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Executive summary

Background

The conflict in the northeast of Nigeria persists and continues to induce widespread displacement and disruption of livelihoods as well as optimal functionality of markets. The protracted nature of the ongoing conflict in the northeast, which is almost a decade long now, coupled with recent displacements attributed to attacks by Non State Armed Groups (NSAGs) in December 2018 and January 2019, continues to draw the attention of the humanitarian community, government and donors to the northeast states of Borno, Adamawa and Yobe (BAY) States, which remains epicenter of the ongoing crisis in the northeast. This recent renewed attacks by the NSAGs continues to intensify the already fragile situation as seen in the fresh waves of massive displacement of people with displacement metrics standing at about 1.75 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) as at January 2019.

Objectives

An in-depth Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) was conducted by the World Food Programme (WFP), government counterparts – National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), the National Programme for Food Security (NPFS) under the Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) of the Federal Ministry for Agriculture and Rural Development (FMARD) and National Population Commission (NPoPC), and other Food Security Sector partners between the 25th of March to the 21st of April, 2019 to update the food security situation in BAY States, particularly given the recent deterioration in the security situation. The objectives of the survey was to evaluate the food security situation of host communities and IDPs, describe the profile, location and characteristics of food insecure households as well as the underlying causes of food insecurity and provide recommendations for the targeting of households most in need of assistance. The EFSA covered IDP camps in nine LGAs of Borno State (Bama, Damboa, Dikwa, Jere, Konduga, Ngala, Maiduguri, Monguno and Gwoza) in order to have representative findings for displaced households living in camps. Findings of the assessment as well provided information for the June 2019 Cadre Harmonisé by the GoN and partners in BAY States.

What proportion of households are food insecure?

Overall, 28.9 percent of households across BAY States were food insecure and 3.1 percent of these households were severely food insecure. This represents an increase of 2.4 percent in the prevalence of food insecurity compared to February 2018. 36.4 percent of IDP camp residents of Borno State were food insecure, 3.4 percent of which were experiencing severe food insecurity.

Where do food insecure households live?

A greater proportion of food insecure households were in Borno State (41.8 percent) as compared to Yobe (25.6 percent) and Adamawa (13.8 percent) States. Both global and severe food insecurity was most pervasive in Northern and central parts of Borno State, specifically Kaga (84.1 percent), Monguno (76.5 percent), Gubio (73.0 percent), Gwoza (70.2 percent), Magumeri (62.0 percent), Nganzai (56.8 percent) and Maiduguri (52.5 percent); Yunusari (55.0 percent) in Yobe State; and Guyuk (37.3 percent), Yola South (27.6 percent), Gombi (25.5 percent), Demsa (25.4 percent), Madagali (21.0 percent), Michika (19.5 percent) and Numan (18.9 percent) in Adamawa State.

Who are the food insecure households?

Displaced households in camps (36 percent), informal settlement (53 percent), and host communities (45 percent) had a higher prevalence of food insecurity than permanent residents (23 percent). Pronounced levels of food insecurity was found in IDP camps in Bama.
Host communities in Borno State, currently hosting a large number of IDPs were found to have higher proportion of food insecure households compared to IDP camps residents in the same locations, most notably host community households in Monguno (76.5 percent), Maiduguri (52.5 percent), Ngala (31 percent), Damboa (33.3 percent) and Gwoza (70.2 percent) LGAs.

Households that had hosted IDPs within six months that preceded the survey were found to be more food insecure (43.5 percent) compared to counterparts that have not (26.9 percent). Moreover, the severity of food insecurity was more pronounced among households that still hosted IDPs at the time of the survey (52.7 percent) compared to households that previously hosted IDPs (38.0 percent), which clearly shows a positive correlation between dependency from IDPs and incidence of food insecurity.

Households with uneducated heads with no previous education (cannot read and write in any language) were found to have a higher rate of food insecurity (37 percent) compared to counterparts with an educated head (24 percent). Among households with an educated head that can read and write, food insecurity was highest for household head that dropped out after primary school (24.1 percent) or that can read only in Arabic (26.4 percent) compared to those that achieved secondary school and above (16.2 percent).

Female headed households were disproportionately affected by food insecurity (36.9 percent) compared to male headed counterparts (24.9 percent). Similarly, there were more severely food insecure female headed households (6.9 percent) compared to their male headed counterparts (2.1 percent), which is unsurprising since women living in the northeast have limited livelihood opportunities compared to men. Majority of female headed households are either widowed (63.7 percent) or separated/divorced (12.0 percent).

Households that their primary means of livelihoods were begging (66 percent), unskilled wage labor (49.0 percent), skilled wage labor (38 percent), petty trade (31 percent) and daily common labor (29 percent) were more food insecure compared to counterparts engaged in salaried work (15 percent), livestock business (16 percent) and agriculture (23 percent).

Households without access to farmland were more food insecure (36 percent) compared to those with access (22 percent). Moreover, among households with access to farmland, a correlation exists between food security and the expanse of land cultivated. Households that cultivated more hectares of land were found to be more food secure.

Poor households with few assets tend to be more food insecure than better off household. In the face of shock and threats, households with lower levels of income and fewer assets are more likely to deploy extreme coping strategies to meet their basic food needs. The persistent use of such coping strategies might have severe, and oftentimes, irreversible impacts on food insecurity within the affected households.

Why are they food insecure?

Insecurity and communal conflict between farmers and herders: Insecurity continues to restrict livelihood activities including functionality of markets and optimal recovery of economic activities, which underscores pronounced levels and, in some cases, deterioration of food insecurity in the most affected areas. The already fragile security situation in the northeast is further exacerbated by communal conflicts between farmers and pastoralists, particularly in some areas of Adamawa State, most notably Numan, Demsa and Lamurde, where a correlation was seen between high incidence of these communal conflicts and food security situation in such areas.

Displacement of population from their home of origin: Displacement, loss of a family member or bread winner have a negative impact on food security at the household level.
Displaced populations are more vulnerable to food insecurity as it results in the loss of livelihood as well as social and natural assets. IDPs are forced to rely on severe coping mechanisms in order to ensure that their basic food needs are met. Displacement primarily limits access to basic livelihood opportunities such as land and skilled employment and this is often compounded by lack of skills and low level of literacy, which limits the capacity of IDPs to connect with local opportunities within areas of new habitation, consequently forcing them to engage in jobs that require less level of skills such as land clearing and manual labor.

Dependency of IDPs on household communities: continues to put pressure on limited and oftentimes, overstretched resources in such communities as seen in the cases of Monguno, Maiduguri, Ngala, Damboa and Gwoza where host community households were found to be more food insecure compared to IDP households in camps. This can be further explained by the targeted systematic humanitarian assistance that IDP households in camps receive from government and partners, the scale of which is often more significant compared to host community counterparts.

Disability within households: The disability of one or more members of the household and the presence of chronically ill members had an impact on food security with households with a disabled or chronically ill members found to have a higher rate of food insecurity compared to those without. The presence of members with long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments would potentially hamper economic productivity of such households, which explains the higher prevalence food insecurity.

Lack of access to farmland: Households that do not have access to land to undertake agriculture are more food insecure compared to those with access, which implies that accessibility to land for farming remains a key determinant of food insecurity in the northeast. Moreover, cultivation of larger expanse of farmland among agricultural practicing households was found to forestall food availability. A correlation exists between food security and the size of land cultivated where households that cultivate more hectares of land are found to be more food secure.

Shocks: Food insecurity was higher among households that had experienced a shock (28 percent) compared to those that had not experienced any shock (23 percent). Severe and moderate food insecurity is higher among households that reported insecurity (36 percent), temporary displacement (36 percent), high food price (33 percent) and loss of employment/reduced income (31 percent). In the face of these shocks, households often adopt a range of different coping strategies to survive, which deepens vulnerability to food insecurity if unabated.

Insecurity and communal conflict between farmers and herders: Insecurity continues to restrict livelihood activities including functionality of markets and optimal recovery of economic activities, which underscores pronounced levels and in some cases, deterioration of food insecurity in the most affected areas. The already fragile security situation in the northeast is further exacerbated by communal conflicts between farmers and pastoralists, particularly in some areas of Adamawa State, most notably Numan, Demsa and Lamurde, where a correlation was seen between high incidence of these communal conflicts and food security situation in such areas.

Nonetheless, the ongoing humanitarian assistance by the Government of Nigeria (GoN) and the international community continues to avert further deterioration of the food security situation and protect livelihoods and contribute to early recovery and resilience efforts in the northeast. The Nigerian Government, UN Agencies, and other key humanitarian actors supported 1.5 million out of the 2.7 million conflict affected people, targeted for food, agriculture and livelihoods support in March 2019.
What can be done to assist food insecure households?

Considering the deterioration in the food security situation between April 2019 and February 2018 and pronounced levels of food insecurity observed in some host communities of Borno State, the situation of displaced households, returnees and host communities remain critical and the following recommendations are proposed:

• There is a need for concerted efforts by government and food security sector partners to consult closely and provide tailored contextualized response (food or livelihood support as appropriate) to the needs of the most vulnerable population in hotspot areas with pronounced levels of food insecurity, giving priority to the IDPs, returnees and the most vulnerable members of host communities. This is key to prevent further deterioration of an already fragile food security situation during the forthcoming lean season;

• In places where feasible, food assistance has to be significantly complemented by the implementation of sustainable livelihoods assistance (farming and non-farming) to reduce the impact of acute food insecurity, particularly within IDP camps in places like Konduga, Maiduguri and Damboa, where IDP camp residents signified their interest to receive livelihood support;

• The government and food security sector partners should rigorously pursue the provision of non-farming oriented livelihood support to conflict affected households without access to farmland to gradually stimulate empowerment and economic recovery of such households, given the protracted nature of the ongoing conflict in the northeast;

• Specific vulnerable groups such as female-headed households, displaced households, most vulnerable host community households, poorest households, those with limited livelihood opportunities and land access and households involved in casual labor, should be targeted and prioritized for assistance;

• In LGAs that have high level of food insecurity, the government and food security sector partners should provide nutrition support through supplementary and therapeutic feeding centers to reduce the risk of malnutrition among children age 6 to 23 months;

• Humanitarian and development actors also need to continue advocacy to the GoN for improved security and greater humanitarian access to LGAs that are currently fully or partly accessible to the humanitarian community in order to enhance access to farmland for cultivation and also provide much needed assistance to affected households that are currently inaccessible, particularly due to the fragile nutrition and food security situation in these areas; and

• Finally, there is need for continued onsite and remote monitoring of the food and nutrition situation, including hard-to reach areas of the northeast, leveraging traditional in-person interviews by Third Party Monitors and innovative technology such as satellite imagery and remote sensing, in order to gain ongoing insights into the nutrition and food security situation and to facilitate an informed and agile response by stakeholders.
Note: Findings from the assessment should be interpreted cautiously as data was only collected from accessible areas of Borno, Adamawa and Yobe States. Food insecurity rates (moderate + severe) inaccessible areas shaded in light blue in the map may be similar or worse.
Introduction
1.1 Context

The conflict in the northeast of Nigeria persists and continues to induce widespread displacement and infrastructural and basic social services deficit and disrupt livelihoods and functionality of markets. The already fragile situation in the northeast states of Borno, Adamawa and Yobe (BAY) is further exacerbated by the increased incidence of conflicts between farmers and herders, particularly in some areas of Adamawa. Borno and Adamawa predominantly accounted for about 40 percent of all fatality cases reported in the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data (ACLED) for Nigeria between January and December 2018, which depicts the severity of the ongoing conflict. In Adamawa, over 50 percent of these deaths were reported in Demsa and Numan, both of which are worst affected by the ongoing conflicts between farmers and herders.¹ Moreover, access to farmland for cultivation remains limited in many previous large-scale agrarian communities, most importantly those in Borno, due to movement restrictions stemming from ongoing military operations and insecurity, which has far reaching consequences on agricultural yield in such affected communities.

According to IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) in October 2018², 1.8 million people are still displaced from their homestead across BAY, 82 percent of which are hosted in Borno state, which is the epicenter of the ongoing conflict in the northeast. This marks an increase of 2.7 percent (+54,361) and 3.1 percent (+47,160) in the total population of internally displaced persons (IDPs) across BAY states in June and September 2018 respectively.³ ⁴ This is due to the volatile situation in northeast as seen in recent swathes of attacks in Borno and Adamawa such as in Gwoza, Monguno and Nganzai. Some returnees, sensing improvement in the security situation in particular areas, are also moving back to their places of origin in search of better livelihood opportunities. Food remains a significant unmet need for 74 percent of all displaced persons. The most recent Emergency Tracking Tool (ETT)⁵ from IOM reported a total of 4,451 movements, 86 percent of which were arrivals to local government areas (LGAs) of Borno and Adamawa such as Askira Uba, Bama, Dikwa, Monguno, Maiduguri, Demsa, Fufure and Yola South among others. In the last week of December 2018, Maiduguri and Jere LGAs witnessed an influx of 8,248 IDPs from Baga ward in Kukawa LGA due to attacks from Non State Armed Groups (NSAG) and counter military operations to restore security and safety.⁶

Due to the ongoing conflict and its humanitarian consequences, humanitarian partners and the Nigerian government have been providing critical assistance to cater for the food and non-food needs of the affected population. Between January and November 2018, 60 government and non-governmental humanitarian partners delivered monthly food assistance through in-kind and cash modalities to over 1.2 million people in BAY states while over 1.5 million people received livelihoods support to foster recovery and build resilience.⁷

Despite the fragile security situation in the northeast, findings from recent food security assessments indicate growing improvements in the food security situation. The CH⁸ report released in November 2018 shows an improvement in the food security situation with a reduction of 33 percent in the number of people experiencing extreme levels of food insecurity compared to October 2017. Moreover, the number of people projected to face extreme levels of food insecurity during the lean season of 2019 (June to August) dropped by

¹ ACLED Data, January 2019. Available at https://www.acleddata.com/data/
² IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), October 2018. Available at https://displacement.iom.int/nigeria
³ IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), September 2018. Available at https://displacement.iom.int/nigeria
⁴ IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), June 2018. Available at https://displacement.iom.int/nigeria
⁵ IOM’s Emergency Tracking Tool (ETT) Report : No. 97, 10-16 December, 2018. Available at https://displacement.iom.int/nigeria
8 percent compared to projected figures for the same period in 2018. Nonetheless, the same report reveals that a significant level of extreme food insecurity persists in the northeast with 1.7 million people falling in such category, which will increase to 2.7 million during the next lean season (June to August 2019) in the absence of humanitarian and recovery oriented support.

Moreover, latest Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) in October 2018 revealed that 38 percent of the entire households in BYA states are food insecure, 6 percent of which are experiencing severe levels of food insecurity. At the state level, 43 percent, 38 percent and 29 percent of such food insecure households were found in Borno, Yobe and Adamawa state respectively. High levels of food insecurity persisted in some areas of the northeast due to high reliance on negative coping strategies and expenditure on food, which depicts the adverse impact of the ongoing conflict on the food security situation in the affected areas. Food insecurity was found to be more pronounced amongst female-headed households, displaced households and poor households with fewer assets. The common drivers of food insecurity were the ongoing hostilities as well as communal conflicts between farmers and herders, which limits access to farming and grazing land, spates of abductions and banditry, climate related events such as floods, and high food prices.

Access to markets in the northeast continues to show growing signs of improvement, but remain at sub-optimal levels compared to pre-crisis situation. Findings from WFP’s mVAM showed that the availability of staple cereals, pulses, vegetables, and fruits is generally normal across over 30 markets surveyed in BYA states. However, traders confirmed constraints due to poor road networks, insecurity and heavy rainfall, despite the steady market availability of food commodities. However, findings from a regional crop assessment suggests that food availability in some markets of the northeast could be linked to limited patronage and accumulated stocks, underscored by insecure trade routes and fear of attacks. Furthermore, prices of key staples in northeast markets remain relatively higher compared to the rest of the country due to insecurity and the deplorable state of infrastructure, which weakens the purchasing power of market reliant households and deepens their vulnerability.

1.2 Justification

Considering the fragile situation in the northeast and the volatile food security situation, it has become necessary to sustain the collection of critical food security information in order to gain a better understanding and continuously update the food security situation across BYA States. Through this, current food security information will be generated which will support and ensure that the March 2019 Cadre Harmonisé analysis is evidence-based. The EFSA additionally aims to identify vulnerable population groups and inform the targeting of such groups at LGA level. Based on the foregoing, an in-depth EFSA was recommended to be undertaken.

2

Objectives and methodology
2.1 Objectives

The main objectives of this EFSA are:

a. To assess the food security status of IDPs and host populations in the Borno, Adamawa and Yobe States;
b. To determine the demographic, geographic and socio-economic characteristics of food insecure households;
c. To define the underlying causes of food insecurity; and
d. To provide recommendations for the targeting of severely food insecure household.

2.2 Methodology

2.2.1 Sampling

Administratively, Nigeria is divided into states and each state is sub-divided into Local Government Areas (LGAs), and each LGA is divided into wards. Subsequently, each locality was subdivided into census Enumeration Areas (EAs) which are based on the demarcation of the 2006 population census with each LGA having varied number of EAs depending on its landmass and population spread.

A total of three states were covered in this round of EFSA i.e. Borno, Adamawa and Yobe States and the sample was drawn to be representative at the LGA level. Given the ongoing insecurity and military restriction in highly volatile areas in Borno state, a total of five LGAs in Borno were not covered. Two previously inaccessible LGAs (Abadam and Marte) were excluded from the assessment, including Guzamala, Kala Balge and Kukawa, all of which witnessed an upsurge of insecurity and counter military operations in recent times.

The sample was derived using a two-stage cluster design. For the first stage, EAs were randomly selected from NPoPC’s sampling frame of accessible EAs across each of the 60 accessible LGA strata. Households were then randomly selected within each EA at the second stage. Some of the EAs in the 60 accessible LGAs remained inaccessible due to security constraints and hence, only accessible EAs were considered in the sampling frame of the assessment. Estimated populations for each EA were projected from the 2006 census as provided by the National Population Commission, which was triangulated against population figures from the Vaccination Tracking System (VTS)\(^{11}\). For Borno state, the sampling frame took the population movement into consideration using the location of IDPs camps and population from the Round 24 of IOM’s DTM.

The sample size for the total number of households to be covered per LGA was computed using the PPS putting into account the population and level of food insecurity (Moderate + Severe) from the October 2018 round of the EFSA and the standard deviation with a confidence interval of 95% and 5% margin of error and Z-score of 1.96. The total sample size per LGA for the survey was derived based on the above parameters. A total of 10 households was expected to be covered per EA (cluster), and a range of 20 to 30 EAs were expected to be covered in each of the LGAs, based on the sample size derived from the above computation. LGAs with clusters fewer than 20 were rounded to 20 clusters whereas those with clusters more than 30 were rounded to 30 clusters for representativeness and optimal usage of resources.

Additionally, in LGAs with a high concentration of IDPs with specific reference to those living in camps or camp like setting, particularly in Borno (Maiduguri, Jere, Konduga, Bama, Dikwa,

\(^{11}\) The Vaccination Tracking System. \(\text{http://vts.eocng.org}\)
Bama, Gwoza, Monguno & Damboa), the sampling took these group into account and hence, a separate sample was drawn for these population group. 30 clusters were systematically drawn from all sites captured in IOM's DTM using PPS by taking the population of IDP households in each of the sites into account. In all, 270 clusters and 2,700 households were planned for coverage across these LGAs.

Based on the foregoing, a total of 19,630 households in host communities (16,930) and IDP camps (2,700) were planned for coverage in the assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Sample Size per State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.2.2 Indicators**

The following indicators were included to be measured by the EFSA:

**Household level**

**Demographic**

- Educational level of head of the HH and primary caregiver
- Gender of the head of the HH and marital status
- Age of HH members and size of the HH
- Vulnerable HH members including OVC, disabled, chronically ill

**HH consumption:**

- Food Consumption Score
- HH dietary diversity
- Share of food expenditure

**Coping strategies:**

- Food and livelihood

**Income:**

- Livelihood activities
- Crop and livestock
2.2.3 Training

Training was conducted at two levels: (i) at country level for training of trainers (ToT) in Abuja for staff from the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), National Programme for Food Security (NPFS), National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), National Population Commission (NPoPC) and other UN agencies and partners such as FAO, AAH, FEWS NET, DRC, CARE; (ii) at state level for enumerators from NBS and other partner organizations. As this marks the 5th cycle of the EFSA with active participation and training for the same stakeholders overtime, the ToT at the country level held for one day as opposed to two days in previous rounds whereas the training at the state level held for four days (three days of training and one day of field pilot) as opposed to five days in the past. During these trainings, participants were exposed to the objectives of the EFSA, key food security concepts as well as the Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) based questionnaire.

2.2.4 Data Collection

In the BAY States, a total of 274 trained enumerators visited randomly selected households and administered the CAPI based questionnaire over a period of 17 days, specifically between the 29th March and 20th April 2019. The entire field exercise was supervised by representatives of the NBS at the national, zonal and state levels, NPFS, NPoPC, WFP and other UN agencies, AAH, FEWSNET and other non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

2.3 Partnership and Coordination

The EFSA followed a participatory and consultative approach involving Government, UN, donors, NGOs, FEWS NET and community representatives in order to encourage productive partnerships (i.e. for data collection, analysis, reporting), build synergies and avoid duplication in assessment and analysis activities. The development of survey tools (open-ended or closed-end questionnaires), identification of participants and determining sampling frame was carried out in consultation with local experts under the leadership of the NBS with close support from the NPoPC. Partners involved in the process contributed in various ways (e.g. provision of resources including staff time, and technical inputs) and also had the opportunity to benefit from trainings on existing food security assessment guidelines and newly developed data collection methods using smartphones.

Key partners in the survey included: - NBS and NPoPC, who provided strategic leadership primarily on methodological issues pertaining to sampling and the necessary sampling frame including ad hoc technical support in primary data analysis as necessary; - all the national members of the Cadre harmonise cell under the leadership of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FMARD) and NPFS.

The FMARD, NBS and NPoPC state offices and other FSS partners participated in the training and primary data collection. While NBS collected data in places without access constraints, FSS partners supported data collection in partially accessible LGAs, particularly those inaccessible to representatives of the NBS. Additionally, UN partners such as FAO were consulted in their areas of technical mandate. WFP, as the primary sponsor of this EFSA, took the lead in facilitating the collaborative efforts among several interested stakeholders, while AAH provided technical and funding support to the conduct of the EFSA.
Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of group</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Level of Participation</th>
<th>Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Overall Coordination</td>
<td>WFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support</td>
<td>Selected stakeholders</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>FAO, ACF, FEWS NET, NBS, NPFS, NPopC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics and Resource</td>
<td>Selected stakeholders</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>NBS, NPFS, AAH, FEWS NET, iNGOs and CPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the core coordination group, the preparation and execution of the assessment was supported by actors with an active interest in the outcomes of the assessment and its follow-up steps. Participation of additional institutions was based on their comparative advantage while the overall technical and logistical effort was based on division of labor subject to availability of human, physical and financial capacity.

2.3.1 Joint Analysis Review Workshop

The maiden edition of a Joint Analysis Review Workshop was convened with Government and FSS partners involved in the EFSA on the 8th May 2019. The workshop aimed to provide a better understanding of the end-to-end process of the EFSA, build consensus on the interpretation of the findings and give participants the opportunity to collectively review the data generated through the EFSA and interpret the finding appropriately based on contextual understanding of the situation in the coverage areas.

2.4 Coverage

Overall, a total of 19,767 households were covered in Borno (9,288 households), Yobe (4,795 households) and Adamawa (5,684 households), which indicates 100 percent completion rate in the three States. In Borno State, 2,712 of the surveyed households were from 75 IDP camps in nine LGAs, specifically Jere, Maiduguri, Konduga, Ngala, Bama, Gwoza, Damboa, Dikwa and Monguno. Five LGAs in Borno (Abadam, Marte, Guzamala, Kukawa and Kala Balge) were not covered due to security concerns. This round of EFSA was able to achieve broader geographic scope due to the robust sample size and prolific synergy between diverse stakeholders.

2.5 Limitations

As with previous rounds of the EFSA, some wards within the LGAs covered, particularly in Borno and fringes of Yobe and Adamawa States, remain inaccessible to the humanitarian community due to insecurity. Therefore, these findings should be understood as representative for accessible areas in the three states as large areas of the assessed LGAs remained inaccessible during the data collection, particularly in Borno State. Additionally, findings for IDP camp population can only be generalized for IDP camp residents in the nine LGAs of Borno State and not the entire IDP camp residents in northeast states of Borno, Adamawa and Yobe. Lastly, the assessment was conducted to enhance the design of food security programmes, particularly in the context of conflict and hence, the assessment team laid more emphasis on the operational relevance of the analysis and findings.
Figure 2: Location of Households Covered
Figure 3: Location of IDP Camps Covered in Borno
Demographics and Household Statistics
3.1 Household Statistics

3.1.1 Gender of Head of Household (HoH)

Overall, 12.6 percent of the households surveyed are female headed with Borno State having the highest proportion (17.2 percent) of such households compared to Adamawa (10.8 percent) and Yobe (7.1 percent) States. Majority of female headed households are either widowed (63.7 percent) or separated/divorced (12.0 percent) and this trend is consistent across BYA states.

At the LGA level, the highest proportion of female headed households are found in Bama (49.8 percent), Ngala (40.0 percent), Askira Uba (25.6 percent), Gwoza (24.1 percent), Mobbar (24.9 percent) and Damboa (20.0 percent) in Borno State, Nguru (18.1 percent) in Yobe State, and Demsa (20.0 percent) and Michika (19.5 percent) in Adamawa State. This high proportion of female-headed households, particularly widowed women in several of these LGAs, can be attributed to the systematic targeting of men by Non-State Armed Groups (NSAG) in the ongoing hostilities.
3.1.1.1 Gender of Head of Household (IDP Camps)

Overall, 30.9 percent of IDP households living in camps are female headed, whereas 69.1 percent are male headed. At the LGA level, over one in every three IDP households in camps are female headed except for Monguno (9.8 percent), Damboa (14.6 percent) and Ngala (21.3 percent).

3.1.2 Age of Head of Household

The average age of the head of households across BAY states is 46.1 years with no significant difference between Yobe (46.8 years), Adamawa (46.5 years) and Borno (45.5 years) States (Figure 8). At the LGA level, the average age of the head of households is highest in Geidam (52.4 years), Monguno (51.7 years) and Mubi North (50.5 years) and lowest in Tarmua and Nangere with an average age of 39.4 years and 40.1 years respectively. There is a slight difference between the average age of female headed households (48.5 percent) compared to their male headed counterparts (45.8 percent). This difference in average age is more pronounced in Yobe State and Adamawa State as compared to Borno State.
3.1.3 Literacy Level of Head of Household

The literacy level among the households surveyed in BAY States stands at 72.6 percent with the highest proportion of literate household heads found in Yobe (75.9 percent), followed by Adamawa (75.1 percent) and lastly, Borno (68.6 percent) (Figure 11). At the LGA level, Yunusari (31.7 percent) in Yobe State along with Damboa (42.0 percent), Mafa (46.3 percent) and Monguno (46.3 percent) in Borno State have the lowest level of literacy among household heads. The low level of literacy in these LGAs remains worrisome since literacy is a key determinant of earnings, health, education of children and social status. Moreover, literacy is found to have a gender dimension as a lower proportion of female headed households (49.1 percent) are literate compared to their male headed counterparts (75.9 percent), a trend that is consistent across BYA (Figure 12).

Figure 10: Average Age of Household’s Head by LGA (Years)

Figure 11: Head of Household’s Literacy Level by State (Percentage)

Figure 12: Head of Household’s Literacy Level by State and Gender
3.1.4 Average Size of Household

The average household size across BAY States was five members, which was consistent for Borno and Adamawa States, except for Yobe, where the average household size was four members. At the LGA level, Potiskum, Fika and Nangere in Yobe had the highest average household size of eight, whereas Biu, Maiduguri, Chibok in Borno and Maiha, Ganye, Jada, Lamurde and Yola South in Adamawa all had an average household size of five. Furthermore, over 20 percent of households in some of these highlighted LGAs had 10 or more members (Figure 14).

Moreover, the age distribution within households was further accessed considering its importance for income generation, resource allocation and operational planning for humanitarian and development actors. Children aged 0 to 4 years constituted about 13 percent of the entire population of the surveyed households and there was no significant difference between the number of male and female household members. Majority of the people in the surveyed households (84 percent) were between the ages of 5 to 59 years. While there were more male members of the household aged 5 to 17 years compared to female, there were slightly more female household members aged 18 to 59 years compared to their male counterparts.
The remaining 3 percent of the population of surveyed households were composed of elderly people (over 60 years) and the number of male household members within this group was about double those of their female counterparts (Figure 15).

**Figure 15: Population Pyramid (Borno, Yobe and Adamawa)**

3.1.5 Household Dwelling Type

Generally, 87.3 percent of the surveyed households were permanent residents that have never left their place of dwelling. There are more permanent residents in Yobe (98.2 percent) and Adamawa (97.7 percent) compared to Borno (73.0 percent), which remains the epicenter of the ongoing hostilities within the region. Some 8.5 percent of the households were IDPs whereas 4.2 percent were returnees. Of the IDP households, 7.6 percent were residing in host communities while about 1 percent were in more informal settlements. As expected, Borno State which currently hosts the largest number of IDPs in BAY States has the highest proportion of IDP households in host communities and informal settlements (19.0 percent) compared to Yobe (0.5 percent) and Adamawa (0.7 percent) States. Noteworthy: about 2,700 IDP households in camps were covered in nine LGAs of Borno with high concentration of IDP camps, as earlier indicated in the methodology section of this report. Returnee households that were previously displaced from their homesteads and finally returned constituted 8.0 percent, 1.6 percent and 1.3 percent of the surveyed households in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe States respectively (Figure 16).

**Figure 16: Returnee households that were previously displaced from their homesteads and finally returned**
3.1.5.1 Dependency (Households hosting IDPs)

About 12.0 percent of households across Borno (16.9 percent), Yobe (11.3 percent) and Adamawa (6.1 percent) States had either hosted IDPs in the last six months or were currently hosting IDPs within their household at the time of the survey, which has implication for limited and oftentimes, already stretched resources within such households. Some 37.5 percent of these households confirmed that these IDPs were still living with them, Borno recording the highest proportion of such households (46.6 percent), compared to 28.3 percent and 17.1 percent in Yobe and Adamawa respectively.

At the LGA level, Maiduguri, which had witnessed a recent influx of IDPs due to ongoing hostilities in neighboring LGAs, had highest proportion of households (34.2 percent) that had hosted IDPs in the last six months or were still hosting IDPs. Other LGAs with a significant proportion of households that had hosted or still had IDPs living with them were Magumeri (27.0 percent), Askira Uba (23.3 percent), Biu (21.0 percent) and Mobbar (20.9 percent) in Borno State, Geidam (20.3 percent) in Yobe State, and Michika (20.2 percent) and Maiha (20.6 percent) in Adamawa State.

Figure 17: Proportion of Households that had hosted or are still hosting IDPs since the last Six Months by LGA

3.1.6 Disability within Households

The Washington Group of questions on disability was adopted in the survey, which aimed to access for the presence of one or more household members with long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments that hampers equality with others and full and effective participation in the society including economic productivity.12

Overall, 13.8 percent of all the households surveyed had one or more members with either one or more disability (ies), with 14.8 percent, 13.9 percent and 11.9 percent of such households found in Borno, Adamawa and Yobe States respectively. At the LGA level, Askira Uba (30.9 percent), Tarmuwa (28.4 percent), Bursari (27.0 percent), Yola North (24.5 percent), Bade (22.7 percent), Demsa (22.5 percent), Guyuk (22.0 percent), Damboa (29.0 percent) and Gombi (20.0 percent) had the highest proportion of households with one or more disabled members.

Disability within Households (IDP Camps)

11.4 percent of IDP households living in camps had one or more members of their households with one or more disabilities with the highest proportion of these households situated in Bama (28.1 percent) and Damboa (17.5 percent). In contrary, Konduga (1.3 percent), Monguno (4.6 percent) and Gwoza (5.0 percent) had the least proportion of households with members that had one or more disabilities.
3.2 Agriculture

3.2.1 Access to Farmland

Agriculture is one of the main sources of livelihood in the northeast, particularly in the rural and less urbanized areas, and as a result, access to farmland remains a key determinant of households’ ability to obtain income or produce food to meet their needs.

Overall, 65.3 percent of the surveyed households in BAY States have access to farmland. The ongoing hostilities continues to restrain access to land in Borno particularly where only 44.3 percent of households have access to farmland compared to 83.1 percent and 79.1 percent in neighboring states of Yobe and Adamawa respectively. Almost one in every four (25 percent) households in Borno only have access to less than half hectare of farmland compared to 12.8 percent and 6.1 percent in Adamawa and Yobe respectively, which is partly due to fears of attack from NSAGs and restrictions from the military to ensure safety within a certain perimeter around communities. Moreover, the ongoing hostilities was referenced as a major inhibitory factor among 55.7 percent of households without access to farmland in Borno State. Other factors highlighted to hamper access to farmland were lack of capital and access to credit facilities (15.0 percent) and lack of farmland (12.0 percent).

At the LGA level, over 60 percent of the households in most of the surveyed LGAs of Adamawa and Yobe have access to farmland with a notable exception for specific LGAs in Borno where less than 10 percent of households have access to farmland such as Gwoza (2.0 percent), Monguno (3.3 percent), Nganzai (5.3 percent) and Mafa (6.7 percent). Moreover, over 50 percent of households only have access to less than half hectare of land in Ngala (70.0 percent), Damboa (62.6 percent), Nganzai (62.5 percent), Magumeri (55.9 percent) and Kaga (50.7 percent), all of which are situated in Borno State.
3.2.2 Cultivation during Last Wet Planting Season (2018/2019)

Generally, 65.9 percent of households were involved in crop cultivation during the 2018/2019 agricultural planting season, with the highest proportion of such households found in Yobe (83.7 percent) and Adamawa (79.3 percent) States compared to only 45.3 percent in Borno State. Of these households that cultivated during the last wet planning season, 80.5 percent still had stock from their harvest as at the time of the survey compared to 51.3 percent and 38.2 percent in Borno and Yobe States respectively. At the LGA level, over 70 percent of households cultivated during the 2018/2019 planting season except for LGAs in the Northern and Central areas of Borno State most notably Monguno (3.6 percent), Dikwa (7.0 percent), Gwoza (7.0 percent), Ngala (7.6 percent), Bama (16.7 percent), Konduga (28.9 percent) and Damboa (29.3 percent) (Figure 24).
3.2.2.1 Major Crops Cultivated

As expected, the main staples cultivated by households across the three states were Maize, Millet and Sorghum with some 95 percent of agricultural practicing households either cultivating one or more of these three staples in Adamawa (96.9 percent), Yobe (93.2 percent) and Borno (92.6 percent). For cash crops, cultivation of rice and beans was generally more pronounced in Adamawa and Borno States compared to Yobe State. The proportion of agricultural households that cultivated rice was 49.2 percent and 33.8 percent in Adamawa and Borno States respectively compared to 14.5 percent in Yobe State and in the case of beans, the proportion of households were 74.9 percent and 72.8 percent in Borno and Adamawa States respectively compared to 42.8 percent in Yobe State. The findings from Borno State should however be interpreted cautiously considering farmland access constraints and low participation in the last wet planting season highlighted in the preceding sections.

3.2.3 Cultivation during the Last Dry Season Farming (2018/2019)

The involvement of households in dry season farming can boost food availability and as well have economic benefits for participating households. Only 12.8 percent of households participated in the dry season farming between November/December 2018 and April 2019 with the majority of such households in Yobe (14.7 percent) and Borno (14.5 percent) States compared to 9.8 percent in Adamawa State. Of these households that practiced dry season farming, 64.2 percent perceived the harvest as being good which could bolster food security within such households on the short term and there were more of such households in Borno (80.7 percent) and Adamawa (66.6 percent) State compared to Yobe State (48.3 percent). The impediments of households' involvement in dry season were predominantly related to financial challenges particularly in Adamawa, insecurity, low rainfall and lack of access to irrigation facilities, low soil fertility and lack of access to farmland. At the LGA level, the highest proportion of households that participated in the 2018/2019 dry season farming were found in Mobbar (53.5 percent), Shani (33.4 percent), Damboa (28.6 percent), Bayo (28.3 percent) and Kwaya Kusar (23.1 percent) in Borno State, Fune (40.3 percent) and Bade (34.1 percent) in Yobe State and Lamurde (36.2 percent) and Mubi North (23.9 percent) in Adamawa State (for LGA level analysis, refer to Figure 25).
3.2.4 Intentions to Cultivate during Next Planting Season (2019/2020)

Majority of agricultural households (94.1 percent) with access to farmland intend to participate in 2019/2020 wet season farming with a slightly fewer proportion of such households found in Borno State (89.0 percent) compared to 96.9 percent and 95.4 percent in Adamawa and Yobe States respectively. For households without an intention to cultivate, the main inhibiting factors reported were financial constraints (17.4 percent), high labour costs (17.4 percent), lack of storage facilities (17.4 percent), lack of seeds and other agricultural inputs (8.7 percent), insecurity (8.7 percent), delayed rainfall (8.7 percent) and fear of pest and disease infestation (4.3 percent). While financial limitation remains a cross cutting challenge for households in Borno and Adamawa States, there were slight variations in the intensity of the other agricultural constraints across BAY States. Insecurity and lack of storage facilities were highlighted as major impediments in Borno State, whereas delayed rainfall, lack of seeds and agricultural inputs and low soil fertility were the major deterrents in Yobe State. In Adamawa, agricultural households without an intention to cultivate referenced high labour costs, fear of pest and disease infestation and delayed rainfall as other major factors that influenced their decision.

3.2.5 Livestock Ownership

Livestock remains a valuable productive asset due to its direct benefit in terms of food (meat production) and income, in addition to its contribution to resilience of households in the face of shocks and crisis. Overall, less than half (45.6 percent) of households in BAY States own any

---

type of livestock (cattle, small ruminants or poultry) and majority of such households were found in Yobe State (71.8 percent) compared to 49.6 percent and 26.7 percent in Adamawa and Borno States respectively. Consequently, favorable livestock-to-cereal terms of trade will potentially boost income of such households and likely contribute towards asset creation on the medium term and boost resilience to future shocks. More than half (67.7 percent) of households that own livestock were into pastoralism and this trend was consistent across the three states where 69.3 percent, 68.7 percent and 65.5 percent of livestock owners were found to be pastoralists in Borno, Yobe and Adamawa States respectively.

At the LGA level, more than one in every four (25 percent) of households in most of the LGAs have one or more livestock such as cattle, small ruminants or poultry except for Borno, which remains the epicenter of the ongoing conflict that continues to hamper livelihood opportunities and deplete productive assets (including livestock) of vulnerable conflict affected households. Most notably, the least rates of livestock ownership was recorded in Konduga (7.4 percent), Mafa (7.8 percent), Ngala (8.7 percent), Askira Uba (10.0 percent), Bama (10.0 percent), Nganzai (13.3 percent), Gubio (15.1 percent) and Monguno (15.6 percent). Similar to state level trends, transhumance was the most common breeding pattern across most of the LGAs with the exception of Damboa (29.4 percent) and Maiduguri (8.0 percent) in Borno State, Potiskum (1.9 percent) in Yobe State and Mubi North (32.3 percent), Mayo Belwa (28.7 percent) and Yola North (18.2 percent) in Adamawa State, where households were more inclined towards sedentary livestock breeding.

Figure 27: Breeding Pattern of Livestock Owners by State

Figure 28: Proportion of Households that own Livestock by LGA

3.2.5.1 Perception on Presence of Conflict between Farmers and Pastoralists

The struggle over grazing land and limited resource continues to stimulate conflict between pastoralists and farmers in different regions of Nigeria. According the ACLED\textsuperscript{15}, country level data for Nigeria shows that almost 3,000 fatalities were linked to conflicts between these two groups in 2018 and 2019 alone, which marks about 35 percent of all cases recorded by the same source from 1997 to 2019, demonstrating the severity and impact of the conflict in recent times.

Based on the foregoing and the ongoing armed conflict in northeast states of BAY, respondents were asked if there were any conflicts between pastoralists and farmers in their communities during the survey. Overall, 15.3 percent of the respondents consented that to having pastoralist-farmer conflicts in their communities where there were almost double of such responses in Adamawa (22.4 percent) compared to Borno (14.0 percent) and Yobe (9.0 percent). At the LGA level, the highest proportion of such conflicts were recorded in Askira Uba (66.8 percent) in Borno State and Toungo (64.0 percent), Michika (51.9 percent), Song (43.3 percent), Demsa (42.5 percent) and Gombi (42.1 percent) in Adamawa State.

\textsuperscript{15} Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED), July 2019. https://www.acleddata.com/
Demographics and Household Statistics
4.1 Global Food Security Situation

Households are food secure when members have uninterrupted physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to cater for their dietary needs and an active and healthy life. In the absence of such access, households are considered to be food insecure.

Overall, more than one in every four households (28.9 percent) in BAY States were food insecure with more of such households situated in Borno (41.8 percent) compared to Yobe (25.6 percent) and Adamawa (13.8 percent). This marks a slight increase of 2.4 percent in the proportion of food insecure households compared to February 2018. This finding was consistent across the three states where year-on-year comparison of April 2019 and February 2018 shows an increase of 2.3 percent, 0.4 percent and 0.3 percent in Borno, Yobe and Adamawa States respectively. However, there was a seasonal decrease of 9.1 percent compared to October 2018, which was due to the impact of the harvest at the time. The reduction was slightly more pronounced in Yobe (- 12.0 percent) and Adamawa (-15.3 percent) compared to Borno, where a marginal reduction of 0.9 percent was recorded, largely due to the relapse in the security situation which has led into fresh waves of displacements most recently.

Table 3: Consolidated Approach for Reporting Indicators on Food Security (CARI) Console

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Food Secure</th>
<th>Marginally Food Secure</th>
<th>Moderately Food Insecure</th>
<th>Severally Food Insecure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Food Consumption Group</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>Economic Vulnerability Food Expenditure Share</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset</td>
<td>Livelihood coping strategy categories</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depletion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 30: Food Security Status by State (Percentage of Households)


17 CARI was calculated using the food consumption score, share of food expenditure and coping strategies. The CARI guideline is available at: https://resources.vam.wfp.org/sites/default/files/CARI%20Guidance_2nd%20ed.pdf
The level of food insecurity (moderate + severe) was highest in northern and central areas of Borno due to the ongoing conflicts, which continues to induce displacement from troubled areas and influx of new arrivals into safer areas like Maiduguri and Monguno LGAs, both of which areas witnessed an upsurge in the influx of new arrivals between January and March 2019. More specifically, LGAs with food insecurity prevalence of at least 50 percent in the northern and central areas of Borno were Kaga (84.1 percent), Monguno (76.5 percent), Gubio (73.0 percent), Gwoza (70.2 percent), Magumeri (62.0 percent), Nganzai (56.8 percent) and Maiduguri (52.5 percent) LGAs, which depicts the consequential impact of the conflict on the food security situation in these areas. Noteworthy that the findings, most especially for Borno State, are only generalizable to areas in the various LGAs that are currently accessible to humanitarian actors and should be interpreted cautiously as the food security situation inaccessible areas could be similar to those from these areas with access or worse as shown by previous hard-to-reach studies.

Moreover, a pronounced level of food insecurity was recorded in Yunusari LGA (55.0 percent) in Yobe State compared to other LGAs within the same state, which was partly due to the impact of the conflict in adjoining LGAs such as Geidam and prolonged dry spells which affected the yield from the planting season. In Adamawa State, Guyuk, Yola South, Gombi, Demsa, Madagali, Michika and Numan LGAs had the highest food insecurity prevalence of 37.3 percent, 27.6 percent, 25.5 percent, 25.4 percent, 21.0 percent, 19.5 percent and 18.9 percent respectively due to pockets of communal clashes between pastoralists and farmers and increased dependency from IDPs due to displacement into capital cities like Yola South.

3.0 percent of food insecure households were severely food insecure with more of such households found in Borno State (4.9 percent) compared to 1.7 percent and 1.2 percent in Adamawa and Yobe States respectively, which shows wide food consumption gaps and loss of productive assets within such households. Year-on-year comparison with February 2018 shows a marginal reduction 0.2 percent in the prevalence of severe food insecurity, albeit there was an increase of 1 percent and 0.2 percent in Borno and Adamawa States respectively. At the LGA level, more than one in every ten households were severely food insecure households in Gubio (14.5 percent), Nganzai (13.0 percent) and Magumeri (10.3 percent) LGAs in Borno State, whereas in Yobe and Adamawa States, severe food insecurity was most pronounced in Yunusari (5.3 percent), Numan (6.3 percent), Gombi (6.2 percent) and Madagali (4.0 percent).


![Figure 31: Trend of Food Insecurity (Moderate + Severe) by State](image-url)
Displaced households in camps and non-camp settings are often more affected by food insecurity in the absence of sustained humanitarian assistance due to limited livelihood opportunities, lack of skills and loss of productive assets, which deepens vulnerability when confronted with shocks. Overall, displaced households in host communities (53.2 percent) and informal settlements (44.9 percent) and returnee households (43.0 percent) were more affected by food insecurity (moderate + severe) compared to only 23.0 percent of counterpart households in host communities.

As indicated in the methodology section, IDP camps or camp-like settings were covered in nine LGAs (Bama, Damboa, Dikwa, Jere, Konduga, Ngala, Maiduguri, Monguno and Gwoza) of Borno State to gain in-depth insights into the food security situation among these population, considering the recent influx of new arrivals into some of these localities. The prevalence of food insecurity was quite pronounced in IDP camps in Bama (73.8 percent), Konduga (62.3 percent), Monguno (37.0 percent) and Maiduguri (33.1 percent), due to recent upsurge of attacks leading to increased displacement and influx of IDPs into camps in these LGAs, which continues to affect the planning and allocation of resources of government and partners providing humanitarian support in these camps. Moreover, overstretched resources or congestion of these IDP camps often results in an “overflow” of IDPs into host communities which puts pressure on resources in such communities as seen in the cases of Monguno, Maiduguri, Ngala, Damboa and Gwoza where host community households were found to be more food insecure compared to IDP households in camps. This can be further explained by the targeted systematic humanitarian assistance that IDP households in camps receive from government and partners, at a scale which is often more significant compared to host communities.
Female headed households are disproportionately affected by food insecurity (36.9 percent) compared to male headed counterparts (24.9 percent), a trend which was consistent across BYA. Similarly, there were more severely food insecure female headed households (6.9 percent) compared to their male headed counterparts (2.1 percent), which is unsurprising since women living in the northeast have limited livelihood opportunities compared to men.
Figure 36: Percentage of Food Insecure Households in Northeast - April 2019

Note: Findings from the assessment should be interpreted cautiously as data was only collected from accessible areas of Borno, Adamawa and Yobe States. Food insecurity rates (moderate + severe) inaccessible areas shaded in light blue in the map may be similar or worse.
4.2 Food Consumption and Food Sources

4.2.1 Food Consumption

Household food consumption is measured through the Food Consumption Score (FCS), an indicator that measures the dietary diversity, energy, and micro and macro content value of the food consumed by interviewed households over the seven-day period preceding the survey.

**Food Consumption Score Cut-off Points**

**0 – 21: Poor Food Consumption**

**22 – 35: Borderline Food Consumption**

**> 35: Acceptable Food Consumption**

Overall, 70.9 percent of the interviewed households had acceptable food consumption and more of such households were situated in Adamawa (87.1 percent) and Yobe (80.2 percent) States compared to 53.3 percent of households in Borno State, which remains the epicenter of the ongoing armed conflict in the northeast. Moreover, 3.1 percent of households had poor food consumption and of these, 6.3 percent were in Borno State compared to only 0.6 percent and 0.7 percent in Yobe and Adamawa States respectively, which depicts acute food shortage within such households, particularly in Borno State. Another 26.0 percent of households in BAY States had borderline food consumption, 40 percent of which were from Borno State, and such households remain susceptible to relapse into the “poor food consumption group” in the face of persistent shocks. Nonetheless, when compared to February 2018, the proportion of households with poor food consumption reduced by 2.8 percent and this trend was consistent across Borno, Yobe and Adamawa States where the prevalence of poor food consumption reduced by 12.7 percent, 3.9 percent and 0.8 percent respectively. At the LGA level, Prevalence of poor food consumption was relatively low and less than five percent in all LGAs of Yobe and Adamawa States and some LGAs of Borno except for Kaga, Magumeri, Ngala, Nganzai, Gubio, Biu, Maiduguri and Gwoza where the proportion of households with poor food consumption stood at 25.9 percent, 25.0 percent, 12.3 percent, 10.6 percent, 7.6 percent, 7.0 percent, 5.6 percent and 5.4 percent respectively.

**Figure 37: Food Consumption Groups by State**

**Figure 38: Trend of Poor Food Consumption by State**
4.2.1.1 Food Consumption (IDP Camps)

Overall, 8.0 percent of the IDP households in camps have poor food consumption and the highest proportion of such households are found in Bama (47.0 percent), which continues to witness an influx of new arrivals and stretch resources within IDP camps. However, as expected, over three in every five households (60 percent) had acceptable food consumption in Dikwa (94.8 percent), Jere (85.7 percent), Ngala (80.4 percent), Damboa (77.2 percent), Maiduguri (69.6 percent) and Gwoza (61.3 percent), which can be attributed to the ongoing food assistance by government and humanitarian actors in these LGAs. Specifically in March 2019, over 1.2 million people received food assistance (in-kind and cash) from government and partner organizations in Borno State. Therefore, there are more households with either poor or borderline food consumption in host communities compared to counterparts in IDP camps in most of the LGAs with the exception of Konduga and Bama (Figure 40).

4.2.2 Household’s Meal Consumption a Day Preceding the Assessment

On the day preceding the assessment, an average of 2.7, 2.5 and 2.3 meals were consumed among household members that were adults older than 18 years, older children and adolescents aged 6 to 17 years and children aged 6 months to five years respectively. Moreover, more than 90 percent of all household members, regardless of their age, consumed at least two meals during the day before the assessment, except for older children and adolescents aged 6 to 17 years in Adamawa (88.3 percent) and Borno (87.1 percent) States.

---

4.2.2.1 Household’s Meal Consumption during Assessment Week (IDP Camps)

In IDP camps across nine LGAs in Borno State, an average of 2.6 meals were consumed by adults older than 18 years and older children and adolescents aged 6 to 17 years the day before the assessment while an average of 3.4 meals were consumed by children aged 6 months to five years. Additionally, over 90 percent of all household members consumed at least two meals the day that preceded the assessment in most of the LGAs, with the exception of older children and adolescents aged 6 to 17 years in Bama, Gwoza and Maiduguri, where 86.1 percent, 87.7 percent and 88.3 percent of households members in this age group respectively had at least two meals the day before the assessment.

Figure 41: Number of Meals Consumed by Household Members by State and Age Group

Figure 41: Number of Meals Consumed by Members of Households in IDP Camps in Borno State by LGA and Age Groups
Figure 42: Distribution of Food Consumption Group (EFSA) - April 2019
4.2.3 Food Sources

At the state level, cash purchase of food from markets remained the predominant means of food access for 84.5 percent of households across BAY States, 88.4 percent, 86.6 percent and 79.4 percent of which were from Yobe, Borno and Adamawa States respectively. Secondly, self-produced food was found to be paramount for the sustenance of food access across households in BAY States considering the agrarian nature of the region. However, the ongoing armed conflict continues to hamper access to farmland and cultivation activities as shown in the survey, where only 5.7 percent and 5.0 percent of households in most conflict-ridden Borno and Yobe States respectively highlighted ‘own production’ as their main food source compared to 15.3 percent of households in Adamawa State, where the impact of the conflict is less intense. Nevertheless, the ongoing food assistance from the GoN and humanitarian partners has been playing a prominent role in bridging food access constraints, particularly in Borno State which is the epicenter of the armed conflict, where about 3.1 percent of households reported food aid as a major food source compared to 0.4 percent in Yobe State and 0.001 percent in Adamawa State.

Figure 43: Sources of Food by State

Similar to trends at the state level, market purchase remains the most important source of food across majority of the LGAs in BAY States, except for a few where own cultivation of food products and food aid reliance was commonplace. In Adamawa State where the ongoing conflict is restricted to only proximal LGAs to Borno (Madagali and Michika), own cultivated food products constituted a major source of food in over one in every five households as seen in the cases of Ganye (29.4 percent), Guyuk (29.1 percent) and Song (28.6 percent). Nonetheless, the ongoing conflict between herdsmen and farmers in areas of Adamawa State such as Demsa LGA continues to hamper access to farmland and optimal production from sustenance farming activities and therefore, force about 5 percent of households to rely on help from friends and relatives to sustain food access. In Yobe State, own cultivation of food products was highest among households Nangere (14.2 percent), Tarmuwa (11.4 percent) and Bursari (10.3 percent), but remained at sub-optimal levels in LGAs such as Gujba (3.4 percent) and Gulani (6.4 percent) both of which were major food baskets to the state prior to the crisis. In Borno State, LGAs in Southern Borno, which are coincidentally least affected by the ongoing conflict despite their proximity to Sambisa forest, had the highest production of households that access food via their own production as seen in the cases of Shani (19.0 percent), Hawul (14.7 percent), Chibok (12.3 percent) and Kwaya Kusar (11.3 percent). While commercial activities within such LGAs remain suboptimal due to heightened insecurity in adjoining LGAs, households are gradually cultivating, albeit on a small scale, in order to cater for their food needs. In garrison towns with limited livelihood opportunities due to military restriction and concentration of people in LGAs...
capitals due to insecurity in rural areas, food aid from government, humanitarian agencies and relatives was a prominent source of food for households in Gwoza (42.3 percent), Dikwa (24.9 percent), Konduga (18.1 percent), Monguno (17.2 percent), Mafa (11.4 percent) and Damboa (10.4 percent).

Figure 44: Sources of Food by LGA

4.3 Household Economic Vulnerability

Based on the CARI, economic vulnerability of households is a significant indicator for food security which measures the proportion of the monthly expenditure on food as households with larger food expenditure share are more susceptible to food insecurity in the face of shocks.

Overall, food constituted over 65 percent of the expenditure of almost half (46.4 percent) of households across Yobe (55.6 percent), Borno (44.6 percent) and Adamawa (41.1 percent) States, depicting some measure of food insecurity in such households due to their vulnerability to unprecedented shocks. Moreover, about one in every four households (25.2 percent) in BAY States had high food expenditure share that was greater than 75 percent, which depicts deeper levels of vulnerability in such households in the absence of an improvement in their economic situation. Of these households, more were found in Yobe State (30.5 percent) compared to Borno (23.9 percent) and Adamawa (22.4 percent). Agricultural production in the northeast remains at sub-optimal levels and this consequently reduces economic viability and income of households, which gives reason to the high contribution of food to the overall expenditure of households, compared to other non-food needs.

Figure 45: Households’ Food Expenditure Share by State
At the LGA level, more than two in every three households food expenditure share of over 65 percent was recorded in Bama (82.3 percent), Nganzai (80.7 percent), Dikwa (80.6 percent) and Shani (72.4 percent) in Borno State, Jakukso (83.3 percent), Yunusari (82.7 percent), Gujba (74.6 percent) and Gulani (72.7 percent) in Yobe State and Fufure (68.9 percent) and Madagali (66.3 percent) in Adamawa State. Furthermore, over 50 percent of households had food expenditure share of over 75 percent in Nganzai (68.4 percent), Bama (53.8 percent) and Dikwa (51.9 percent) in Borno State and Yunusari (61.3 percent), Gujba (54.8 percent) and Jakusko (51.7 percent) in Yobe State, which depicts concerning levels of economic vulnerability in such households, particularly when exposed to inadvertent shocks.

Figure 46: Households’ Food Expenditure Share by LGA

4.3.1 Household Economy Vulnerability (IDP Camps)

In IDP camps of Borno State, food constituted over 65 percent of the expenditure of slightly more than half (56.5 percent) and more of such households were situated in Damboa (73.5 percent), Maiduguri (64.4 percent), Monguno (62.6 percent) and Jere (60.8 percent). Moreover, more than one in every four IDP households residing in camps had food expenditure share of over 75 percent except for Bama (19.6 percent) and Gwoza (20.3 percent). The slightly pronounced food expenditure share of IDP households in camps can be explained by the livelihood and income constraints often experienced by these households, which reduces their purchasing power, particularly on non-food items. Albeit, there were more vulnerable households with pronounced levels of food expenditure share of host community members compared to IDPs in camps in Dikwa, Bama and Gwoza LGAs, which heightens the inability of these host community households to cater to their non-food needs and increased susceptibility to food insecurity in the face of unprecedented shocks.

Figure 47: Households’ Food Expenditure Share in IDP Camps/Camp-like settings and Non-Camps in Borno State by LGA
4.4 Household Coping Strategies

4.4.1 Food Based Coping Strategies

When households are exposed to shock or threat in the face of food shortage, they employ coping strategies to mitigate the impact of such shock in order to ensure that their basic food needs are met. The reduced coping strategy index (rCSI) measures the use of five food consumption based alimentary coping behaviors that households leverage to sustain food availability during the seven days preceding the assessment. A high rCSI depicts persistent reliance on coping strategies to deal with scarcity of food or money required to buy food\textsuperscript{22}.

Overall, some 83.2 percent of households experienced difficulty in accessing food and used one or more coping strategies to bridge such gaps within seven days preceding the assessment with Yobe State having the highest of such households (88.0 percent), then Adamawa (86.5 percent) and Borno (77.9 percent) States. Moreover, the severity in the usage of food based coping strategies is found to be more in Yobe State where the mean rCSI was 13.8 compared to 10.4 and 10.2 in Borno and Adamawa States respectively. The food-based coping strategies mostly adopted by households when confronted with food gaps were reliance on less preferred meals (77.6 percent), reduction in portion sizes (62.6 percent) and reduction in the number of meals consumed daily (60.7 percent).

Figure 48: Type of Food Based Coping Strategies by State

At the LGA level, majority of households in BAY States have used one or more coping strategies to meet their food needs within seven days preceding the survey. More specifically, over 60 percent of households have adopted coping strategies to bridge food gaps within seven days prior to the assessment in most of the LGAs in BAY States except for Kwaya Kusar (55.3 percent), Ngala (50.3 percent), Dikwa (43.0 percent) and Shani (22.9 percent) in Borno State and Potiskum (40.3 percent) in Yobe State. The persistent usage of alimentary coping strategies to bridge food gaps in most of the assessed LGAs, despite the ongoing humanitarian assistance, depicts the pervasive nature of vulnerability to food insecurity within such areas.

\textsuperscript{22} More info on the rCSI can be found here: http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/manual_guide_proced/wfp211058.pdf?ga=1,70068179,2144366633,1459255840 and here: https://resources.vam.wfp.org/node/6.
4.4.1.1 Food Based Coping Strategies (IDP Camps)

Over two in every three IDP households residing in camps used one or more food based coping strategies within the last seven days that preceded the assessment with the exception of Gwoza where 59.7 percent of households admitted likewise. The mean rCSI across the various IDP camps surveyed was 11.7 which depicts quite pronounced levels of usage of food based coping strategies, albeit the rCSI being lower in places like Monguno (5.8) and Bama (7.5). Moreover, persistent usage of food based coping strategies was more rampant among IDP households in camps compared to non-camp resident counterparts in most of the LGAs except for Monguno and Maiduguri. Nonetheless, pervasive adoption of food based coping strategies was commonplace in spite of dwelling status (camps versus non-camps) in places like Bama where pronounced mean rCSI of 19.8 and 14.2 were recorded in IDP camps and host communities respectively. The most common food based coping strategies reported across the nine LGAs were reliance of less preferred or less expensive food (72.2 percent) and reduction in the number of meals consumed daily.
4.4.2 Livelihood Based Coping Strategies

The livelihood based coping strategies depict the status of the households’ livelihood stress and the consequential implication on food security. Through this indicator, the long-term coping ability of households and their capacity to produce in future can be assessed. The livelihood coping strategy measures the livelihood stress and asset depletion during the 30 days prior to survey. Respondents are classified into four categories, following the severity of the behaviours adopted vis-à-vis the family assets. Households adopt stress, crisis or emergency coping strategies, or no strategies at all with the most affected households adopting crisis and emergency coping strategies.

The overall reliance on livelihood coping strategies was relatively high as 75.0 percent of the entire households surveyed have relied on one or more of these strategies in order to meet their food needs within 30 days that preceded the assessment. The highest proportion of households that relied on one or more of such strategies were found in Yobe (82.2 percent), followed by Borno (75.9 percent) and Adamawa (67.8 percent).

While 25.0 percent of the households did not adopt any coping strategy, emergency coping strategies, the most severe of the coping strategies, was adopted by almost one in every five households in BAY States and 20.5 percent, 19.8 percent and 18.7 percent of such households were situated in Yobe, Borno and Adamawa States respectively. Among these households that employed emergency coping strategies, the form of strategies cited were reduction of expense on agricultural inputs (25.8 percent), substantial sale of productive animals (14.1 percent) and begging (9.5 percent). Sale of productive assets such as animals (45.1 percent) and farmland (13.6 percent) were mostly cited in Yobe State which heightens the risk of deepened vulnerability within such households in the face of inadvertent shocks. Moreover, high reliance on emergency coping strategies such as sale of productive assets, animals or farmlands were particularly worrisome due to their negative impact on the future productivity of affected households and regain of such assets.

Another 26.6 percent of the households used crisis coping strategies and again, more of such households were found in Yobe State (31.6 percent) compared to Borno (25.0 percent) and Adamawa (24.6 percent) States. The most common crisis coping strategies utilized by the affected households was the reduction in the expense on health and education (28.9 percent), which was more pronounced within households in Yobe State (42.4 percent) compared to Adamawa (27.6 percent) and Borno (21.6 percent) States. Households’ reliance on these sort of coping strategies jeopardizes their ability to work and produce in future provided the situation persists.

Moreover, 28.8 percent of the households deployed stress coping strategies across Borno (31.1 percent), Yobe (30.2 percent) and Adamawa (24.5 percent) States within 30 days that preceded the assessment. Most frequently, such households borrowed money to buy food (47.2 percent) or spent their savings in order to buy food (28.2 percent), all of which increases their burden of debts and deepens the economic vulnerability of such households.

Figure 52: Livelihood Coping Strategies by State

---

23 For more information on livelihood coping strategies indicator, refer to the CARI technical guidance note: [https://resources.vam.wfp.org/sites/default/files/CARI%20Guidance_2nd%20ed.pdf](https://resources.vam.wfp.org/sites/default/files/CARI%20Guidance_2nd%20ed.pdf)
At the LGA level, over 90 percent of households that adopted one or more coping strategies were situated in Magumeri, Jere, Maiduguri and Biu in Borno State, Machina, Yusufari, Geidam and Nangere in Yobe State and Girei and Gombi in Adamawa State, which shows prevalent and concerning usage of these strategies in these localities. The highest concentration of households that resorted to severe, and oftentimes, irreversible emergency coping strategies were found in Mubi North (45.8 percent), Girei (41.6 percent), and Michika (35.8 percent) in Adamawa State, Nguru (37.0 percent), Bursari (37.0 percent) and Geidam (30.6 percent) in Yobe State and Kaga (34.6 percent), Jere (33.0 percent), Gubio (31.5 percent) and Nganzai (30.2 percent) in Borno State. Of these emergency coping strategies adopted, there was concerning rate of sales of productive animal in Geidam, Tarmuwa, Machina and Jakusko where 61.8 percent, 61.2 percent, 43.3 percent and 38.0 percent respectively used this strategy within 30 days that preceded the assessment. Moreover, reduction of expense on agricultural inputs was found to be pervasive in the some of the surveyed areas, where over half of all households reported resorting to such to meet their food needs, most notably Kaga in Borno State, Bade, Karasuwa, Geidam and Nangere in Yobe State and Song in Adamawa State, which has devastating consequences for the future productivity of agricultural practicing households.

The employment of crisis coping strategies such as the sale of productive asset and withdrawal of children from school was highest among households in Biu (55.7 percent) in Borno State, Nangere (48.5 percent), Karasuwa (45.3 percent) and Geidam (44.9 percent) in Yobe State and Song (41.3 percent), Guyuk (41.3 percent) and Girei (41.1 percent) in Adamawa State. Additionally, the use of stress coping strategies such as the depletion of savings and sale of assets were prominent coping strategies leveraged to counter food-related shocks in Yusufari (66.0 percent), Yunusari (51.0 percent), Machina (49.8 percent), Fika (46.7 percent), Fune (44.3 percent), Gujba (43.5 percent) and Gulani (41.7 percent) in Yobe State, Ganye (66.2 percent), Demsa (45.0 percent), Maiha (44.5 percent), Hong (44.5 percent), Shelleng (41.7 percent) and Toungo (40.5 percent) in Adamawa State, and Konduga (50.3 percent), Jere (49.5 percent), Monguno (47.0 percent) and Bama (44.1 percent) in Borno State. The persistent usage of one or more of these livelihood based coping strategies deepens economic vulnerability of households to shocks and heightens their risk to food insecurity in the absence of intervention.
### 4.4.2.1 Livelihood Based Coping Strategies (IDP Camps)

Overall, 69.2 percent of IDP households residing in camps across the nine LGAs surveyed used one or more livelihood based coping strategy during the last 30 days that preceded the assessment with begging being the most employed. The most prominent usage of such strategies was recorded among IDP camp residents in Jere (95.3 percent), Maiduguri (83.6 percent) and Ngala (82.4 percent). The adoption of emergency coping strategies was prevalent among IDP households in Bama (47.0 percent) and Jere (45.5 percent). Moreover, there was generally more usage of stress coping strategies (35.0 percent) across the IDP camps in the LGAs surveyed compared to the slightly more severe crisis coping strategies (23.1 percent). Of these stress coping strategies, households were more inclined to either borrow food or money to buy food (45.2 percent) and source for loans to buy food, when confronted with food shortage. Albeit, there were more host community households that used livelihood coping strategies compared to IDP camp residents in Monguno, Maiduguri, Damboa and Gwoza and this could be attributed to fresh waves of displacement and influx of IDPs which continues to stretch host community resources, coupled with the ongoing response by government and humanitarian partners to particularly cater for the food needs of IDPs residing in camps.

*Figure 55: Livelihood Based Coping Strategies in Camps/Camp-like Settings and Non-Camps in Borno State by LGA*
Characteristics and profile of food insecure households
5.1 Food Insecurity by Livelihood Group

The livelihood strategy employed by a household plays a significant role in determining their level of food security and socio-economic status. In the three states, majority of households depend more on agriculture as their main way to access income and food. However, the opportunities to access to land are more important in Adamawa and Yobe States. In Borno State, households engage in trade (petty trade and trade) and precarious income earning activities such as temporary jobs and begging (Figure 56).

**Creation of livelihood groups:** Households that share similar livelihood strategies tend to be affected by the same shocks or risk factors. The livelihoods group to which a household belongs is therefore an important determinant of food security outcomes. Livelihood grouping is achieved through “a cluster analysis preceded by principal components analysis (PCA).” Primary livelihood strategies can be recognized through the PCA. Livelihood groups are then composed based on their reliance on various strategies.

Food insecurity is highest among households adopting begging as their main livelihood activity (66 percent), followed by those who live primarily on unskilled wage labour (49 percent), skilled wage labour (38 percent), trade (31 percent) and daily/common laborer (29 percent). In contrast, households engaged in salaried work (15 percent), livestock business (16 percent) and agriculture (23 percent) are less food insecure (Figure 57).
5.2 Food Security by Educational Level of Household’s Head

To gain an understanding of the interrelationship between education and food security, we explored the impact of the educational level of the household head on the household’s level of food security. Households headed by an individual with no previous education (cannot read and write in any language) were found to have a higher rate of food insecurity (37.0 percent) compared to counterparts with an educated head (24.0 percent). Furthermore, among households with an educated head that can read and write, food insecurity was highest for household head that dropped out after primary school (24.1 percent) or that can read only in Arabic (26.4 percent) compared to those that achieved secondary school and above (16.2 percent).

Figure 58: Food security by level of education of Household Head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Status</th>
<th>Education Level of Household Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Cannot Read and Write in any Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Can Read and Write in any Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Displaced population are more vulnerable to food insecurity since displacement causes the loss of assets as well as human and social capital. Additionally, this situation exacerbates vulnerability among displaced individuals in the event of shock since IDPs are forced to rely on severe coping mechanism in order to ensure that their basic food needs are met. Generally, IDPs and returnees are more likely to be affected by food insecurity compared to permanent residents (Figure 60).

For instance, IDPs living in informed settlement (53 percent) are more affected by severe and moderate food insecure compared to IDPs living in host communities (45 percent). Displacement primarily limits access to basic livelihood opportunities such as skilled employment and this is often compounded by lack of skills and low level of literacy, which limits the capacity of IDPs to connect with local opportunities within areas of new habitation, consequently forcing them to engage in jobs that require less level of skills such as land clearing and manual labor.

5.3 Food Security by Dwelling Type and Displacement

Displaced population are more vulnerable to food insecurity since displacement causes the loss of assets as well as human and social capital. Additionally, this situation exacerbates vulnerability among displaced individuals in the event of shock since IDPs are forced to rely on severe coping mechanism in order to ensure that their basic food needs are met. Generally, IDPs and returnees are more likely to be affected by food insecurity compared to permanent residents (Figure 60).

For instance, IDPs living in informed settlement (53 percent) are more affected by severe and moderate food insecure compared to IDPs living in host communities (45 percent). Displacement primarily limits access to basic livelihood opportunities such as skilled employment and this is often compounded by lack of skills and low level of literacy, which limits the capacity of IDPs to connect with local opportunities within areas of new habitation, consequently forcing them to engage in jobs that require less level of skills such as land clearing and manual labor.
Moreover, specifically for IDP camp residents in Borno State, the prevalence of food insecurity was quite pronounced in IDP camps in Bama (73.8 percent), Konduga (62.3 percent), Monguno (37.0 percent) and Maiduguri (33.1 percent), due to recent upsurge of attacks leading to increased displacement and influx of IDPs into camps in these LGAs, which continues to put pressure on limited resources of government and partners providing humanitarian support in these camps. Moreover, overstretched resources or limited capacity of these IDP camps often results in an “overflow” of IDPs into host communities continues to put pressure on host community resources as seen in the cases of Monguno, Maiduguri, Ngala, Damboa and Gwoza, where host community households were found to be more food insecure compared to IDP camp residents. This can be further explained by the targeted systematic humanitarian assistance that IDP households in camps receive from government and partners, the scale of which is often more significant compared to host communities.

5.4 Food Security by Dependency (Households hosting IDPs)

Generally, households that had hosted IDPs within the last six months were found to be more food insecure (43.5 percent) compared to counterparts that have not (26.9 percent). Moreover, the severity of food insecurity was more pronounced among households that still hosted IDPs at the time of the survey (52.7 percent) compared to households that previously hosted IDPs (38.0 percent), which clearly shows a positive correlation between dependency from IDPs and incidence of food insecurity. The presence of IDPs in such host community households often overstretches already limited resources within these households, due to the ongoing conflicts and limited livelihood opportunities (Figure 62).
5.5 Food Security by Farming and Non-Farming Households

The results show a clear relationship between the level of food security, land access and cultivation. In general, households without access to farmland were more food insecure (36.0 percent) compared to those with access (22.0 percent). This implies that accessibility to land for farming remains a key determinant of food insecurity in the northeast. Moreover, among households with access to farmland, a correlation exists between food security and the expanse of land cultivated. Households that cultivated more hectares of land were found to be more food secure (Figure 63).

5.6 Food Security by Livestock Ownership

The results show only 46.8 percent of the surveyed household own livestock (cattle, small ruminants or poultry). Severe and moderate food insecurity is almost twice higher among households who do not have livestock (33 percent) compared to those who have (18 percent). In addition to the direct income from selling of livestock products, explanatory factors include the direct food benefits that livestock farming provide including meat, milk and other dairy products, which are important for the nutritional wellbeing of children and pregnant and lactating women. The type of breeding seems not to have a huge impact on the level of food insecurity. Food insecurity is almost at the same level between households practicing sedentary livestock breeding as opposed to transhumance stockbreeding. Fishing activities also have a positive impact on food security as it promotes access to protein. Households that do not practice any fishing or fish farming are more food insecure than their counterparts that are involved in fish farming (Figure 64).
Figure 64: Food security by livestock ownership

- Does your household own any livestock (cattle, small ruminants, or poultry)?
- If yes, what type of livestock are you practicing: transhumant stock breeding (FREE RANGE) or sedentary livestock breeding (CONFINED)?
- Does the household practice any fishing or fish farming?
Figure 65: Model of land Access in Northeast (EFSA) - April 2019
5.7 Food Security by Asset Ownership

Poor households with few assets tend to be more food insecure than better off households (Figure 66). When confronted with shocks and threats, households with lower levels of income and fewer assets are more likely to deploy extreme coping strategies to meet their basic food needs. The persistent use of such coping strategies might have severe, and oftentimes, irreversible impacts on food insecurity within the affected households.

**Wealth:** Wealth is the value of all natural, physical and financial assets owned by a household, reduced by its liabilities. The wealth index is a composite index that combines the ownership of key assets; it is used as a proxy indicator of household level wealth. The calculation requires various steps based on a principal component analysis iteration. The following assets have been used to generate the wealth index: Beds, Sponge mattress, Table/chair, Radio, Television, Car, taxi, Cupboard/dresser, Agricultural tools (hoe/spade/cutlass), Seed for planting, Wheel barrow, Mosquito net, Cash, other savings (jewellery), Motorcycle, Bicycle, Cart (ox cart, etc.), Tricycle, Cell/Mobile phone.

5.8 Food Security by Shocks and Coping Strategies

Shocks have a negative impact on food security at the household level. In the event of a shock, households become highly vulnerable and many become food insecure, at least in the short-term. Others continue to experience food insecurity in the long-term, depending on the nature of the shock and the depth of its impact.

Households in the northeast experienced a number of different shocks since the beginning of the insurgency. Across the three northeast states, sickness of a household member (30.8 percent) followed by insecurity/conflict (20.8 percent), high food price (17.2 percent) and loss of employment (13.5 percent) are the most significant shocks cited. Yobe State households are most affected by insecurity (32.1 percent), compared to Borno State households (17.4 percent). Moreover, 3.7 percent of households experienced crop failure in Adamawa which has implication for food availability and vulnerability within such affected households (Figure 67).
The EFSA results showed that food insecurity is higher among households that had experienced a shock (28 percent) compared to those that had not experienced any shock (23 percent). Severe and moderate food insecurity is higher among households that reported insecurity (36 percent), temporary displacement (36 percent), high food price (33 percent) and loss of employment/reduced income (31 percent) (Figure 68).

In the face of these shocks, households often adopt a range of different coping strategies to survive, which deepens vulnerability to food insecurity if unabated.

Among households that adopted a coping strategy when they experienced a shock, the prevalence of food insecurity is higher compared to those who did not resort to such strategies. This is because households with higher incomes or more assets are less likely to resort to coping strategies that negatively impact on food insecurity (e.g. reducing food expenditure), as they have the resources to maintain normal levels of food consumption. The highest percentages of severe food insecure households are found among those who were engaged in illegal activities (26.0 percent) and those begging (21.2 percent).
5.9 Food Security by Various Vulnerable Groups/disabilities

Food insecurity impacts various groups differently and with different levels of intensity. The prevalence of severe and moderate food insecurity is higher in female-headed households compared to male-headed households. On the other hand, a high proportion of male-headed households are food secure as compared to male-headed households. In the case of marital status, households headed by widows/widowers are more likely to be food insecure (37.7 percent) followed by divorced (33.6 percent). The married and single groups are less food insecure. Households headed by individuals that are single were found to be the most food secure (83.4 percent), followed by married (74.9 percent). The disability of the household’s head and the presence of chronically ill members also have an impact on food security: those households with a chronically ill member or headed by a person living with a disability have a higher rate of food insecurity compared to those without. The presence of members with long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments would potentially hamper economic productivity of such households, which explains the higher prevalence food insecurity (Figure 69).

No or slight difference were found in term of food insecurity for household with pregnant and lactating women.

Figure 69: Food security by vulnerable Groups
Protection
Overall, 86.8 percent of the surveyed households perceived that the situation in their area of abode was good and devoid of any threats to their safety and that of their families at the time of the assessment. The proportion of households with favorable view about their living conditions was higher in Yobe State (97.6 percent) compared to Borno (84.0 percent) and Adamawa (81.6 percent) States. Moreover, year-on-year comparison between April 2019 and February 2018 shows an increase of 8 percent in the proportion of households that witnessed some sort of threat and this increase was most pronounced in Borno State (13.3 percent) compared to Adamawa (7.6 percent) and Yobe (0.9 percent). The upsurge in the incident of threats witnessed by the surveyed households can be corroborated by the recent relapse in the security situation in Borno State and communal conflict between farmers and pastoralists in Adamawa State.

Of these households that encountered one or more threats, the most prominent threats were movement restrictions due to military check points and landmines (66.5 percent), killings (52.6 percent), destruction of properties such as houses and land (45.5 percent) and physical violence (36.8 percent). Albeit, abduction remains a key threat among households in Adamawa State (58.2 percent) compared to Borno (28.2 percent) and Yobe (17.7 percent) States. Moreover, about 157 cases of rape were reported across the three states with Borno and Adamawa States accounting for 85 and 59 of such cases respectively, compared to only three cases in Yobe State. At the LGA level, the highest number of these cases were from Mobbar (42) and Michika (44). The cases of rape reported has grieve protection concerns as the study only accessed the situation on a superficial level and hence, further protection specific research is required to gain deeper insights into the specific groups affected by rape including the underlying and inherent risk factors.
Men were found to be most exposed to these threats (79.1 percent) which could be attributed to the activities of the NSAGs that specifically target men, particularly in Borno State (84.9 percent). Additionally, 12.2 percent of the household members that encountered some sort of threat were women with more of such women found in Yobe State (33.6 percent) compared to Adamawa (11.7 percent) and Borno (10.6 percent) States. The same dynamics with observed for girls in Yobe State (6.2 percent) had higher rates of exposure to threats compared to counterparts in Adamawa (1.2 percent) and Borno (0.7 percent) States (Figure 72). Households were mainly exposed to these threats when attempting to return to their place of origin (56.2 percent), accessing farmland (55.0 percent) and collecting firewood, all of which has implications for returns and resettlement, recovery of agricultural activities and food security, in addition to the apparent protection risk.

*Figure 72: Household members exposed to Threats by States*
Gender
The EFSA results show that female headed-households have the highest rates of food insecurity (36.9 percent), compared to their male counterpart (24.9 percent). However, these findings should be gauged carefully as only 12.6 percent of households surveyed were female headed. Patriarchal cultural norms often contribute to few women having access to farmland and financial empowerment, this is likely contributing to food insecurity.

The results show that Borno state has the highest percentage of female headed households as compared to Yobe and Adamawa states. One negative impact of conflict has been the widowing of women, especially in Borno which has been worst hit by the ongoing conflict. As a result of which, thousands of men have disproportionately been killed and their wives have become widows. Amongst the LGAs in Borno, Bama LGA has the highest percentage of female headed households (49%).

Women tend to have less access to land for farming, 42.2 percent of female headed households compared to 73.9 percent male headed households. Lack of access to land equals slow livelihood and economic recovery, especially where households depend on farming to access food and income. In such cases, access to land is vital in household food security. We can infer, household that have access to land for farming are more food secure.

Women’s engagement with farming overall is significantly less than men’s due to gendered economic norms and roles around land ownership and farming practice. Only about 28. 3 percent of female headed households engage in farming as their main income activity, compared to 56.7 percent of male headed households who are involved with farming as their main income activity.

Access to credit: Female headed households (44.1 percent) accessed less credit than male headed households (5.2 percent). Moreover, 75.6 percent of the credit accessed by female headed households was used to buy food compared to 66.2 percent for male headed households, this is more likely to due to cultural barriers.

Restriction in movement may also impact of ability to access farm lands and other economic sources as 72 percent of women headed households were restricted from movements compared to 67.8 percent of the male headed households who were affected by restriction. Women farm smaller plots and most likely consume more of what they plant. About 25.4 percent of female-headed households cultivate on less than 0.5 hectares, while 13 percent of male headed households farm on less than 0.5 hectares.

Women’s livestock ownership was found to be low. Findings indicate that only 25.7 percent of the female headed households owned livestock as compared with 49.6 percent of male-headed households that owned livestock. Ownership of livestock provides households with access to liquid assets that can be realized where needed either for their food needs or to weather economic challenges.

Women tend to have a lower level of education compared to men: 54.8 percent of women cannot read and write in any language against 26.3 percent for men. Lacking Quranic or formal education, many are compelled to beg and are unable to feed their children. As a solution, a high level of educational attainment for women would promote improved care practices and the nutritional status of children.
Food assistance and household priorities
8.1 Food Assistance

One out of every ten households (10 percent) had benefited from food assistance in the last few months prior to the survey. Of these households, Borno State had the highest percentage (19 percent) compared to Yobe (5.6 percent) and Adamawa (1.9 percent) States. Insecurity and sporadic attacks continue to characterize the socio-economic environment of Borno State, impeding the lives of not only the residents of the state, but also internal displaced persons (IDPs) and returnees returning to their place of origin. The conflict in the northeast of Nigeria persists and continues to induce widespread displacement and disruption of livelihoods as well as the functionality of markets. After more than nine years of ongoing conflict, the need for humanitarian assistance remains high, especially following recent displacements attributed to December 2018 and January 2019 attacks, drawing attention of the humanitarian community, government and donors to one of the most affected states in the northeast. These recent renewed attacks by the NSAGs continues to intensify the already fragile situation as seen in the fresh waves of massive displacement of people. In December 2018 alone, Maiduguri witnessed an influx of over 30,000 thousand internally displaced persons (IDPs) from Baga ward in Kukawa local government area (LGA) and neighboring LGAs such as Monguno due to fresh attacks by NSAG and counter military operations to restore security and safety.

Food assistance is linked with vulnerability of households as IDP households, which often have limited productive assets and livelihood opportunities, are much more likely to benefit from food assistance compared to host communities. Thus, more food assistance primarily targets vulnerable IDPs and returnees. There are more IDP households, specifically those living within host communities and informal settlements (76.2 percent) that have benefited from food assistance within three months preceding the assessment compared to permanent residents (35.1 percent).

At the LGA level, more households in local government areas who have recorded high influx of displaced persons, such as Dikwa, Monguno and Gwoza have benefited from food assistance within three months preceding the assessment. In Borno State, Dikwa (82.6 percent) Monguno (60.3 percent), Gwoza (53.2 percent), Mafa (33.3 percent), Damboa (28.7 percent), Konduga (26.7 percent), Nganzai (21.3 percent), and Gubio (15.6 percent) and all of which have limited livelihood opportunities and restricted movement have the highest proportion of households that have received food assistance. In the same vein in Yobe State, Gulani (17.5 percent), Damaturu (12.2 percent), Tarmuwa (11.9 percent) and Gujba (11.1 percent), are all LGAs within this category. On the other hand, in Adamawa state a small proportion of households have benefited from food assistance three months prior to this assessment. Such LGA's include: Maiha (6 percent), Michika (5.4 percent), Mubi North (5.3 percent) and Madagali (3 percent), some of which are affected by the ongoing hostilities compounded by farmers and herders' conflict compared to other LGAs in Adamawa State which have not been receiving humanitarian assistance.

In Borno state, majority of IDP’s (63 percent) in camps indicated they had received food assistance. Of which 92.4 percent of IDP’s in Damboa responded that in the last 3 months, they had benefitted from food assistance. This shows that food assistance in IDP camps in Damboa covers a higher proportion of IDP’s, and this is understandable considering the perilous location of this LGA proximal to the fringes of Sambisa. It is worth mentioning, a recent attack in villages surrounding Damboa resulted in a fresh wave of displacement into the local government.

24 New Arrivals into MMC and Jere from Baga, Flash Report, 24-31 December, 2018. Available at https://displacement.iom.int/nigeria
8.2 Household Priorities

Food is the main priority (55 percent) for the respondents, which is interrelated with the findings about credit where the topmost reason for about 67 percent of households to collect credit was to buy food. Food was mentioned among the first priorities at least by half of the households in Borno and Yobe states, while in Adamawa State, food was mentioned as the first-priority by about 30 percent of the respondents. Respondents also expressed the need for health services, livelihood and water, particularly in Adamawa where health and medical services and water were priority for 22 percent and 18 percent of households respectively.

In Borno state, LGAs with the highest need for food assistance were Ngala (96 percent), Kaga (93.4 percent), Bama (86.6 percent), Gubio (85 percent), Mobbar (83.4 percent), Gwoza (82.9 percent), Dikwa (79.5 percent), Mafa (78.9 percent), Magumeri (77.7 percent), Damboa (75 percent), Maiduguri (72.5 percent), Nganzai (71.8 percent), Jere (66.7 percent), Biu (66.3 percent), Konduga (60.9 percent), Askira Uba (58.8 percent) and Monguno (54 percent). Similarly, in Yobe state, food assistance was stated as a priority by respondents in Gujba (89.3 percent), Bade (89 percent), Tarmuwa (88.6 percent), Geidam (85.7 percent), Jakarta (73.6 percent), Fune (70.9 percent), Karasuwa (70 percent), Nguru (67.8 percent), Yunusari (65.7 percent), Yusufari (57 percent), Nangere (53 percent) and Gulani (52 percent). While in Adamawa state Toungo (68 percent), Mayo Belwa (53.2 percent), Mubi North (51.8 percent), Yola South (50.8 percent) and Michika (30 percent) respondents had the highest responses for food as a main priority.
8.2.1 Household Priorities (IDP Camps)

Overall, over two in every three households (77 percent) in the IDP camps surveyed indicated that food as their priority need which shows that food remains a predominant need across IDP camps. The highest proportion of IDP camp residents that reported food as being their priority need were situated in Monguno (96 percent), Gwoza (90 percent), Jere (89 percent) and Ngala (83 percent). However, IDP camp residents in Damboa (32 percent), Maiduguri (17 percent) and Konduga (11 percent) preferred almost as much to receive food assistance as livelihood support. Government and partners can consider targeted farming and non-farm support to such population in the bid to gradually restore self-sufficiency and resilience of such IDP camp residents.

Figure 74: Household Priorities in IDP Camps in Borno State by LGA
Conclusion
Overall, more than one in every four households in BAY States were food insecure with the prevalence of global food insecurity most pronounced in Borno State compared to Yobe and Adamawa States. Moreover, about three percent of households in the northeast were found to be severely food insecure, showing concerning food consumption gaps and extreme loss of productive assets within such households, which heightens the risk of deepened vulnerability due to high susceptibility to shocks. In IDP camps, specifically in nine LGAs of Borno State, 38 percent of IDP camp residents were food insecure and of these, four percent were severely food insecure. Year-on-year comparison between April 2019 and February 2018 EFSA findings further shows a slight deterioration in the food security situation, which was more pronounced in some areas of Borno (Magumeri, Kaga, Askira Uba, Maiduguri and Biu) and Yobe (Yunusari, Geidam, Jakusko, Damaturu and Bade), which reveals the fragile nature of the food security situation in the northeast.

The conflict in the northeast of Nigeria persists and continues to induce widespread displacement and disruption of livelihoods as well as optimal functionality of markets. After more than nine years of ongoing conflict, the need for humanitarian assistance remains high, especially following recent displacements attributed to attacks by NSAGs in December 2018 and January 2019, drawing attention of the humanitarian community, government and donors to Borno State, which remains epicenter of the ongoing crisis in the northeast. This recent renewed attacks by the NSAGs continues to intensify the already fragile situation as seen in the fresh waves of massive displacement of people.

Both global and severe food insecurity was most pervasive in Northern and central parts of Borno State, which can be attributed to the renewed attacks by NSAGs which continues to intensify the ongoing conflict and induce displacement of people from their places of abode into safer areas. The influx of new arrivals from these troubled areas of Borno State into safer capital cities like Maiduguri, Jere and Monguno continues to overstretch limited resources within such areas, which explains more pronounced levels of food insecurity seen in host communities of Monguno, Maiduguri, Ngala, Damboa and Gwoza compared to IDP camp residents in these same locations. Albeit, concerning levels of global food insecurity were as well recorded in IDP camps situated in Bama, Konduga, Monguno and Maiduguri, due to the recent upsurge of attacks that led to increased displacement and influx of IDPs into these locations. These findings reveal the generally fragile nature of the food security situation in places like Monguno and Maiduguri where there was high prevalence of global food insecurity both in host communities and IDP camps.

The already fragile security situation in the northeast is further execrated by communal conflicts between farmers and pastoralists, particularly in some areas of Adamawa State, most notably Numan, Demsa and Lamurde, where a correlation was seen between high incidence of these communal conflicts and food insecurity in such areas, due to displacement induced by the conflict, limited access to farmland due to fear of attacks and loss of assets (i.e. farmland and livestock), which heightens adoption of severe, and oftentimes, irreversible emergency coping strategies that has a devastating consequences for economic productivity due to deepened economic vulnerability.

The main drivers that underscored food insecurity were increased incidence of hostilities as well as communal conflicts between farmers and herders, limited access to farming and grazing land including livelihood opportunities, stretched communal resources due to increased dependency from IDPs and returnees, extended dry spells which affected productivity and harvest in northern areas of Yobe State and high food prices.

Nonetheless, the ongoing humanitarian assistance by the GoN and the international community continues to forestall further deterioration of the food security situation and protect livelihoods and contribute to early recovery and resilience efforts in the northeast.

The Nigerian Government, UN Agencies, and other key humanitarian actors supported 1.5 million out of the 2.7 million conflict affected people, targeted for food, agriculture and livelihoods support in March 2019\textsuperscript{26} which indicates 56 percent achievement with 44 percent unachieved due to funding constraints. The deterioration in the food security situation calls for renewed commitments and concerted efforts by the GoN and entire humanitarian community to promptly respond to the acute needs among the most vulnerable, conflict affected population to prevent further deterioration of the food security situation.

Recommendations
There is a need for concerted efforts by government and food security sector partners to consult closely and provide tailored contextualized response (food or livelihood support as appropriate) to the needs of the most vulnerable population in hotspot areas with pronounced levels of food insecurity, giving priority to the IDPs, returnees and the most vulnerable members of host communities. This is key to prevent further deterioration of already fragile food security situation during the forthcoming lean season. In places where feasible, food assistance has to be significantly complemented by the implementation of sustainable livelihoods assistance to reduce the impact of acute food insecurity, particularly within IDP camps in places like Konduga, Maiduguri and Damboa, where IDP camp residents signified their interest to receive livelihood support.

Moreover, the government and food security sector partners should rigorously pursue the provision of off-farming oriented livelihood support to conflict affected households without access to farmland to gradually stimulate empowerment and economic recovery of such households, given the protracted nature of the ongoing conflict in the northeast, which fails to recede after ten years and continues to hamper optimal recovery of the previously, vibrant agricultural sector in northeast states of Borno, Adamawa and Yobe States. The GoN and food security sector partners should target and prioritize specific vulnerable groups for assistance in the most affected areas of the northeast most notably female-headed households, displaced households, returnee households, most vulnerable host community households, poorest households, those with limited livelihood opportunities and land access and households involved in casual labor.

Humanitarian and development actors also need to continue advocacy to the Government of Nigeria for improved security and greater humanitarian access to LGAs that are currently fully or partly accessible to the humanitarian community in order to enhance access to farmland for cultivation and also provide much needed assistance to affected households that are currently inaccessible. Moreover, the government and humanitarian actors should support households with safe access to quality agriculture inputs, water, land, fishing and grazing areas; reconstruction of productive infrastructures; and recovery of agriculture extension services, all in the efforts to harness the agricultural value chain. In parallel, there is a need to continue peace building dialogue between key stakeholders to ensure social cohesion between farmers and herders. These interventions should be complemented by women empowerment initiatives in order to reinforce the resilience of female headed households and also, provision of nutrition support through supplementary and therapeutic feeding centers to reduce the risk of malnutrition among children age 6 to 23 months.

Finally, there is need for continued onsite and remote monitoring of the food and nutrition situation, including hard-to reach areas of the northeast, leveraging traditional in-person interviews by Third Party Monitors and innovative technology such as satellite imagery and remote sensing, in order to gain ongoing insights into the nutrition and food security situation to facilitate informed and agile response by stakeholders.
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