensive agriculture.

> Promote access to public pastures.

> Act to limit armed conflict to allow agricultural activities to resume.

> Improve early warning systems throughout the country, particularly regarding crop damage (pests or weather).

> Build the capacity of the local population on climate change, its impact and the impact mitigation measures available.

> Carry out a market diagnosis and set up social protection mechanisms in vulnerable areas.