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# Livelihood Coping Strategies for Food Security in Rural and Urban Settings

*The latest update took place in May 2023. For the latest strategies please refer to the* [*VAM Resource Centre*](https://resources.vam.wfp.org/data-analysis/quantitative/food-security/livelihood-coping-strategies-food-security) *or* [*Survey Designer*](https://wfp.sharepoint.com/sites/NeedsAssessmentsTeam/Shared%20Documents/General/11.%20Standardization/5.%20LCS/LCS%20FS/Survey%20Designer)*.*

## Livelihood Coping Strategies with Stress Severity for both Urban and Rural Settings

#### Lcs\_stress\_Saving During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to spend savings due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: Spending savings weakens the ability of households to fall back on readily available cash, unlike assets that require liquidation.  Savings are understood as money or other valuables (i.e., gold jewellery) put aside for future use/consumption. For example, cash that is put aside for household emergencies, ceremonies, schooling, or other large expenditures. Savings could be also intended for future investments (e.g., family business, buying land livestock etc.).  Lookouts: It is vital to ask about the spending of savings, rather than the spending of the household’s income. Be careful about the use of this strategy in a protracted displacement setting, as most of the households would have exhausted this strategy more than 12 months ago; thus, this strategy would not apply to most households. Note that for the case of gold jewelry, there can be some overlap with “DomAsset,” & “Pawn,” thus, it is advised to avoid using more than one of these strategies in the same module.  Severity: Almost always has a stress severity. | No, there was no need to spend savings because the household did not face food shortages or lack money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) does your household have savings?  2) why did you not spend the savings (or not)? |
| Yes, the household needed to spend savings in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household spent savings to be able to afford food, and not for other reasons. |
| No, because the household had already spent its savings within the last 12 months, and now the household ran out of savings. | If the household responds, “we used to have savings but had to spend them before the past 30 days but within the last year” then the appropriate response option is “no because it had already been exhausted in the last 12 months”. |
| Not applicable as the household has not had savings in over 12 months. | If the household responds, “we do not have savings and did not have savings in the last year, as our income barely covers our expenditures” then the appropriate response choice is “not applicable”. |

### Lcs\_stress\_DomAsset

#### During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to sell household assets/goods (radio, furniture, television, jewellery, etc.) due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: Households with more assets tend to be more resilient and able to cope better with shocks. However, the specific assets used for coping depend on the severity of the shock(s). This strategy entails the selling of non-productive household assets such as radio, furniture, television, jewellery, watches, etc.  Lookouts: Be careful before using this strategy in recent displacement settings (new arrivals), as the strategy might not be relevant for most of the population.  It is important to distinguish between this strategy and others related to the actual selling of household items or borrowing money. As these coping strategies overlap, it is important to avoid using more than one of these strategies: “Savings,” “DomAsset,” & “Pawn” in the same module.  Severity: Almost always has a stress severity. | No, there was no need to sell household assets/goods (radio, furniture, television, jewellery, etc.) because the household did not face food shortages or money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) does your household have non-productive assets?  2) why did you not sell the non-productive assets? |
| Yes, the household needed to sell household assets/goods (radio, furniture, television, jewellery, etc.) in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household sold household non-productive assets to be able to afford food, and not for other reasons. |
| No, because the household had already exhausted this strategy within the last 12 months, and now the household ran out of household assets. | This strategy can be exhausted in extreme catastrophic conditions and the households ran out of all household non-productive assets. |
| Not applicable as the household does not have assets and has not in over 12 months. | It is rare for this option to be selected unless the household has been recently displaced, and thus may have fled and left everything behind. |

#### Lcs\_stress\_ConsActive During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to prioritize the food consumption of active household members due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Uses | What does each response option mean? | Verification example |
| This action might have an impact on the nutritional situation of members who are not consuming enough food. This coping strategy is usually taken in the short-term.  This strategy is usually associated with the male breadwinners, to sustain access to livelihood. Especially if they are involved in income-generating activities that require physical effort (e.g., casual labour).  Active members are defined as household members who work. This means they are engaged in income-generating activities, including production for own consumption of the household.  Lookouts and use: If it is known that the community prioritizes the consumption of males as common practice, then this strategy shouldn’t be included in the module.  Severity: Normally the severity of this strategy is ‘stress’ but in certain contexts, it could have a ‘crisis’ severity level. | No, there was no need to prioritize the food consumption of active household members because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) Is this commonly done by your household?  If prioritizing male/active members in consumption is part of the culture and is not due to lack of food then the appropriate response to this strategy should be “No, there was no need”. |
| Yes, the household needed to prioritize the food consumption of active household members in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household prioritized the food consumption of active members due to lack of food and not due to local customs. |
| No, because the household had already prioritized the food consumption of active household members within the last 12 months, and now food is too little to prioritize among active household members. If the household does so, then there will be no leftovers for other members. |  |
| Not applicable as the household does not have any active members who are engaged in income-generating activities and has not in over 12 months. |  |

#### Lcs\_stress\_SellFoodRation During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to sell, share or exchange food rations due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: Households could sell, share, or exchange food received through assistance for various reasons. Sometimes these options are employed to increase the availability of food by selling/exchanging rations to acquire either more food or other foods which better meet dietary preferences (e.g. palm oil over refined oil, or beans over chickpeas). However, these activities could also indicate reduced vulnerability or an increased need for food not provided through assistance.  High reliance on this strategy could indicate vulnerability and/or selection criteria inaccuracy in design and/or implementation. In other words, involved households may be undertaking this action in order to acquire cheaper food (thus more quantity) or for more preferred foods.  Lookouts and use: Be careful before using this strategy in settings where in-kind food assistance is not very prevalent as the strategy will not apply to many households.  Severity: Almost always has a ‘stress’ severity. | No, there was no need to sell, share and exchange food rations because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it, or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) does your household receive food through assistance or gifts?  2) why did you not sell, share, or exchange the food items? |
| Yes, the household needed to sell, share, or exchange food rations in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household had sold, shared, or exchanged rations to buy more food, or different food to meet their household needs. If it is because they don’t need the food assistance, or the quantity exceeds their consumption needs, then the response is no because there was no need to apply this strategy. |
| No, because the household had already exhausted this strategy within the last 12 months. | This response option does not apply to this specific strategy. |
| Not applicable as the household does not receive food assistance and has not for more than 12 months. | The N/A response is rarely an option for this strategy as it is extremely unlikely that households would run out of any food to exchange, share or sell. |

#### Lcs\_stress\_SellNFIRation During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to sell non-food items that were provided as assistance due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: Households could sell non-food items received through assistance for various reasons. Selling could be done to compensate for lack of food and other needs.  Lookouts and use: Be careful before using this strategy in settings where non-food assistance is not very prevalent as the strategy will not apply to many households. If it is known that most of the target population does not receive non-food assistance (or not often enough), then this strategy should not be included in the module.  Severity: Almost always has a ‘stress’ severity. | No, there was no need to sell non-food items that were provided as assistance because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) does your household receive non-food items through assistance? |
| Yes, the household needed to sell non-food items that were provided as assistance in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household had sold NFI to buy food because they were lacking food, and not because they did not need the non-food assistance. |
| No, because the household had already exhausted this strategy within the last 12 months, and now there is no availability of non-food items from the received assistance. | Ensure that the household refers to non-food items received through assistance that could last for a while, such as items used for shelter or income generation (e.g., tent, cooking pots, bed nets, agricultural tools, etc.). |
| Not applicable as the household does not receive non-food assistance and has not in over 12 months. |  |

#### Lcs\_stress\_EatOut During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to send household members to eat elsewhere due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: To stretch out the little food available to a household, the decision-makers in this household may send some household members to eat at the homes of relatives (not direct household members), neighbours or friends.  Lookouts and use: This coping strategy does not include households eating at community kitchens.  Severity: Usually has a ‘stress’ severity. | No, there was no need to send household members to eat elsewhere because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) why did your household send members to eat elsewhere?  If the household responds: “Yes, we sent our child or other members to his/her friend’s or relatives’ house because he/she was invited for lunch/dinner,” this is not counted as a coping strategy. Similarly, if the children are eating at school as part of the school feeding programme, this is not a coping strategy. |
| Yes, it was necessary to send household members to eat elsewhere in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household had sent members to eat elsewhere due to lack of food or money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had already sent household members to eat elsewhere within the last 12 months, and now the household can no longer transfer this burden onto relatives, friends, or neighbours. |  |
| Not applicable as the household has no other outlet or community support to lean on and has not had it in over 12 months. |  |

#### Lcs\_stress\_BorrowCash During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to borrow money to cover food needs?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Borrowing money from moneylenders, relatives, neighbours or friends to cover food needs is a sign of stress.  Lookouts and use: This activity should be considered when the local context indicates that borrowing money is not common practice, but more of a coping strategy.  Severity: Usually has a ‘stress’ severity. | No, there was no need to borrow money because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) why did you borrow money (or not)? |
| Yes, the household needed to borrow money in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household had to borrow money due to lack of food or of money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had already borrowed money within the last 12 months, and now the household can no longer borrow money from relatives, friends, or neighbours; meaning that this strategy has now been exhausted. Another outlet could have been an institution that would not support and/or has a limit. | It is possible that a household used this strategy before the 30-day recall period and cannot rely on it anymore due to a very high accumulation of debt and/or people refusing to lend the household money until they repay their debts. |
| Not applicable as the household has no way of borrowing money and has not had this option in over 12 months. |  |

#### Lcs\_stress\_Pawn During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to pawn household items due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: When a household’s assets (e.g., gold jewellery, watches) are used as collateral to borrow money. If they can’t re-pay, then the pawnshop will sell it to someone else.  Lookouts and use: It is important to distinguish between this strategy and others related to the actual selling of household items, or borrowing money. As these coping strategies overlap, it is important to avoid using more than one of these strategies: “Savings,” “DomAsset,” & “Pawn” in the same module.  Severity: Usually has a ‘stress’ severity. | No, there was no need to pawn household items because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) does your household have assets that can be pawned?  2) why did you not sell the pawn these assets? |
| Yes, the household needed to pawn household items in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household had to pawn their assets due to lack of food or lack of money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had already pawned household items within the last 12 months, and now does not have desirable/worthy household items that could be pawned. This strategy has already been exhausted in the past year. |  |
| Not applicable as the household does not have desirable/worthy items to pawn and has not had this option in over 12 months. | If the household already does not own any household assets, they are living in a rented house, furnished, and do not have any valuable household assets to pawn. |

#### Lcs\_stress\_LessSchool During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to move children to a less expensive school due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| This strategy would reduce the expenditures of a household on essentials but will most likely impact children’s development.  Lookouts and use: Less applicable in contexts where education costs are covered by organisations/government (e.g., camps settings and public schools), or where admission into / availability of schools is restricted.  Severity: Normally the severity is ‘stress’ for this strategy but in certain contexts, it could have a ‘crisis’ severity level. | No, there was no need to move children to a less expensive school because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  If the household moved the children to a less expensive school not because they are in need of food, but for any other reason (e.g., suitability of the school), then this strategy has not been applied. |
| Yes, the household needed to move children to a less expensive school in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household had to move their children to a less expensive school due to lack of food or of money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had already moved children to a less expensive school within the last 12 months and is no longer able to relocate an even cheaper school; the strategy has already been exhausted. |  |
| Not applicable as the household does not have school-aged children (generally ages 6-18) and has not in more than 12 months or their school-age children have never been enrolled into school. | The not applicable response is only allowed for when the household does not have children within the school-age category, or when their school-age children were never enrolled in school. |

#### Lcs\_stress\_Utilities During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to reduce or cease payments on essential utilities and bills due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| This strategy statement refers to lack of payment of essential services such as electricity, water, telephone, or gas. A utility bill is a statement of the amount owed for essential services or utilities (i.e., gas, electricity, water). It is applied when households either stop or reduce payments of bills of utilities that, if interrupted, that could have consequences on their living standards.  Lookouts and use: Avoid the inclusion of this strategy in camp settings (where utilities are provided free-of-charge) or in areas where these utilities are not available or used by the majority of households.  Severity: Usually has a ‘stress’ severity. | No, there was no need to reduce or cease payments on essential utilities and bills because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) does your household have utilities and bills to cover?  2) why did your household not reduce or default on these essential payments? |
| Yes, the household needed to reduce or cease payments on essential utilities and bills in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household had to reduce or cease payments due to lack of food or of money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had already reduced or ceased payments on essential utilities and bills within the last 12 months, and now cannot further reduce the expenses. This strategy has already been exhausted. |  |
| Not applicable as the household does not have any utility expenditures and has not had these expenditures in over 12 months. |  |

### Lcs\_stress\_Edu

#### During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to reduce expenses on education due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: The reliance on this strategy would have an impact on human capital. When families cut expenditures on basic educational tools (e.g., tutoring, books, calculators) or the quality of means of transport to school (e.g., taxi vs. public transport vs. on-foot).  Lookouts and use: This strategy is less applicable in contexts where education costs are covered by organisations (e.g., camps), or where public systems provide strong coverage.  This strategy should not be included in a module with other education-related strategies such as withdrawing children or moving children to a less expensive school.  Severity: The severity is normally stress but could have a crisis severity level depending on the contextual information available. When the educational expense reduction has an impact on the attendance or retention in school then it could have the crisis severity level. When the severity is determined for the entire target population of interest, then it must be the same across the population and not differ from household to household. | No, there was no need to reduce expenses on education because the household did not face food shortages or money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) do you have any expenses related to education?  2) why did you not need to reduce these expenses? |
| Yes, the household needed to reduce expenses on education in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household had to reduce these expenses due to lack of food or lack of money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had already reduced expenses on education within the last 12 months, and now cannot further reduce the expenses. If the household does so, then there will be some serious risks to their human capital. |  |
| Not applicable as the household does not have any education-related expenditures to be reduced and has not had these expenditures in over 12 months. |  |

## Livelihood Coping Strategies with Crisis Severity for both Urban and Rural Settings

#### Lcs\_crisis\_ProdAsset During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to sell productive assets or means of transport (sewing machine, wheelbarrow, bicycle, car, etc.) due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: Selling off productive assets is a crisis strategy as it decreases household productivity and likely future income levels. This coping strategy would negatively impact income generation for involved households.  Lookouts and use: Ensure that this strategy captures the selling of productive assets by households due to a lack of food or money to buy it, and not for other purposes such as making further investments.  Severity: Almost always has a ‘crisis’ severity. | No, there was no need to sell productive assets or means of transport (sewing machine, wheelbarrow, bicycle, car, etc.) because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) do you have productive assets?  2) why did/didn’t you sell any of your productive assets? |
| Yes, the household needed to sell productive assets or means of transport (sewing machine, wheelbarrow, bicycle, car, etc.) in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household had to sell their productive assets due to lack of food or lack of money to buy it. |
| No, because the household already sold their productive assets or means of transport within the last 12 months and does not have any more that could be sold. This strategy has been exhausted in the past 12 months. |  |
| Not applicable as the household does not have any productive assets to sell and has not had any productive assets to sell in over 12 months. | The response is not applicable if the household responds, “We do not have any productive assets now and have never had any in the past.” |

#### Lcs\_crisis\_Barter During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to barter/exchange clothing for food due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: Bartering of clothes usually occurs when households run out of money and productive and non-productive assets. This is an action that reflects the level of despair and lack of household assets, income, and savings.  Lookouts and use: This strategy is relevant in contexts where cash flow is low/ceased and/or movement is restricted. Thus, bartering is carried out by households to acquire food.  Severity: Usually has a ‘crisis’ severity but can also be considered ‘emergency’ in extremely food insecure areas. | No, there was no need to barter/exchange clothing for food because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy food or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) why did not you barter/exchange clothes for food? |
| Yes, the household needed to barter/ exchange clothing for food in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household had to barter/exchange their clothing due to lack of food or money to buy it. If the exchange of clothes was done because the clothes are no longer used by the HH members (e.g., clothes are no longer fitting the children) and they were sold/or bartered, then the response to this strategy should be no. |
| No, because the household had already exhausted this strategy within the last 12 months, and now does not have many clothes or shoes left to barter or exchange; this strategy has been exhausted already in the last 12 months. | In extremely food insecure areas (e.g., famine/catastrophe), it is possible that a household would have already gotten rid of or traded their clothing to the maximum extent possible the past 12 months, thus exhausting this strategy. |
| Not applicable as the household does not have any outlets or does not have anyone with whom to exchange (or doesn’t have clothes to exchange) and has not had this option in over 12 months. | This could be found in extreme food insecure areas (e.g., famine/catastrophe). |

#### Lcs\_crisis\_Health During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to reduce expenses on essential health (including drugs) due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: The reliance on this strategy would impact the human capital of the household, so is considered a crisis strategy.  Essential health services include reproductive, maternal, new-born and child health, infectious diseases, and non-communicable diseases.  Essential medicines are those that satisfy the priority health care needs of a population. They are selected with due regard to disease prevalence and public health relevance, evidence of efficacy and safety and comparative cost-effectiveness.  This strategy is less applicable in contexts where health costs (incl. medicine) are covered by organisations (e.g., camps), or where public systems provide strong coverage.  Examples: 1) Reducing doses of essential medications or prioritizing essential medicines over others (e.g., diabetes, hypertension medication). 2) Not buying medications for chronic or critical diseases. 3) Postponing/delaying surgeries and delaying or stopping a medicine for chronic diseases (e.g., chemo sessions).  Severity: Almost always has a ‘crisis’ severity. | No, there was no need to reduce expenses on essential health (including drugs) because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy food or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) do you have any expenses related to essential health needs?  2) why did you reduce these expenses (or not)? |
| Yes, the household needed to reduce expenses on essential health (including medications) in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household has had to reduce this expenditure due to lack of food or money to buy it, and that the cuts relate to essential health expenditures. Reductions in spending on non-essential health expenses such as acute, non-serious viral infections (e.g. flu) or switching from original medicines to generic medicines are not considered reductions in essential health benefits. Also, if the cutback of medicines is due to reluctance to follow medical advice, it is not a coping strategy; this is a personal decision. |
| No, because the household had already reduced expenses on essential health (including medications) within the last 12 months and cannot further reduce the expenses. Or the household member(s) stopped taking medicine more than one year ago. |  |
| Not applicable as the household does not have any health-related expenditures to be reduced and has not had this option in over 12 months.  This response option does not apply to this specific strategy. | The N/A response is not an option in this case as it is extremely unlikely that households (even of a single person) would be zero. In 12 months’, time, a household is likely to have spent at least something, even if minimal (e.g., over the counter medications). |

#### Lcs\_crisis\_Housing During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to move to less expensive accommodation due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: Households might apply this strategy to reduce their expenditures and be able to afford food. This strategy may disrupt their daily lives.  Lookouts and use: Less applicable in contexts where accommodation is provided/covered by an organisation (e.g., camps). However, fits contexts where most households are renting their homes.  Severity: Normally the severity of this strategy is ‘crisis,’ but in certain contexts it could have a ‘stress’ severity level. | No, there was no need to move to less expensive accommodation because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy food or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) why did you need to apply this strategy (or not)? |
| Yes, the household needed to move to less expensive accommodation in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household had to move to a less expensive accommodation due to lack of food or money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had already exhausted this strategy within the last 12 months, and now is not able to relocate to even cheaper accommodation. |  |
| Not applicable as the household is not able to relocate to cheaper accommodation and has not had this option in over 12 months. It is possible that the household is restricted to the current accommodation due to ownership or residence status. |  |

#### Lcs\_crisis\_HHSeparation During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to send one or more household members to live elsewhere due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: To stretch out the little food available to a household, the decision-makers in this household could send members to live and eat at the home of relatives or friends.  Severity: Normally the severity is ‘crisis’ for this strategy, but in certain contexts, it could have a ‘stress’ severity level. | No, there was no need to send one or more household members to live elsewhere because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) why did you need to apply this strategy (or not)? |
| Yes, the household needed to send one or more household members to live elsewhere in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that the household sent one or more members to live elsewhere due to lack of food or money to buy it, and not for any other reason (e.g., access to education). |
| No, because the household had already exhausted this strategy within the last 12 months, and now the household can no longer transfer any further burden onto relatives, friends, or neighbours. |  |
| Not applicable as the household has no other outlet or community support to lean on and has not had it in over 12 months. This could also be N/A when a household consists of only one member. |  |

#### Lcs\_crisis\_OutSchool During the past 30 days, did your household have to withdraw children from school (compulsory education) due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: This decreases human capital, so is considered a crisis strategy, removing children from school will have a huge influence on their future productivity and it is a violation of their right to education.  Lookouts and use: This strategy is relevant for households with children who are of school age for compulsory education (normally this is ages 6-16). If a household withdrew children from high school or vocational high education to contribute to household income, this is not considered under this coping strategy.  Severity: Normally the severity is ‘crisis’ for this strategy, but in certain contexts, it could be considered ‘emergency’ severity level. | No, there was no need to withdraw children from school because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) do you have any school-aged children?  2) why did you need to apply this strategy (or not)? |
| Yes, the household needed to withdraw children from school in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that they withdrew children from school due to lack of food or lack of money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had already withdrawn children from school within the last 12 months. | If the household already withdrew all their school-aged children from school due to lack of money before the 30 days, and within the last 12 months. |
| Not applicable as the household does not have school-aged children and did not in the last 12 months. It is also possible that the household has school-aged children who have never been enrolled in school or have withdrawn from school more than 12 months ago. | The not applicable response is only relevant if the household:  1) does not have children within the school-age category.  2) never enrolled their children in school or the children were withdrawn more than 12 months prior to the interview.  3) there are no schools around. |

#### Lcs\_crisis\_Migration During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to migrate informally/ irregularly due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: This is an activity that could pose protection risks to the involved household member. This strategy may reflect the degree of desperation of the household in search of food, as households are willing to accept these protection risks to overcome food needs.  Irregular migration: Movement of persons that takes place outside the laws, regulations, or international agreements governing the entry into or exit from the state of origin, transit, or destination. The term is generally used to identify persons moving outside regular migration channels.  Lookouts and use: This strategy refers to international migration and not to the domestic movement in certain contexts such as the rural to urban migration (i.e., urbanization). Domestic migration should be considered through another strategy.  Avoid including this strategy together with the informal migration of children coping strategy.  Severity: Normally this is classified as a ‘crisis’ strategy; however, depending on the context and the protection risks associated with informal migration, this strategy could have the severity of an ‘emergency’. | No, there was no need to have a household member informally migrate because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) why was there a need to apply this strategy? |
| Yes, the household needed to have a member informally migrate in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to lack of food or money to buy it. If migration is done to find better livelihood opportunities or done using formal routes, this is not considered as this coping strategy. |
| No, because the household already has a household member who had informally migrated within the last 12 months, and others are not able to migrate informally due to physical, financial, or other constraints in their household/community. |  |
| Not applicable as the household has no way to migrate and has not had this option in over 12 months. |  |

#### Lcs\_crisis\_DomMigration During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to move within the country (as an internally displaced person - IDP) due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: This is an activity that could pose protection risks to the involved household member(s). This strategy may reflect the degree of desperation of the household in search of food, as households are willing to accept these protection risks to overcome food needs.  Lookouts and use: This strategy refers to internally displaced persons (IDPs) and **does not** refer to regular internal movements for reasons such as rural to urban migration (i.e., urbanization). This strategy would be particularly useful in contexts where there are regular internal displacements due to conflict or extreme weather events (i.e., droughts, floods, etc), in which households are forced to move internally to seek out resources, including food. **This strategy must not be applied in contexts where there are regular internal movements by choice or specifically in search of food, e.g., nomadic herding communities.**  Severity: Normally this is classified as a ‘crisis’ strategy; however, depending on the context and the protection risks associated with informal migration, this strategy could have the severity of ‘stress’. | No, there was no need to have a household member move within the country as an IDP because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) why was there a need to apply this strategy? |
| Yes, the household needed to have a member move within the country as an IDP in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to lack of food or money to buy it. If movements were made to find better livelihood opportunities, this is not considered as this coping strategy. In addition, this should not be counted for certain communities (e.g., nomadic herders) who normally engage in regular within country movements specifically to look for food. |
| No, because the household already has a household member who moved within the country within the last 12 months, and others are not able to do so due to physical, financial, or other constraints in their household/community. |  |
| Not applicable as the household has no way to move and has not had this option in over 12 months. |  |

#### Lcs\_crisis\_ChildWork During the past 30 days, did any children (under 15 years old) in your household work to contribute to the household income (e.g., casual labour) due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: A strategy that affects human capital and child development. It could be difficult to reverse and could have a negative impact on the education of children.  Lookouts and use: This strategy may be less applicable in places where the law strictly prohibits child labour that would result in legal liability.  Severity: Depending on the context, this strategy could have the severity of ‘emergency,’ and not necessarily ‘crisis’. | No, there was no need to engage children (under 15 years old) in work to contribute to the household income (e.g., casual labour) because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) do you have any children under the age of 15?  2) why did you need to apply this strategy (or not)? |
| Yes, the household needed to engage children (under 15 years old) in work to contribute to the household income (e.g., casual labour) in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to a lack of food or lack of money to buy it. For example, if a household engaged any children (under 15) to work with them in a family business or a farm during their holidays, and not due to lack of food or money, then the appropriate response option is “no, there was no need to”. |
| No, because the household had already been engaging children (under 15 years old) in work to contribute to the household income (e.g., casual labour) within the last 12 months; there are no more children to put to work, so this strategy has been exhausted. | If a household already sent all their children (under 15) to work due to lack of money before the 30 days, and within the last 12 months then this is the most appropriate response option. |
| Not applicable as the household does not have small children (under 15) and has not in over 12 months, or all children are already have already been working for over 12 months. | The not applicable response is only relevant when the household does not have children between 6 and 15 years old; has children who cannot physically work; or has already been engaging in work for over 12 months. |

## Livelihood Coping Strategies with Emergency Severity for both Urban and Rural Settings

#### Lcs\_em\_ChildMigration During the past 30 days, did any minor household members (under 15) migrate informally due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: A serious and difficult-to-reverse activity which poses child protection risks to the involved minor migrants.  Irregular migration: Movement of persons that takes place outside the laws, regulations, or international agreements governing the entry into or exit from the State of origin, transit or destination. The term is generally used to identify persons moving outside regular migration channels.  Lookouts and use: Normally reflect a low frequency of households relying on this strategy compared to other emergency strategies. This strategy refers to international migration and not to the domestic movement in certain contexts such as the rural to urban migration (i.e., urbanization). Domestic migration should be considered through another strategy. Only relevant in a context where informal migration is feasible.  Avoid including this strategy together with the informal migration coping strategy.  The age included in the parentheses can be adjusted to the maximum age in which the local law considers persons as minors.  Severity: The severity of this strategy is almost always ‘emergency’. | No, there was no need for a minor (under 15) in the household to migrate informally because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.   1. do you have any children under the age of 15? 2. Why did they have to migrate? |
| Yes, the household needed to have a minor household member (under 15) migrate informally in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to lack of food or money to buy it. |
| No, because all minor members (under 15) in the household had already migrated informally within the last 12 months and the household no longer has other children under the age of 15. |  |
| Not applicable as the household does not have children (under 15) and has not in over 12 months. | The household might not have any more children under the age of 15, and thus cannot apply this strategy. Or it could be that other children are not able to migrate informally due to physical, financial, or other constraints in their household/community. |

#### Lcs\_em\_IllegalAct During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to engage in socially degrading, high-risk, exploitive or life-threatening jobs or income-generating activities (e.g., smuggling, theft, joining armed groups, prostitution) due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: This coping strategy is referring to income-generating activities that are high risk or socially degrading - thus, leading to loss of human dignity and posing protection risks to involved household members.  Lookouts and use: Need to emphasis the reasons for engaging in illegal activities: often it could be financially rewarding (e.g., smuggling, selling drugs) and people do it because of that, not because they are desperate or in need of food. Avoid using this strategy in contexts where households would be fearful of reporting such activities.  Some activities are illegal by law, but they are still considered normal activities such as charcoal production, or refugees who are by law not allowed to work outside camps. Given that these activities are regularly accepted, they would not be qualified as an emergency strategy.  Severity: The severity of this strategy is almost always ‘emergency’. | No, there was no need to engage in socially degrading, high-risk, exploitive or life-threatening jobs or income-generating activities because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  Probing should be context-specific and refer to commonly used socially degrading, risky or exploitative activities. For example, if smuggling is a common activity for vulnerable households, then probing should focus on this, among others. Different terms can be used to describe these activities to soften the language. For example, smuggling can be rephrased as crossing the border with unregistered goods. Another example: joining armed groups could be reformulated as participating in groups to protect their families/communities. |
| Yes, the household needed to engage in socially degrading, high-risk, exploitive or life-threatening jobs or income-generating activities in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to lack of food or money to buy it. |
| No, because the household has already engaged in socially degrading, high-risk, exploitive or life-threatening jobs or income-generating activities within the last 12 months and this strategy has been exhausted as continuation would have more severe consequences. |  |
| This response option does not apply to this specific strategy. | The not applicable response is not an option for this question because it could be applicable to all households if they are truly in need. While households that apply this strategy might have concerns about responding to this question, it is necessary to ask in order to understand if they have reached a level of emergency and have employed such a strategy. |

#### Lcs\_em\_Begged During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to beg (i.e., ask strangers on the streets for money or food) and/or scavenge due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: This strategy poses protection risks and entails a loss of human dignity.  Lookouts and use: Often difficult to interpret, and highly dependent on how 'begging' is understood and translated in local languages. It is sometimes understood as relying on friends and family for support, which is not an emergency strategy. Therefore, translation to the local language should reflect begging, which is asking strangers for money or food.  If a household reports relying on friends and family for support then refer to the previous stress strategy listed about “borrowed money to cover food needs”.  Asking support from local NGOs and INGO, is not considered begging and not part of this emergency strategy.  In certain contexts, where selling gum, tissues, etc. on the streets are seen as begging (and undignified), then such activities could be considered under this strategy.  Severity: Almost always classified as ‘emergency’ severity. | No, there was no need to beg byasking strangers for money/food and/or scavenging because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  If the household reported having relied on friends and family for support, then the response is “no they did not need to apply this strategy.” |
| Yes, the household needed to beg byasking strangers for money or food and/or scavenging in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to lack of food or money to buy it and it is not a normal activity. |
| No, because the household had already exhausted this strategy within the last 12 months and there are no more people in the community to beg from. | The exhaustion of this coping strategy occurs only in catastrophic/famine situations where there is near exhaustion of livelihoods in the community. |
| This response option does not apply to this specific strategy. | The not applicable response is not an option, because if the household is really in need and in an emergency, they will resort to asking for money from strangers. It is unlikely that this strategy is exhausted more than 12 months ago (i.e., complete exhaustion of livelihoods for more than a year). |

#### Lcs\_em\_Marriage

#### During the past 30 days, was any female child member (under 15) married off due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: An irreversible activity that could disturb children’s health and education as well as their future socioeconomic status. It is also a direct and immediate child protection issue.  Lookouts and use: In many cases, it is applied by families to reduce financial burdens. The age included in parenthesis can be adjusted to the maximum age in which the local law considers persons as minors.  Less applicable in contexts where child marriage is common practice (e.g. Yemen) for other reasons.  Severity: Almost always has an ‘emergency’ severity. | No, there was no need to marry off any female child members (under 15) because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.   1. do you have any female children under the age of 15? 2. were they married in the past year? |
| Yes, the household needed to marry off a female child member (under 15) in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to a lack of food or lack of money to buy it.  If the household married off their female child who is under 15 because it is culturally accepted and not due to lack of food or money, then the appropriate response option is “no, there was no need to”. |
| No, because the household had already married off a female child member (under 15) within the last 12 months, and now the household does not have single females under the age of 15 to be married off. |  |
| Not applicable as the household does not have female children (under 15) and has not in over 12 months. | The not applicable response is only relevant when the household does not have any female children under the age of 15. |

#### Lcs\_em\_ResAsset During the past 30 days, did your household have to mortgage/sell the ​house where your household was permanently living in or land due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: A strategy that involves the selling of house or land is particularly difficult to reverse.  Lookouts and use: Normally this strategy reflects a low frequency of households relying on this strategy compared to other emergency strategies, especially in the context where ownership of houses or land is very rare (e.g., protracted displacement crisis). Hence, considerations of the context must be made before the inclusion of this strategy in the module. This strategy could be relevant in contexts where most households own their homes/lands.  Avoid the inclusion of this strategy in refugee or IDP settings where ownership of housing or land is not common.  Severity: Almost always has an ‘emergency’ severity. | No, there was no need to mortgage/sell their​house or land because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) do you own a house or land?  If the household responds that they will never sell their house as it is their only shelter, then the appropriate response option is “no there was no need to”.  If the household was in real need and the only option is to sell their house, eventually they will undertake this strategy. |
| Yes, the household needed to mortgage/sell their ​house or land in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to a lack of food or lack of money to buy it.  If the household responds, “yes, we sold our house because we wanted to buy another house” then the appropriate response option is “no, there was no need to”.  Ensure that the sold/mortgaged house was their primary house (i.e., where they used to live). If the reference is made to a second house, then this is not considered under this emergency coping strategy. Thus, the appropriate response option is “no, there was no need to”.  If the sale is related to land, make sure that the household has sold its land that it relied on for agricultural and/or pastoral production, or is the land that they lived on, and in relation to a lack of food or money to buy food. |
| No, because the household had already mortgaged/sold ​their house or land within the last 12 months and can no longer mortgage or have an additional house/land to sell, thus exhausting this strategy. | If the household sold their house or land prior to the last 30 days, but within the last 12 months period and the reason for this was to cover food needs. |
| Not applicable as the household does not own a house or land and did not have these assets in over 12 months. | If the household responds that they do not own a house or land, or they are living in a rented house or rented land to grow their crops then the appropriate response option is “not applicable”. |

# Livelihood Coping Strategies for Food Security in Rural Settings

The latest update in 2022 (for more recent strategies please refer to the [VAM Resource Centre](https://resources.vam.wfp.org/data-analysis/quantitative/food-security/livelihood-coping-strategies-food-security) or [Survey Designer](https://wfp.sharepoint.com/sites/NeedsAssessmentsTeam/Shared%20Documents/General/11.%20Standardization/5.%20LCS/LCS%20FS/Survey%20Designer)).

## Livelihood Coping Strategies with Stress Severity for Rural Setting

#### LcsR\_stress\_Animals During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to sell more animals than usual due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: The strategy indicates a hindered ability to deal with future shocks due to the reduction of the household’s livestock assets.  Lookouts and use: Specifically relevant to livestock producers who keep animals for own consumption, or reproduction or animal power or transportation.  Be careful of how the question is asked in pastoral settings, where it is normal for households to sell animals for income generation. Emphasis is placed on “more than usual due to a lack of food or money to buy food”. The usual is always compared to before the last recent shock.  Severity: Usually has a ‘stress’ severity given that it would generate income for involved households in the short-term but less wealth or livestock to fall onto when faced with future shocks. | No, there was no need to sell more animals than usual because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) do you have animals or raise animals?  2) why did you sell your animals (or not)?  If the household responds “yes, we sold more animals than usual”, and explained that it was due to increased prices of animals, thus making more profit, then the appropriate response option is “No, they did not need to”. |
| Yes, the household needed to sell more animals than usual in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to a lack of food or lack of money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had sold more animals than usual within the last 12 months, and now does not have any animals to be sold; this strategy has already been exhausted in the past 12 months. |  |
| Not applicable as the household did not have any animals to sell and has not had any in over 12 months. | If the household does not have animals to sell and did not have animals before, then the appropriate response option is “not applicable”. If the household already exhausted this strategy more than 12 months ago, then the appropriate response option is “not applicable”. |

## Livelihood Coping Strategies with Crisis Severity for Rural Setting

#### LcsR\_crisis\_AgriCare During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to decrease expenditures on fertilizer, pesticide, fodder, animal feed, veterinary care, etc. due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: These actions decrease agricultural production and likely future income levels as this activity would negatively impact the upcoming harvest.The strategy refers to any agricultural inputs that are critical to the productivity of the household's agricultural or livestock enterprise. Depending on the context, the examples in the strategy statement may also include inputs such as seeds, machinery, and the use of hired labour to carry out agricultural activities such as sowing, seeding, weeding, etc.  Lookouts and use: Specific to farmer/agricultural households or livestock producers.  Severity: Almost always has a ‘crisis’ severity. | No, there was no need to decrease expenditures on fertilizer, pesticide, fodder, animal feed, veterinary care, etc. because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) do you rent or own a farm/land where you grow crops or keep livestock?  2) has there been a growing season in the last 30 days? |
| Yes, the household needed to decrease expenditures on fertilizer, pesticide, fodder, animal feed, veterinary care, etc. in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to a lack of food or lack of money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had already decreased or cut expenditures on fertilizer, pesticide, fodder, animal feed, veterinary care, etc. within the last 12 months and thus this strategy has been exhausted; it is not possible to reduce further. |  |
| Not applicable as the household does not have any expenditures related to agricultural inputs and has not had any in over 12 months. | If the household responds that they are not farmers and they have not been in the past 12 months, then the appropriate response option is not applicable. |

#### LcsR\_crisis\_ImmCrops During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to harvest immature crops (e.g., green maize) due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: This strategy reduces crop yields and is normally has less nutritional value, thus possibly perpetuating food insecurity.  Lookouts and use: Specifically, relevant to farming/agricultural households.  Severity: Almost always has a ‘crisis’ severity. | No, there was no need to harvest immature crops (e.g., green maize) because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) do you have a farm or land where you grow crops?  2) why did you not harvest immature crops? |
| Yes, the household needed to harvest immature crops (e.g., green maize) in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | If the household responds, “yes, we sold immature crops,” but stressed that this was due to the increasing prices of the crops, thus making more profit, then they did not need to do it due to lack of food and the answer should be “no, there was no need”. |
| No, because the household had already harvested immature crops (e.g., green maize) within the last 12 months, and now does not have any more immature crops to be harvested. | If the household responds “no, we are currently not growing any crops as this is not the appropriate season but had harvested immature crops within the last 12 months” then the appropriate response option is “no, because the household had already exhausted this strategy”. |
| Not applicable as the household does not have any immature crops to sell and has not had any crops in over 12 months. | If the household responding is not involved in farming, then the appropriate response is “not applicable”. |

#### LcsR\_crisis\_Seed During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to consume seed stocks that were to be saved for the next season due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: Consumption of seed stocks intended for future planting would likely reduce future income levels as this activity would negatively impact the upcoming harvest. If the consumption is done for a large amount of seeds, then this strategy is difficult to reverse, at least for the upcoming season.  Lookouts and use: Specifically relevant to farmer households.  Severity: Depending on the context, this strategy could have the severity of an ‘emergency’, and not necessarily a ‘crisis’. | No, there was no need to consume seed stocks that were to be saved for the next season because the household did not face food shortages or money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) do you have a farm or land where you grow crops?  2) why did you not consume or sell seed stock? |
| Yes, the household needed to consume seed stocks that were meant to be saved for the next season in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to lack of food or lack of money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had already consumed seed stocks that were to be saved for a following season within the last 12 months, and now does not have any seed stocks to consume. | If the household reported already consuming or selling their seed stock within the last 12 months and before the last 30 days. Thus, does not have any seed stocks anymore. |
| Not applicable as the household does not have any seed stocks to consume and has not had seed stocks in over 12 months. | If the household responds,” we are not farmers and we do not have land to grow.” Or if the household has a farm or grow land but does not have seed stocks. |

## Livelihood Coping Strategies with Emergency Severity for Rural Setting

#### LcsR\_em\_FemAnimal During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to sell the last female (productive) animal due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: Female animals are the reproductive assets for rural households, which can provide milk and give birth to more animals that could be sold for income generation. Selling the last female animal is difficult to reverse and it could be a last resort for a rural household.  Lookouts and use: Specifically, relevant to livestock producers.  Be careful how the question is asked in pastoral settings, where it is normal for households to sell animals for income generation. Strictly refer to the last remaining female animal. Selecting this strategy without much relevance to the target population can be expected to have a low frequency/response. Hence, please consider the context before inclusion in the module (only appropriate for rural/agricultural settings).  Severity: Almost always has an ‘emergency’ severity. | No, there was no need to sell the last female (productive) animals because the household did not face shortages of food or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) do you own and raise female animals?  2) why did you sell your last female animal (or not)?  If the household responds that they need money, but they will never sell their only female animal as it generates income for them, then the appropriate response option is “no, they did not need to”, as the household did not reach the level of emergency to sell their last female animal. |
| Yes, the household needed to sell the last female (productive) animal in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to lack of food or lack of money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had already sold the last female (productive) animal within the last 12 months, and now does not have any more female animals to be sold. | If the household had female animals in the last 12 months but had already sold them, then the strategy is exhausted. |
| Not applicable as the household does not have any female animals to sell and has not had female animals in over 12 months. | If the household responds, “we do not have female animals to sell and did not have animals before”, then the appropriate response option is not applicable. If applied before the past 12 months due to a lack of food, then the response should be not applicable. |

#### LcsR\_em\_WildFood During the past 30 days, did anyone in your household have to gather wild foods (not normally consumed) due to a lack of food or money to buy it?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rationale/Use | What does each response option mean? | Verification examples |
| Rationale: Depending on the context, this activity could be a sign of a famine survival strategy. In rural areas, when markets run low or out of staple crops, households may turn to wild foods, which are also referred to as “famine foods”.  In emergency situations, households can be forced to eat all possible ‘wild foods,’ which are not normally consumed, e.g., hunting of wild animals, birds and scavenging of plants, including inedible plants; this should be flagged when it is done in excess or in the extreme cases or when households become reliant on these food sources. For example, during the famine around 1995 in North Korea, birds and other wild animals were hunted to near extinction, and households resorted to consuming grass and tree bark.[[1]](#footnote-2)  Lookouts and use: When the strategy is asked, emphasis must be put on the extensive use of wild foods due to the unavailability of staple foods. In addition, this strategy is uncommon in urban settings; therefore, avoid its inclusion unless relevant in exceptional cases.  Consumption of wild foods to complement the household’s diet cannot be considered under this strategy (i.e., wild fruit, roots) such as in Yemen where Nabeekh, Dammun are wild edible plants that are traditionally collected and used.  Severity: Almost always has an ‘emergency’ severity. | No, there was no need to gather wild foods because the household did not face food shortages or lack of money to buy it or had applied another livelihood coping strategy. | Probing is needed to ensure the selection of the most appropriate response.  1) Is this normally done?  2) why was this strategy applied? |
| Yes, the household needed to gather wild foods in the last 30 days due to a lack of food or money to buy it. | Ensure that this strategy was applied due to a lack of food or lack of money to buy it, and it is not part of the local culture (e.g. hunting for sport). In some contexts, gathering wild foods or foraging can be a personal or household preference (e.g., truffle or mushroom hunting), and not due to a lack of food or money to buy it. |
| No, because the household had already gathered wild foods within the last 12 months, and now does not have enough access to and availability of wild foods. The household has already exhausted this strategy in the past 12 months. |  |
| Not applicable as the household does not have access to wild foods to gather and has not had access to this option in over 12 months (arid settings). |  |
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1. Source: [IPC-Guidance-Note-on-Famine.pdf (ipcinfo.org)](https://www.ipcinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/ipcinfo/docs/IPC-Guidance-Note-on-Famine.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)