Overall, food security status is not expected to change much until after the end of the agricultural season and the return of labour migrants immediately before the winter. Food security status in the country during the summer and autumn will depend mostly on the following factors:

1. **Food prices** are expected to increase in August during Ramadan and later when the winter and lean season start. Fuel prices and imported wheat prices remain high and are not expected to decrease with the onset of the autumn cultivation season.

2. **Remittances** will be an important determinant for household food security and should be monitored closely for changes in volume. A higher rate of remittances -- 29% more for the first five months of 2011 compared to the same period last year -- will continue to play a crucial role in acquiring the minimum food basket. Without remittances, as trends for this round FSMS indicates, households will continue to use coping strategies, including reducing expenditures in essential areas, such as health care.

3. **Crop yields** are critical for people in the most food insecure areas. The overall impact of the poor harvest which is forecast for this year is still to be determined, especially for potatoes in the most food insecure zones of the Rasht and Zarafshan Valleys.

**Overview of household food security between April and July 2011**

- **THE OVERALL FOOD SECURITY SITUATION** is similar to the April and November 2010 rounds, with around 24% of the households interviewed classified as food insecure.
- The data shows an aggravated situation among households that do not cultivate crops or receive remittances and are located in remote areas such as parts of the Rasht and Zarafshan Valleys or in parts of Khatlon (Khuroson, Temurmalik and Qumsangir).
- **POOR QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF DRINKING WATER AND HIGH STAPLE FOOD PRICES** represent the main threats to households’ food security.
- **HIGHER REMITTANCES AND HARVEST** allow households to cope with high food and fuel prices and to keep acceptable food consumption.

**Outlook for the coming months (August to October 2011)**

Overall, food security status is not expected to change much until after the end of the agricultural season and the return of labour migrants immediately before the winter. Food security status in the country during the summer and autumn will depend mostly on the following factors:

1. **Food prices** are expected to increase in August during Ramadan and later when the winter and lean season start. Fuel prices and imported wheat prices remain high and are not expected to decrease with the onset of the autumn cultivation season.

2. **Remittances** will be an important determinant for household food security and should be monitored closely for changes in volume. A higher rate of remittances -- 29% more for the first five months of 2011 compared to the same period last year -- will continue to play a crucial role in acquiring the minimum food basket. Without remittances, as trends for this round FSMS indicates, households will continue to use coping strategies, including reducing expenditures in essential areas, such as health care.

3. **Crop yields** are critical for people in the most food insecure areas. The overall impact of the poor harvest which is forecast for this year is still to be determined, especially for potatoes in the most food insecure zones of the Rasht and Zarafshan Valleys.
### Zone and districts with highest food insecurity levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone and districts</th>
<th>Food insecurity level*</th>
<th>Specific shocks and factors</th>
<th>Chronic food security factors – all zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Zone 17 – Jirgatol, Tojikobod, Rasht** | This round: 97% Last year: 91% | • 91% report the high food prices as a main shock in the past 3 months  
• Protein-deficient food consumption (cereals, tea and vegetables/fruits)  
• 74% take new debts in the past three months, in most cases to buy food (4 out of 5)  
• Reduce number of meals as a coping strategy. Highest Coping Strategy Index  
• Very high reliance on markets for food  
• 97% households cultivated potato expect receive less harvest compared to 2010  
• Lowest estimated monthly income (316 TJS-$66/month/family) | **Food Availability**  
- Harsh weather conditions (drought)  
- Poor access to irrigation water  
- Reduced harvest compared to 2010  
- Lack of seeds  
- Lack of investment capital and access to credit |
| **Zone 11 – K. Mastchoh, Aini, South Pendjakent** | This round: 30% Last year: 20% | • Remittances are the main source of income (66%)  
• 66% of the household budget is spent on food  
• 100% are not able to build sufficient stocks for the coming months  
• Low estimated monthly income (TJS350-$74/month/family) | **Food Access**  
- High food prices  
- Lack of permanent jobs  
- High dependence on markets for food  
- High level of indebted households  
- High level of remittances |
| **Zone 5 – Khuroson, Yovon, Jomi** | This round: 66% Last year: 21% | • 83% have not recovered from their main shocks (reduced drinking water quality and quantity, high level of crop pest, high food prices)  
• Protein-deficient food consumption (cereals, vegetables and tea).  
• 43% took new debts in the past three months, mainly for buying food  
• The main income of 43% interviewed households is remittances, 11% charity  
• 49% do not have sufficient stocks for the coming months | **Food Utilization**  
- Poor access to drinking water  
- Increased percentage of households reporting health problems in summer (diarrhea)  
- Insufficient access to health drugs  
- Reduced expenditures on health and drugs  
- Poor dietary diversity  
- Poor knowledge of feeding and care practices |
| **Zone 3 – Pendjakent** | This round: 32% Last year: 3% | • 69% have not recovered from main shocks  
• Reduce number of meals as a coping strategy. High Coping Strategy Index  
• Main livelihood: remittances (83%)  
• Loss of livestock due to of livestock disease (17%)  
• Lack of irrigation water and less harvest compared to 2010  
• Drastic increase requires further assessment and analysis | **Other**  
- Low education of household head |
| **Zone 9 – Temurmalik** | This round: 31% Last year: 20% | • High levels of livestock diseases  
• 54% of households do not possess food stocks  
• Less harvest compared to last year due to bad climatic conditions  
• Main sources of income: daily wage labor (20%), remittances (26%), pension and government salaries (11%) and charity/borrowings (9%)  
• 49% took new debts in the past 3 months, 76% for buying food | **Food Utilization**  
- Poor access to drinking water  
- Increased percentage of households reporting health problems in summer (diarrhea)  
- Insufficient access to health drugs  
- Reduced expenditures on health and drugs  
- Poor dietary diversity  
- Poor knowledge of feeding and care practices |
| **Zone 1 – Qumsangir** | This round: 25% Last year: 21% | • 86% can not build sufficient stocks for the coming months due to lack of income  
• 46% took new debts in the past three months  
• Charity is the main source of the income for 17% of interviewed households  
• 37% of households reported receiving less harvest of wheat and potato than last year due to bad climatic conditions | **Other**  
- Low education of household head |

*The Food Insecurity level is calculated by cross tabulating income sources and food consumption of a household and by combining severe and moderate food insecurity. The full methodology is available at [http://untj.org/files/library/Emergency_Food_Security_Assessment_in_Rural_Areas_of_Tajikistan_2008.pdf](http://untj.org/files/library/Emergency_Food_Security_Assessment_in_Rural_Areas_of_Tajikistan_2008.pdf), p. 23. The levels presented here are indicative and representative for the interviewed population only. Results are for the 665 households interviewed in July 2011. The arrows represent the change between the food security status of this round and last year at the same season.
Context

- The last bulletin, in February 2011, reported price increases for food and fuel as the main threat to food security in the country. Since then, the situation has stabilized and food prices remain at similar levels over the past three months but still at much higher levels than last year at the same period.1
- High fuel prices have an impact on other agricultural inputs such as fertilizers which, according to information provided by the Agriculture Information Service of Tajikistan (www.aist.tj), have considerably increased (by 44%) since the beginning of the year.
- IMF and NBT data indicate that inflows of remittances are set to establish a record in 2011 surpassing 2008 when $2.5 billion was sent by migrants to the country.2
- The Ministry of Agriculture with support from FAO and WFP is currently conducting a Crop and Food Security Assessment Mission (CSFAM). This assessment will link the 2010-2011 agricultural season to the food security situation in the country. It should inform further what the impact of the poor rainfall in some areas will be on the potato, cereal and fruit harvests.

Shocks3

While last year high food prices represented the main shock for the households interviewed, this round drinking water quantity and quality is the main preoccupation (especially in Khuroson, Asht, Vanj and Temurmalik). FSMS data from previous rounds show that the main sources of water are rivers, irrigation canals and standing water. The link between food (in)security and water access/use is manifested primarily through illness and the costs associated with managing those illnesses. The scarcity of irrigation water is also a serious concern for household family farms and their ability to produce food for home consumption and cash.

High food prices remain second on the list of shocks experienced in rural areas: 25% of the households cite it as their main shock. This shock is particularly cited in regions where households purchase food from markets or where the harvest will come later in the summer such as Jirgatol/ Tavildara (97% of the households), Nurobod/Rasht (66%) and Muminobod/Shurobod (63%).

2 International Monetary Fund and National Bank of Tajikistan monitor monthly the remittances sent to the country since 2002
3 Shocks are defined by an event that has a negative impact on food and nutrition security. Shocks can be natural or caused by human action

Coping strategies1

Compared to last year at the same period measurements along the Coping Strategy Index (CSI) have improved: households use harmful coping strategies less frequently.

Evolution of the Coping Strategy Index

To cope with the situation, households use different coping strategies. For instance, 71% of the households surveyed in Nurobod and 49% in Jirgatol rely on less expensive food, while the majority of the households in Penjikent, Asht, Jirgatol and Ghonchi have reduced the number of meals eaten per day at least 6 times a month. 57% of the households surveyed in Jilikul and 26% in Maschoh districts reported skipping meals entirely for 1 to 3 days in a month, while around 90% of families interviewed in Faizobod seek alternative employment.

In addition, 20% of all surveyed households mentioned that to deal with the problems they faced they had to decrease family’s expenditures for health care. This is more than last year at the same period and could have impacts beyond food-related vulnerability, especially for children under the age of five.

Remittances

In the last round, 31% of the households interviewed were receiving regular remittances. This round 41% of the households regularly received remittances in the past three months. This is particularly true for households interviewed in Sughd (Pendjakent, Ghonchi, Isfara, Ayni and Asht). This confirms the high level of remittances recorded by the National Bank of Tajikistan and the IMF in the first 5 months of 2011. While money transfers were the main income for more than 25% of the households in February, it is now the main revenue for 36% of the households interviewed.

1 The Coping Strategy Index takes into account the frequency of use of the most harmful coping mechanisms such as not eating during a full day or adults restricting their consumption to allow children to eat.
As noted in the last round, remittances are essential for food security as the part of funds received are used to acquire food, especially at a time when purchased food is becoming more expensive.

Agriculture, livestock ownership and conditions
In the summer season, agriculture becomes an essential part of the livelihood of rural households. The outcome of this year’s harvest will be a determinant for building stocks for the next winter and for adequate food consumption as the food grown is mainly consumed directly by the households.

But this round reinforces the results of the last round: for wheat, potato and vegetables, 30% of the farmers expect a lower production than usual due mainly to poor rainfall. Other results are similar to last year’s round: the main constraints in the agriculture sector are the lack of access to larger land/acreage, the lack of irrigation water and quality seeds and seedlings.

Overall, livestock ownership is similar to the last round and to last year: 79% of the households own farm animals, in general an average of 1-2 cows/calf, 4 sheep/goats, 5 poultry and 1 horse/donkey. Some diseases (not specified) were reported by households in the regions with the most livestock (Temurmalik, Nurobod, Fayzobod, Panjaket), causing livestock loss.

The Crop and Food Security Assessment Mission (CFSAM) report should be able to highlight this in more details (state of pasture areas, prices of fodder, etc.).

Income and expenditures
Households interviewed spend 65% of their income on food. This spending is higher than during the last round (58%). This might be attributed to higher food prices but also to the fact that the areas where food expenditures are the highest are mainly remote areas (see table below) which have yet to harvest their fields, currently do not benefit from their own production and have already depleted their food stocks.

As mentioned above, remittances account for the main income source for this round as they did for the previous round. This additional influx of money has helped to mitigate the effects of the high food prices and continues to play a crucial role in acquiring the minimum food basket. In July last year, the food basket was TJS90 (US$20) – in June 2011 the cost had risen by 45% to TJS131 (US$27.62).

Although the cost of the food basket has fallen slightly since April this year (see graph), the survey shows that the monthly income barely covers food needs. In the face of lower than usual crop yields, as reported in this issue, it would seem that families must be having a very difficult time coping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of household budget spent on food</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Qumsangir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Maschoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Panjakent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Asht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Khuroson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Vanj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Kulob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Murghab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Temurmalik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Ghonchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Aini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Isfara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- Nurobod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Tursunzoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- Fayzobod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- B. Gafurov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- Jirgatol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- Jilikul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19- Muminobod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As usual at this period, income generated from agriculture (crops, livestock, orchard and daily labor) is important but it remains second to remittances in most areas. The graph on page 5 shows the contribution of each activity to the total income. It indicates where remittances play an important role in households’ income.
Fewer households interviewed have new debts in the past three months compared to last year (36% against 42%). Households in Nurobod, Fayzobod and Jirgatol are still the ones borrowing the most. Most loans are used to buy food.

Food stocks

During the summer, households often have a more regular income (remittances, casual labor etc.) than during winter and spring. Families are therefore able to buy food on a more regular basis than during the winter and they purchase smaller quantities as they have greater access to home grown food supplies.

Similar to July 2010, 80% of the families interviewed in July 2011 report have food stocks in the house, although fewer reported stocks of cooking oil and potato than last year and they noted that these stocks will only last for a maximum of 3 weeks.

More importantly, fewer households report being able to build up sufficient food stocks for the months to come (24% compared to 35% last year). Households reported that this is mainly due to lack of income, while in 2010 the main reason given was a poor harvest.

This year, more household food supplies are coming mainly from purchases in the market. Previous surveys reveal that at this time of year, household food supplies are usually from home production (60% of the households July 2010 against 16% in July 2011). This difference might be due to the delay in agricultural production because of poor rainfall and the timing of the data collection (early July before the harvest in several areas).

Food consumption

At this time of year, food consumption normally improves as households have greater access to their own production. Food consumption even improved compared to last year. Households seem to eat more vegetables and fruits and slightly more proteins. Nonetheless, the diet of most families still consists mostly of cereals, some fruits, vegetables and sugar with a low intake of protein.

Number of times food items were consumed during the week before the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rounds</th>
<th>Cereals &amp; tubers</th>
<th>Beans/peanuts</th>
<th>Vegetables</th>
<th>Fruits</th>
<th>Meats</th>
<th>Milk products</th>
<th>Sugar/honey</th>
<th>Oils/fats</th>
<th>Condiments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2011</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female-headed households and food security

One household out of six (or 100 households) interviewed for the FSMS is headed by a woman. As demonstrated in previous studies, there do not appear to be statistically significant differences on the status of food insecurity between female-headed and male-headed households. After 10 rounds of data collection, several characteristics about the vulnerability, and resilience of female-headed households, have emerged.
Both male-headed and female-headed households share many of the same characteristics: they stock the same food at the same time, rely on similar income activities and face identical food access and availability issues.

For example, the shocks reported by both female- and male-headed households are consistently the same: harvest failures, lack of irrigation and high food prices.

Shocks linked to the lack of drinking water might be the main difference: female-headed households tend to report it as their main shock while male-headed ones report it as their third problem. This might be explained by the fact that women normally are in charge of collecting water for the household and are therefore more affected by the issue.

Coping methods vary between the two types of household. The first one relates to household diet. Female-headed households spend more of their total budget on food. This extra expenditure goes to food items such as proteins (especially milk products - which are less frequently eaten at table in male-headed households).

Men appear to have other options to eat balanced meals outside of the home.1 This could explain why for almost every round, female-headed households have a better food consumption score and report fewer problems in feeding their family. Female-headed households will less frequently rely on cheaper foods and will more often restrict the consumption of adults (generally other females) in order for children to eat properly.

From a vulnerability perspective, households managed by women are more prone to taking credits. The use of the credit is also different, as women will spend more on food, health care and medicine.

In terms of livelihoods, male-headed households seem to engage more in daily wage labor, orchards and livestock activities. Although remittances represent the main livelihood for both male and female, it seems significantly more important for the latter (often above 40% of the households managed by women compared to a 30% average for men). A 2010 labor study on Tajikistan reported that when remittances are coming into the household, male members are less likely to seek work.2

More in-depth study of the links between the gender of the household head and food security is needed to understand and ascertain the impact gender has on food security status.

The results on the nutritional status of women between 19 and 49 years showed a decrease in the number of overweight (from 19.5% to 13.9%), while the rate of obesity has increased slightly -- 6.7% in August 2010 and 7.1% in July 2011. The percentage of underweight women is significantly increased from 7.7 % in August 2010 to 11.8% in July 2011.

The dietary diversity among women between 19 and 49 years is between poor and borderline level, using the FANTA and WHO definitions. From the 9 different food groups, only 4 of them were consumed by >50% of women during the week before of assessment. The food group “yellow or orange vegetables and fruits” are eaten more during this period, due to the season of harvest. The food intake patterns of women (mothers and caretakers) are very similar to those of the children in the survey.

Overall, dietary diversity among women has decreased in comparison with previous years, with the exception of fruits and vegetables, which is largely due to seasonal availability. Women rarely eat eggs, meat, beans and milk products more than once a week.

1 Save the Children“ “Why is Khatlon food insecure?” November 2010. Reportedly, men often eat 3-4 principle meals outside the home, i.e, funerals, weddings, circumcisions, etc.
For this round, WFP partnered with WHO and the Ministry of Health to collect nutrition data.

Nutrition findings
- Malnutrition among children in the July 2011 cycle is more pronounced than in previous FSMS rounds and the UNICEF National Micronutrient Status Survey (NMSS) 2009. This may be influenced by what is traditionally known to be “the diarrhea” season, and indirectly by high food prices in comparison with the food prices of July 2010.
- 12.5% of measured children are wasted and 29.1% are stunted. The wasting statistics correlate closely with the recent survey results from the Rasht Valley by Mercy Corps.
- The percent of underweight women increased from 7.7% (FSMS April 2011) to 11.8% and the percent of overweight decreased from 19.5% to 13.9%. The obesity index remained the same: 7.1%. These results are similar with results of NNS 2006.\(^1\) Underweight and overweight in women may be influenced by a lack of dietary diversity, accelerated changes in lifestyle, and indirectly by high food prices which determine choices when paying for foods.

Introduction and methodology
The anthropometric nutrition assessment component of the FSMS is conducted at longer intervals than the quarterly FSMS. This is due in part to the more complex methodologies involved, and because nutritional status is best expressed at minimum six month intervals, except in emergency situations.

Sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GBAO</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRD</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khatlon</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sughd</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6 months</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-23 months</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-59 months</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total interviewed</td>
<td>980 (965 measured)</td>
<td>932 (926 measured)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparative data is available from April 2008, January 2009, July 2009, August 2010 and July 2011. The survey instrument collected the ages, heights, weights, and mid-upper arm circumferences (MUAC) of all children between six months and five years of age in the household.

Additionally, there were questions regarding diarrhea, treatment of diarrhea, and feeding habits. WHO measured and/or weighed 965 children 0-59 months and 926 women of reproductive age 19-49 years (see table 1).

Nutritional status of children between 0-59 months
Nutritional status among children is assessed through a comparison of weight for height, which is reported as wasting (low weight for height), and height for age, which is reported as stunting (low height for age). Wasting is also referred to as acute malnutrition, indicating pronounced undernutrition (lack of food); stunting is also referred to as chronic malnutrition, indicating a sustained period of poor nutrition coupled with other non-food related anomalies such as illness due to poor hygiene, poor feeding and caring practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence of malnutrition in children 0-59 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight for height (acute malnutrition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height for age (chronic malnutrition)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show an increase in acute malnutrition at 12.5% compared with August 2010 (10%) and July 2009 (10.3%). Chronic malnutrition showed a slight decrease at 29.1% compared to August 2010 (33.1%) and July 2009 (34.1%).

\(^1\) Overweight statistics referenced in other surveys and reports: WB "Nutrition at a Glance" (2011) reporting over 40% aged 15+ above are overweight; UNICEF NMSS July 2009, 28% overweight or obese.
Data stratified by age shows a critical period for children between the ages of 0 to 24 months for wasting, and between the ages of 2 and 3 years (24-35 months) in both categories but in particular for stunting.

Underweight (low weight for age) is a particular problem among children under 24 months. This clearly reflects lost possibilities in the “window of opportunity”, which is defined as the period from conception to 24 months of age of the child. Interventions that address health and nutrition for infants in utero through 24 months of age are known to have the greatest impact over all other post-birth interventions.1

The percentage of overweight children is 5.8% which is lower than in August 2010 (6.9 %), but still higher than in July 2009 (4.3%). It reflects the double burden of undernutrition and overweight, which has also been observed in other Central Asian countries.2

Breastfeeding and Semi-solid foods yesterday

WHO and UNICEF recommend the introduction of nutrient-appropriate semi-solid foods beginning at 6-8 months, to provide the child with an enhanced food balance. 47% of the children are completely weaned after 12 months of age. The recommended introduction of semi-solid foods after 6 months is practiced with 40% of children 6-8 months.

Health Status
Illness patterns, in particular diarrhea, are closely associated with malnutrition as children are unable to absorb nutrients when ill. A correlation may exist between the age of ill children and stunting.

1 Emergency Food Security Assessment in Rural Areas of Tajikistan (EFSA), A Joint Food Security, Livelihoods, Agriculture and Nutrition Assessment, April/May 2008.
Dietary diversity
The dietary diversity in children between 6 to 11 months is very low and remains the same as August 2010. Only three food groups1 were consumed by children during the last week of assessment.

For children between 12-23 months, the dietary diversity remains the same as well in comparison with August 2010. This is a sharp decrease from the 80% registered in July 2009. The average consumption of meat, eggs or legumes for all age groups the week before the assessment is very low.

Attributing cause to acute and chronic malnutrition in July 2011
Traditional explanations for the continued high rates of malnutrition in Tajikistan include high food prices. Over the course of the year (August 2010-July 2011), food prices have climbed significantly.1 However, it has been reported that "Kyrgyzstan, with a similar per capita income, has a stunting prevalence of 18%, illustrating that stunting is not dependent on GNI alone."2 Solutions such as food price subsidies, greater access to more diverse foods will not fully resolve entrenched malnutrition.

Poor infant feeding practices are also cited as a leading cause of malnutrition. Of primary concern is the poor rate for immediate and exclusive breastfeeding. Solutions that encourage greater support to mothers for optimal breastfeeding and infant feeding must take into account other factors such as obligations to work as field labor, and a recent phenomenon wherein mothers prolong EBF as an economic coping mechanism.

A knowledge, attitudes and practice (KAP) survey would be useful to determine why women do not practice semi-solid food introduction at the recommended time.

1 The dietary diversity score ranges from 0 to 7, including the following food groups: Grains, roots and tubers; legumes and nuts; Vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables; other fruits and vegetables; dairy products; eggs; meat, poultry, fish, and shellfish. It measures the food intake of the week preceding the assessment.


The FSMS provides reliable data which is integrated into the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) system along with data from other sources to make a composite analytical statement on the state of food security in the regions. The data can be used by WFP and partners to better target their interventions.

The methodology used for this bulletin is in line with WFP’s corporate methodology on food security assessments.

Previous reports on food security can be found on www.wfp.org/food-security and www.untj.org/library.

For information and data on Food Security contact, Saidamon Bodamaev, WFP Tajikistan Saidamon. Bodamaev@wfp.org.
For information and data on Nutrition: Khadicha Boymatova, WHO Tajikistan nutkhadicha.who@tajnet.tj
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