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Key highlights

> At least seven out of ten surveyed households reported to have been confronted by a shock in the three months preceding the survey. The most reported shocks were higher fuel and food prices.

> In terms of household income stability, about 36 percent of the respondents reported a decrease in the main source of income in the three months preceding the survey compared to the same period in a typical year, particularly in Adamawa (42 percent).

> A significant majority of crop producers (69 percent) reported facing difficulties with crop production. The most reported difficulties across the states were access to fertilizer (44 percent), plant disease (37 percent), and lack of water for irrigation water (33 percent).

> Most households faced challenges selling their crop and animal products, possibly due in part to the acute scarcity of the Nigerian Naira. Crop and livestock sales difficulties were reported by 63 percent and 54 percent of households, respectively.

> About 53 percent of households engaged in various coping strategies to meet their food and income needs. Most households (34 percent) adopted stress coping strategies, about 10 percent engaged in crisis coping strategies and 9 percent engaged in emergency coping. As a result, household food security based on food consumption indicators was generally fair. For example, according to the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) indicator, about 2 percent experienced the prevalence of severe recent food insecurity, while 28 percent of the respondents experienced moderate or severe recent food insecurity.

> In terms of assistance needs, most households reported the need for cash (80 percent) and inputs for crop production (51 percent) to protect and strengthen their basic agricultural livelihoods. Other needs included food assistance (27 percent), animal feed (25 percent) and infrastructure for crop production (23 percent).
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 fourth-round survey was conducted through computer-assisted telephone interviews from 11 February to 1 March 2023 and reached 1,418 households. Data collection took place at the beginning of the lean season across five states: Adamawa, Borno, Katsina, Yobe and Zamfara. Data were weighted using population counts.

The third-round survey, which has been drawn from to make comparisons throughout this brief, was conducted between 23 September and 24 October 2022 through computer-assisted telephone interviews. The second-round survey was conducted between 26 June and 8 July 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 Nigeria and other countries.

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

Approximately 71 percent of surveyed households reported facing at least one shock during the three months preceding the survey. The primary shocks reported were higher fuel prices (33 percent), particularly in Borno and Adamawa (35 percent each); higher food prices (32 percent), particularly in Borno and Katsina (35 percent each); sickness or death of a household member (21 percent), particularly in Zamfara (26 percent); plant disease (13 percent), particularly in Adamawa (15 percent); animal disease or death (13 percent), particularly in Katsina (17 percent); and conflict and violence (11 percent), particularly in Katsina (16 percent).

The main sources of income indicated by the respondents were production and sale of staple crops (36 percent), production and sale of livestock and products (32 percent) and production and sales of cash crops (12 percent). Thirty-six percent of the respondents reported a decrease in their main source of income in the three months preceding the survey compared to the same period in a typical year, particularly those in Adamawa (42 percent).

The country experienced lack of availability of the Nigerian Naira in the months preceding the survey. As a result, farmers experienced affordability issues and purchases of agricultural inputs were likely reduced. This could have contributed to reduced productivity and income.
Figure 2. Main shocks (percentage of households)

Approximately 64 percent of the households surveyed were crop producers. Difficulties with crop production were reported by more than half of the households interviewed (69 percent). The most frequently reported difficulty across the surveyed states was access to fertilizer (44 percent). This was also the crop production difficulty that was mentioned the most during the previous rounds. This difficulty was noted particularly in Katsina (53 percent) and Zamfara (49 percent).
Other difficulties reported include plant disease (37 percent), particularly in Zamfara (40 percent) and Katsina (39 percent); lack of water for irrigation (33 percent), particularly in Katsina and Adamawa (34 percent); and pest presence (22 percent), particularly in Yobe (29 percent) and Borno (26 percent).

Crop sales difficulties were experienced by 63 percent of surveyed households and consisted of high transportation or marketing costs (69 percent), particularly in Zamfara (67 percent) and Katsina (66 percent); low selling prices (34 percent), particularly in Katsina (30 percent) and Borno (28 percent); usual traders not buying as much as usual (33 percent), particularly in Borno (27 percent); difficulty accessing the market (27 percent), particularly in Adamawa and Yobe (25 percent); and payment delays (26 percent).

Figure 4. Crop production difficulties (percentage of crop producers)

Livestock

Forty-five percent of the surveyed households are livestock producers. Among them, 63 percent reported production difficulties. The primary difficulty experienced was purchasing feed (54 percent), particularly in Zamfara (60 percent), and Katsina (54 percent). Purchasing feed was also the most reported difficulty during previous rounds. Other reported difficulties included livestock disease or injury (43 percent), particularly in Borno (54 percent) and Katsina (46 percent); access to veterinary inputs and services (25 percent); access to pasture (23 percent); and livestock theft (11 percent), particularly in Katsina (16 percent).

In addition, 58 percent of the livestock producers reported a decrease in the number of livestock compared to last year due to animal death (36 percent), increased sales due to good prices (26 percent) and distress sales (15 percent).

Livestock sales difficulties were reported by 54 percent of respondents. The most reported sales difficulties were high transportation or marketing costs (59 percent), particularly in Katsina (69 percent); low selling prices (41 percent), particularly in Yobe and Zamfara (48 percent); lack of demand from usual customers (33 percent) particularly in Yobe (39 percent) and Borno (38 percent); and payment delays from traders/buyers (21 percent).

Figure 5. Livestock production difficulties (percentage of livestock producers)

Food security

The Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) ¹ indicated that 28 percent of the respondents experienced moderate or severe recent food insecurity, and for 2 percent there was prevalence of severe recent food insecurity (Figure 6). Female headed households (4 percent of the population) are at a much higher risk of food insecurity than the rest of the population (20 percent versus 11 percent).

The Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) shows that approximately 74 percent of the interviewed households have a high level of dietary diversity, followed by 20 percent of households that present medium level dietary diversity and 6 percent with a low level of dietary diversity. An increase in the number of households with a high level of HDDS has been observed compared with the previous rounds (Figure 7).

According to the household hunger scale (HHS), 94 percent of households reported experiencing little to no hunger over the three months preceding the survey, 6 percent experienced moderate hunger and 0.5 percent experienced severe hunger. The HHS indicator is aligned with the results from previous rounds (Figure 7).

Figure 6. FIES comparison over rounds 2–4

According to the livelihood coping strategy index (LCSI), the livelihood coping strategies put in place revolved around stress strategies (34 percent) involving households spending their savings, borrowing money, or selling their assets/goods – and crisis strategies (10 percent), involving households that withdrew children from school and sold productive assets or means of transport. Emergency strategies were implemented by 9 percent of the respondents, involving households begging, or selling their house or land. There is a trend in the reduction in number of respondents putting in place emergency coping strategies across the three rounds. Forty-seven percent of the respondents did not apply any coping strategy.

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.
Figure 7. Food insecurity measures

Needs

An expected need for assistance within the three to six months following the survey was reported by 88 percent of the surveyed households. Approximately 80 percent reported the need for cash, followed by the need for inputs for crop production (51 percent). Twenty-seven percent reported the need for food assistance, followed by 25 percent that reported the need for animal feed and 23 percent that reported the need for infrastructure for crop production. Ninety percent of the respondents reported to have not received any assistance in the three months preceding the survey, and among those that received assistance, the assistance was mainly in the form of food (2 percent) and cash vouchers (2 percent).

Figure 8. Main needs (percentage of households)

Recommendations

Short-term recommendations

> Given that the main reported source of household income was the sale of staple crops, provision of agricultural inputs like seeds and fertilizer, and relevant agronomic information (including Integrated Pest and Disease Management) to boost production of staples should be prioritized across all states, complemented by food and cash assistance to strengthen and protect basic livelihoods.

> Sensitization of livestock farmers to cooperate with animal health workers by presenting flocks for vaccination remains a high priority.

Long-term recommendations

> Support water harvesting for food production during dry season planting in areas with limited access to permanent sources of water for irrigation.

> Link farmers with community-based savings and credit schemes in order to access credit and limit the sale of household assets.

> Improve access to extension services through community-based farmer field schools to improve knowledge of climate smart agriculture and increase resilience. Promote the use of bio-pesticides to address crop pests and diseases.

> Train community-based animal health workers and livestock farmers on pasture production to alleviate the problem of pasture deficiency especially during the lean season when there is difficulty accessing pasture.

> Leveraging on the presence of community health workers (para veterinarians), mass livestock vaccinations should be promoted. For this to materialize, para veterinarians should be equipped with relevant kits, refresher trainings and supported to move around villages to vaccinate animals within livestock production clusters.