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Key highlights

> Food and fuel prices have spiked resulting in the main reported shocks affecting households coupled with conflict, insecurity, and the prevalence of crop pests and diseases.

> Production difficulties affected both crop and livestock producers, with the first group having difficulties accessing fertilizer (81 percent), credit (40 percent) and pesticides (31 percent), and the latter facing difficulties accessing feed (67 percent), livestock disease or injury (35 percent), and access to veterinary services (35 percent). Both crop and livestock producers faced sales difficulties due in large part to high transportation costs.

> The combined impact of several shocks and production difficulties, has contributed to severe economic hardship, leading to a reduction in the main source of income for nearly half of the households (45 percent), compromising purchasing power, and limiting access to safe, sufficient and nutritious food, thereby rendering them food insecure.

> According to the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), three-quarters of households experienced moderate to severe levels of recent food insecurity (RFI), while nearly one in ten experienced severe levels. Levels of FIES moderate or severe, and severe were higher for female-headed households compared to male-headed households. A higher percentage of female-headed households were also found to have a poor food consumption score (FCS).

> In addition to food, the need for crop inputs, crop production infrastructure, and cash vouchers were prominently reported by crop producers, and feed and veterinary services were reported by livestock producers. These needs are important in enhancing household food production, food and nutrition security and self-sufficiency.

> With the northwest region (Katsina, Sokoto and Zamfara states) now becoming a fully-fledged food insecurity hotspot just like the northeast (Adamawa, Borno and Yobe), it is paramount to consider establishing a new food security and nutrition response coordination mechanism like the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs led Humanitarian Resource Plan process in the northeast region of Nigeria. This new coordination mechanism should advocate for and coordinate humanitarian response to the most vulnerable households, while also scaling up peace, development and resilience building approaches.
Methodology

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) conducted a household survey in Nigeria through the Data in Emergencies Monitoring (DIEM-Monitoring) System to monitor agricultural livelihoods and food security. This sixth-round survey was conducted through face-to-face interviews from 21 January to 5 February 2024, reaching 3 441 households.

Data collection took place at the beginning of the lean season across five states: Adamawa, Borno, Katsina, Yobe and Zamfara. Data were collected at the level of local government areas (administrative level 2) in Zamfara and at state level (administrative level 1) in Adamawa, Borno, Katsina and Yobe. Data were weighted using population counts.

Figure 1. Countries with an 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 https://data-in-emergencies.fao.org/pages/monitoring
Income and shocks

Ninety-nine percent of the surveyed households reported having faced at least one shock in the three months preceding the interview. The main reported shocks were unusually high food prices (81 percent) – experienced especially by households in the northeast – followed by unusually high fuel or transport prices (72 percent) – in Adamawa, in particular, where all of the surveyed households experienced this shock – and Yobe (77 percent) (Figure 2). Other economic shocks, such as inflation, have affected 43 percent of the households, followed by other intra-household shocks (25 percent). Other reported shocks were sickness, accident or death of a household member (19 percent), violence and insecurity (18 percent), and plant disease (12 percent). Pockets of insecurity were identified in Zamfara (54 percent) and Borno (29 percent). It should be noted that some of the more at-risk areas could not be accessed during data collection.

Figure 2. Main shocks reported (percentage of households)

In Zamfara, at local government area level, the major shock experienced was high food prices, especially in Gusau (92 percent), Maradun (92 percent) and Bungundu (85 percent). Other economic shocks were experienced in Gusau (50 percent), Gummi and Maradun (40 percent, each).

A decrease in the main source of income was reported by 45 percent of the households in the three months preceding the survey, compared to the same period in a typical year. A reduction in main income was experienced in Yobe (60 percent), Zamfara (59 percent) and Katsina (58 percent). The presence of insecurity and other economic shocks, such as inflation, was associated with an important reduction in main income in the three months preceding the survey compared to the same period in a typical year. The households that experienced the most significant reduction in main income were those whose main income was farm labour or collection of natural resources.
Crops

Figure 3. Nigeria agricultural calendar

About 94 percent of the households surveyed were crop producers. Crop production difficulties were reported by 75 percent of the crop producers. These included access to fertilizer (81 percent) – especially in Katsina (96 percent), Borno (84 percent) and Zamfara (71 percent) – access to credit (40 percent) – especially in Yobe (59 percent) and Borno (45 percent) – access to pesticides (31 percent) – especially in Borno (65 percent) and Katsina (26 percent) – and not enough irrigation water (30 percent) – more prominent in Borno (65 percent) and Zamfara (22 percent). Labour force was also reported as a difficulty by 23 percent of the respondent crop producers, in Borno, in particular, were half of the respondent farmers struggled to find a labour force. Pest diseases were reported by 44 percent of the crop producers in Adamawa.

Pronounced changes in crop area, with a reduction in cultivated area were reported in Zamfara, in particular, while Borno, on the other hand, presented an increase in cultivated area compared to the same period in a typical year (Figure 4). Despite the increase in crop area, 59 percent of the households in Borno reported a reduction in harvest compared to a normal year. Similarly, crop producers in Zamfara and Yobe reported that their harvest was a lot less this year when compared to a typical year (Figure 5). Millet, maize and sorghum reported a reduction in harvest compared to a typical year of slightly less than 60 percent.

About 54 percent of the crop producers faced difficulties selling crops. The main crop sales difficulties reported were high transport or other marketing costs (89 percent) – in the northeast states, in particular – payment delays from traders and buyers (36 percent), and difficulty processing products (22 percent).

In Zamfara, at local government area level, crop production difficulties, such as access to fertilizer, were reported – especially in Talata Mafara (98 percent), Bungudu (95 percent) and Bakura (84 percent). Other crop production difficulties included access to credit – especially in Bungudu (85 percent) and Gusau (61 percent). Difficulty accessing plot was experienced, especially in Maradun, Maru and Zurmi (55 percent, each).

Crop sales difficulties at local government area level in Zamfara, included high transport costs – especially in Maradun (99 percent), Talata Mafara (95 percent) and Bungudu (94 percent) – and crop damage and losses – especially in Gummi (71 percent), Anka (63 percent) and Zurmi (62 percent).
Figure 4. Changes in crop area (percentage of crop producers)


Figure 5. Changes in harvest (percentage of crop producers)

Livestock

About 56 percent of the households surveyed were livestock producers. Among them, 78 percent experienced livestock production difficulties. The main livestock production difficulties experienced were difficulties purchasing feed (67 percent) – mostly reported in Katsina (64 percent) and Zamfara (55 percent) – livestock disease or injury (35 percent), and access to veterinary services (35 percent) (Figure 6).

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

About 51 percent of the livestock producers experienced difficulties selling livestock. The most reported livestock sales difficulties were high transportation costs (82 percent) – mostly in Zamfara (53 percent) and Katsina (69 percent) – followed by payment delays from traders and buyers (23 percent), and lack of demand from usual traders or buyers (21 percent). About 68 percent of the respondent livestock producers reported a decrease in the number of livestock compared to last year. Livestock producers in Yobe were among those more affected as 84 percent experienced a decrease in the number of livestock. Livestock were sold more than usual because of good prices (33 percent) and distress sales (29 percent). Livestock production difficulties were associated with high fuel and food prices, and the presence of insecurity.

In Zamfara, at local government area level, livestock production difficulties included difficulties purchasing feed – notably in Talata Mafara (93 percent), Bakura (86 percent) and Birnin Magaji (81 percent) – and livestock theft – especially in Maradun (72 percent), Maru (68 percent) and Tsafe (61 percent).
Livestock sales difficulties at local government area level in Zamfara included high transport costs – especially in Talata Mafara (95 percent), Maradun (89 percent) and Bungudu (87 percent).

**Food security**

According to the FIES, 1 77 percent of the households were affected by RFI at moderate or severe level, and 9.4 percent were affected by severe RFI. Borno presents the highest percentage of households affected by RFI at moderate or severe level (Figure 7). When the relationship is explored between shocks and the FIES indicator, the presence of plant diseases is associated with a higher number of households affected by RFI at moderate or severe level. Other economic shocks, such as inflation, are associated with a higher percentage of households affected by severe food insecurity. The level of FIES moderate or severe, and severe were higher for female-headed households compared to male-headed households and this difference is statistically significant. Households whose main income source was cash crops, presented a higher level of FIES moderate or severe.

**Figure 7. Prevalence of recent moderate or severe household food insecurity (FIES)**

![Map showing prevalence of recent moderate or severe household food insecurity](https://data-in-emergencies.fao.org)

1 FIES results are subject to change, until the country scale is established for more consistent comparability across rounds.
The household hunger score (HHS) indicates that 64 percent of the households reported experiencing little to no hunger, 35 percent experienced moderate hunger and 1 percent experienced severe hunger. The households in Zamfara were among those experiencing the most severe hunger (6 percent), while moderate hunger was experienced in Borno (59 percent) (Figure 8). The households that experienced economic shocks such as inflation, were among those more affected by severe hunger. A reduction in income was associated with more households experiencing severe hunger. Households whose main income source was cash crops, experienced more moderate hunger (62 percent) compared to others.

Concerning the livelihood coping strategies put in place, most of the households put in place stress coping strategies (40 percent), while 28 percent put in place emergency coping strategies, as measured by the livelihood coping strategies index (LCSI). Crisis coping strategies were reported by 26 percent of the respondents. The households affected by insecurity were among those putting in place more emergency and crisis coping strategies than those affected by other shocks, notably across Zamfara. Adamawa and Yobe presented percentages of households implementing emergency coping strategies above 30 percent. For these two states, however, this result may be linked to the increase in food and fuel prices. Livestock producers, together with households whose main income source was farm labour or the collection of natural resources, were among those putting in place mostly emergency coping strategies.

According to the FCS, poor FCS was reported by 38 percent of households, borderline was reported by 37 percent and acceptable was reported by 25 percent. Households whose main income source was cash crops, experienced lower levels of FCS (54 percent) compared to others. Households in Yobe were among those presenting the lowest FCS (88 percent). A higher percentage of female-headed households were found to present poor FCS, compared to male-headed households.
Needs

About 98.5 percent of the surveyed households reported the need for assistance, but only 9 percent reported having received some form of assistance. The received assistance was mainly in the form of cash (5 percent) and food (4 percent). Apart from cash and food, crop producers reported the need for crop inputs (96 percent) followed by the need for crop infrastructure (93 percent) and voucher fairs (89 percent). Livestock producers reported the need for cash (87 percent), followed by food (81 percent), livestock feed (50 percent) and veterinary services (37 percent).

Despite food and cash being requested across all states, some requested specific support. In Adamawa, respondents identified the need for livestock feed; in Borno, respondents requested crop infrastructure, voucher fairs, veterinary services and veterinary feed; in Katsina, respondents requested livestock feed and veterinary services; and in Yobe, respondents identified the need for crop knowledge, voucher fairs, livestock feed and crop infrastructure (Figure 9).

![Figure 8. Food insecurity measures (by state)](image-url)

Figure 9. Needs reported by crop and livestock producers (percentage of households)

Recommendations

Short-term recommendations (1–6 months)

> Integrate cash+ programming for emergency assistance. Cash remains the main need across several household categories in addition to specific needs associated with their main income source.

Medium- to long-term recommendations (6 months and beyond)

> Consider the establishment of a new food security and nutrition response coordination mechanism in the northeast region of Nigeria like the Humanitarian Resource Plan led by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. This new coordination mechanism should advocate for and coordinate humanitarian response to the most vulnerable households, while also scaling up peace, development and resilience building approaches.

> Encourage the formation of produce marketing groups to aggregate produce for marketing, and overcome high transportation and other marketing costs.

> Perform a conflict sensitivity assessment and mapping to fully understand the underlying causes and impacts of insecurity on food security and livelihoods, and the needs and priorities of the affected populations.
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