The Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee (ZimVAC), as has become the tradition since 2002, conducted the 15th annual Rural Livelihoods Assessment (RLA). The assessment is part of a comprehensive information system that informs Government and its Development Partners on programming necessary for saving lives and strengthening rural livelihoods in Zimbabwe. ZimVAC is the central pillar around which the Food and Nutrition Council (FNC) plans to build its strategy to fulfil the 6th Commitment of the Government of Zimbabwe’s Food and Nutrition Security Policy (FNSP) and monitor implementation of the ZimASSET.

The 2016 RLA covers and provides updates on pertinent rural household livelihoods issues such as education, food and income sources, income levels, expenditure patterns, crop and livestock production and nutrition. In addition to paying particular focus on, and putting households at the centre of its analysis, the RLA also collects and records rural communities’ views on their livelihoods challenges as well as their development needs. The RLA recognises and draws from other national contemporary surveys that define the socio-economic context of rural livelihoods. Most notable amongst these are the Crop and Livestock Assessments, the Demographic and Health Surveys, the National Census, the Poverty Assessment Surveys and National Economic Performance reviews.

We want to express our profound gratitude to all our Development Partners in the country and beyond for their support throughout the survey. Financial support and technical leadership were received from the Government of Zimbabwe, United Nations Agencies, NGOs and Technical Agencies. Without this support, this RLA would not have been successful. We also want to thank the staff at FNC for providing leadership, coordination and management to the whole survey. Our sincere appreciation also goes to the rural communities of Zimbabwe as well as the local leadership for cooperating with and supporting this survey.

We submit this report to you all for your use and reference in your invaluable work. We hope it will light your way as you search for lasting measures in addressing priority issues keeping many of our rural households vulnerable to food and nutrition insecurity.

George D. Kembo
FNC Director/ ZimVAC Chairperson

Dr. Leonard Madzingaidzo
Interim Chief Executive Officer - SIRDC
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Background and Introduction
Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee (ZimVAC)

ZimVAC is a consortium of Government, UN agencies, NGOs and other international organisations established in 2002, led and regulated by Government. It is chaired by FNC, a department in the Office of the President and Cabinet whose mandate is to promote a multi-sectoral response to food insecurity and nutrition problems to ensure that every Zimbabwean is free from hunger and malnutrition.

ZimVAC supports Government, particularly the FNC in:

• Convening and coordinating national food and nutrition security issues in Zimbabwe

• Charting a practical way forward for fulfilling legal and existing policy commitments in food and nutrition security

• Advising Government on strategic directions in food and nutrition security

• Undertaking a “watchdog role” and supporting and facilitating action to ensure commitments in food and nutrition are kept on track by different sectors through a number of core functions such as:
  • Undertaking food and nutrition assessments, analysis and research,
  • Promoting multi-sectoral and innovative approaches for addressing food and nutrition security, and:
  • Supporting and building national capacity for food and nutrition security including at sub-national levels.
In 2015, Zimbabwe recorded a GDP growth rate of 1.5%, progressively declining from 10.6% in 2011 (ZimSTAT, 2015). Year-on-year inflation was -1.64% in April 2016 as the deflationary environment continued in the economy since 2013. The economy is currently facing cash shortages partly resulting from increasing imports against decreasing export earnings.

The 2011/2012 Poverty Income and Consumption Survey estimated 76% of rural households to be poor with 23% deemed extremely poor.

Up to the end of February 2016, normal to below normal rains were received in the country in line with regional and national rainfall forecasts for 2015/16 owing to the El Niño. Late start of rains, a prolonged mid-season dry spell (December 2015 to January 2016) compounded by high temperatures marked the season impacting on crop and livestock production and other livelihoods. High livestock poverty deaths of over 25,000 cattle were recorded between October 2015 and February 2016 mainly in the southern parts of the country.

Following a poor 2014/15 rainfall and agricultural season that left the country with about 650,000MT of cereal deficit, Zimbabwe managed to fill most of the cereal gap with Government and the private sector imports between April 2015 and March 2016.

A significant proportion of households experienced poor access to crop and livestock inputs partly due to liquidity challenges, high prices and unavailability of particular inputs in some areas.
Background - The 2015/16 Rainfall and Agricultural Season Quality

- The El Niño induced drought affected most parts of Southern Africa including Zimbabwe.
- Most of the southern parts of the country that normally receive poor rainfall, received significantly below normal rainfall resulting in widespread crop failure and subdued grazing development.
- Mediocre to average crop performance was expected for some areas in the central and northern parts of the country.
Background

• In response to the El Niño induced-drought, ZimVAC undertook a rapid livelihoods assessment in January 2016 focusing on updating the May 2015 results. Rural food insecurity was projected to rise to approximately 30% (2.8 million people) from the 16% (1.5 million people) initially estimated in May 2015.

• The January 2016 ZimVAC rapid assessment also indicated a worsening nutrition situation. At 5.7%, the Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rate of children aged 6-59 months was the highest recorded in 15 years. The Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) rate for children aged 6-59 months was 2.1%, slightly above the 2% threshold for emergency response in Zimbabwe.

• Against this background, the Government declared the drought a State of Disaster and subsequently launched the 2016-2017 Drought Disaster Domestic and International Appeal for Assistance, totaling USD 1.5 billion. The Government plan is built around the key areas of grain importation, emergency irrigation rehabilitation, livestock destocking, emergency water supply, school feeding and food security.

• In order to strategically align with Government emergency needs and priorities, the UN and its humanitarian partners revised the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) to facilitate scaling up the drought response. The HRP, covers the period April 2016 to March 2017 and its focus is on saving lives and protecting critical livelihoods of 2.8 million people (30% of the total rural population) with a total requirement of USD360 million in the sectors of food assistance and agriculture, health and nutrition, social protection, education and water, sanitation and hygiene.
Assessment Purpose

Guided by the ZimASSET, particularly cluster number 1 and 2 and buttressed in the FNSP, the ZimVAC 2016 RLA aimed to:

• Monitor progress made towards the attainment of ZimASSET set targets for food and nutrition security.

• Update information on Zimbabwe’s rural livelihoods with a particular focus on rural households’ vulnerability to food and nutrition insecurity.

• Identify constraints to improving community resilience and rural livelihoods including opportunities and pathways of addressing them.
Specific Objectives

• To estimate the rural population that is likely to be food insecure in the 2016/17 consumption year, their geographic distribution and the severity of their food insecurity;

• To assess the nutrition status of children of 6 – 59 months;

• To describe the socio-economic profiles of rural households in terms of such characteristics as their demographics, gender, access to basic services (education and water and sanitation facilities), income sources, incomes and expenditure patterns, food consumption patterns and consumption coping strategies;

• To determine livelihood coping strategies used by rural communities

• To determine the coverage of formal and informal social protection interventions;

• To identify constraints including shocks and hazards to improving community resilience and rural livelihoods including opportunities and pathways of addressing them; and

• To assess the diversity of livelihood options in the 2016/17 consumption year.
Technical Scope

The 2016 RLA collected and analysed information on the following thematic areas:

• Household demographics

• Access to education and extension services

• Food consumption patterns, food sources and nutrition

• Income and expenditure patterns and levels

• Small-holder agriculture (crop and livestock production and irrigation)

• Market access

• Household food security

• Community livelihood challenges and development priorities.

• Shocks and hazards

• Gender as a cross-cutting issue and violence against women
Assessment Methodology
Methodology and Assessment Process

• The assessment design was informed by the multi-sectoral objectives generated by a multi-stakeholder consultation process.
• An appropriate survey design and protocol, informed by the survey objectives, was developed.
• The assessment used both a structured household questionnaire and a community focus group discussion questionnaire as the two primary data collection instruments. District key informant interviews were also conducted.
• ZimVAC national supervisors and enumerators were recruited from Government, United Nations and Non-Governmental Organisations and underwent training in all aspects of the assessment (background, data collection tools, assessment sampling strategy, assessment supervision and field supervision).
• The Ministry of Rural Development, Promotion and Preservation of National Culture and Heritage in collaboration with the Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing through the Provincial Administrators’ offices coordinated the recruitment of district level enumerators and deployment of vehicles in each of the 60 rural districts of Zimbabwe.
• The composition of district enumeration teams comprised of officers from Government and local NGOs. Each district enumeration team had at least 2 Anthropometrists that had the responsibility of measuring children aged 6-59 months.
• Primary data collection took place from the 13th to the 30th of May 2016, followed by data entry and cleaning from the 16th of May to the 1st of June 2016.
• Data analysis and report writing ran from the 2nd to the 10th of June 2016. Various secondary data sources were used to contextualise the analysis and reporting.
• Data analysis and report writing was done by a team of 47 technical officers from Government, UN and technical partners under the leadership and coordination of FNC.
Data Collection Methods and Sample Size

- The sample size was determined such that key household food insecurity indicators and Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) prevalence were statistically representative at district, provincial and national levels.
  - 95% confidence level
  - 10% precision level for the key household food insecurity indicator
  - 3.4% precision level for the GAM rate
- Primary data collection was undertaken in 25 enumeration areas (EAs) in each district, selected using systematic random sampling applying the proportion to population size principle.
- Households were systematically randomly sampled in one randomly selected village in each of the sampled EAs.
- The final sample of households was 14,434 and that for children aged 6 to 59 months was 19,057.
- One community key informant Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was held in each of the selected wards, bringing the total community key informant FDGs to 1,095.
- One district key informant interview on food assistance interventions was conducted in each of the 60 rural districts.
- In addition to the above, field observations also yielded valuable information that was used in the analysis.

### Province Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Children under 5</th>
<th>Community FDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland Central</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>2581</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>2767</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland North</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>2296</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland South</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2242</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>2575</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>2281</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14434</strong></td>
<td><strong>19057</strong></td>
<td><strong>1095</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sampled Wards
Data Preparation and Analysis

• All primary data was captured using CSPro and it was consolidated and converted into three SPSS datasets:
  • Household survey
  • Child Nutrition
  • Community key informant interviews

• Data cleaning and analysis were done using SPSS, ENA, Microsoft Excel and GIS packages

• Analysis of the different thematic areas covered by the assessment were informed and guided by relevant international frameworks, where they exist.
Demographic Description of the Sample
The highest population group in the sampled households was in the 18-59 years age group.

The distribution pattern is similar to that which has been observed in the past 10 years.
Sex and Age of Household Head

- Most households (68.2%) were male headed, whilst 31.8% were female headed.
- The average household head age was 48.8 years.
- Child headed households comprised 2% of the sample and the elderly headed comprised 27%.
- The average household size was 5.5.
The majority of household heads (68%) were married and living together with their spouse followed by the widows and widowers (19%).
### Household Head Education Level by Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>None %</th>
<th>Primary level %</th>
<th>ZJC level %</th>
<th>O' level %</th>
<th>A' level %</th>
<th>Diploma/Certificate after primary %</th>
<th>Diploma/Certificate after secondary %</th>
<th>Graduate/Post-Graduate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash Central</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash West</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat North</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat South</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- About 21.5% of the household heads had not completed primary education.
- The assessment revealed that a significant number of the household heads had completed primary level (38%).
Vulnerability Attributes

- The above results show no significant difference in vulnerability attributes over the past five years.
Households with Children Under Foster Care

- Nationally, 23% of the households were taking care of children under foster care arrangements with Matabeleland South having the most households at 32%.
Dependency Ratio

• Household dependency ratio was calculated as follows:

\[ \frac{\text{Number of economically inactive members}}{\text{number of economically active members}} \]

• The average household dependency ratio was 1.8.

• The highest dependency ratio was recorded in Masvingo province (2.0) and the lowest in Mashonaland West (1.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>2016 Dependency ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland Central</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland North</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland South</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Protection
About 65% of the households received some support in form of food, cash, crop inputs, livestock inputs or water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) during 2015/16 consumption year, a proportion higher than the 49% for the 2014/2015 consumption year.

The majority of provinces had over 65% of households receiving support while Manicaland had the least (51%) followed by Mashonaland East (58%).
### Sources of Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>UN/NGO</th>
<th>Churches</th>
<th>Relatives within rural areas</th>
<th>Relatives within urban areas</th>
<th>Remittances outside Zimbabwe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash Central</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash West</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat North</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat South</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Support was mostly from Government (48.5%) and from remittances from within and outside Zimbabwe (totalling 32.6%).
- The proportion of households receiving support from Government was highest in Mashonaland Central (71%) followed by Mashonaland West (67.7%) while Matabeleland South and Masvingo received the least support (29% and 36%) respectively.
- UN and NGO support was mainly received in the southern provinces (Matabeleland North 25%, Matabeleland South 21%, Masvingo 25% and Manicaland 19%).
- Remittances from within Zimbabwe were highest in Mashonaland East (40%) followed by Masvingo (29%). This pattern is similar to that of 2015.
- Remittances from outside Zimbabwe were highest in Matabeleland South (24%) consistent with 2015. The least was Mashonaland Central with about 2%
### Forms of Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Cash support (%)</th>
<th>Food support (%)</th>
<th>Crop support (%)</th>
<th>Livestock support (%)</th>
<th>WASH support (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash Central</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash West</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat North</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat South</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The most common forms of support which households received remains the same as 2014/2015 with food (48%) and crop support (30%) being the dominant ones.
- With the exception of food support, all other forms of support decreased. This is consistent with the poor agricultural season and the projected increase in food insecurity.
- The highest proportions of households receiving crop support was in Mashonaland Central and Mashonaland West (46%) while the lowest was Matabeleland North (13%) and Matabeleland South (16%)
- Livestock support was significantly low even in the provinces where livestock is a major source of livelihood and were hard-hit by the drought.
Education
School attendance increased in 2016 (85%) compared to 76% in 2015.
Reasons for not Attending School

- About 32% of the children were not in school due to financial constraints followed by 24% who were considered to be too young.
- Disability was amongst the reasons with the lowest frequency.
Access to Extension Services
Access to Agricultural Training

- About 35% of households engaged in crop and livestock production received agricultural training. This was lower compared to last year (38%).

- Mashonaland Central, Matabeleland North and Midlands Provinces showed an increase while the other provinces recorded a decline.

- The agricultural training received came from Government (91%), NGOs (5%), private companies (2%), research organisations (2%) and lead farmers (1%).

- Households received an average of 3 trainings.
Almost equal proportions of male and female headed households received agricultural training in all provinces except for Midlands where a higher proportion of male headed households (58%) received training compared to female headed households (42%).

Masvingo had a higher proportion of female headed households (54%) that received training compared to male headed households (42%).
During the 2015/16 agricultural season, 28% of the households received agricultural extension visits from extension providers.

- The number of extension visits per farmer ranged from 2 to 3.
- Extension was provided by Government (91.7%), NGOs (3.9%), private companies (2.8%) and research organisations (1.5%).
Households that Sought Cropping Advice

- About 25% of the households sought advice out of their own initiative.
- Manicaland had the highest proportion (32%) with Matabeleland South having the lowest (19%).
Access to Veterinary Services by Livestock Owners

- About 62% of households which owned livestock sought veterinary services from April 2015 to March 2016. This is significantly higher compared to the previous year (32%).
- Matabeleland South province had the highest proportion of households which sought veterinary services (75%).
Households Satisfied by Cropping and Livestock Advice

**Crop:** About 68% of households that sought cropping advice reported that their needs were not satisfactorily met.

**Livestock:** About 88% of livestock owners that sought veterinary services were satisfied by the way their needs were addressed.
Crop Production
Proportion of Households which Planted Crops

- Maize (84%) and groundnuts (43%) were the most common crops planted by households.
- There was a general increase in the proportion of households that planted all crops as compared to last season with the exception of maize, tobacco and cotton.
Proportion of Households which Planted Cereals by Province

- Over 80% of all households, except Matabeleland North and South, planted maize.
- Matabeleland North and South had high proportions of households which grew small grains.
Proportion of Households Which Planted Legumes

- Groundnuts, roundnuts and cowpeas were the most commonly planted legumes across the provinces.
- Masvingo (55%), Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland East and Midlands had the highest proportion of households growing groundnuts (50%).
- Round nuts were most common in Masvingo (51%), whilst cowpeas was most common in Matabeleland South (43%).
- Generally, the proportion of households growing legumes were lowest in Matabeleland North and South as well as Manicaland.
Adequacy of Agricultural Labour

- The majority of households in all provinces did not have adequate agricultural labour with a national average of about 58%, a figure slightly lower than the 59% reported in 2015.
- The situation was worse in Manicaland (65%) followed by Midlands (61%).
- Inadequacy of labour is one of the reasons for limited agricultural production.
Hiring of Agricultural Labour

- Nationally, 13.6% of the households reported to have hired casual labour for agricultural purposes, a figure lower than the 20% reported in 2015.
- Mashonaland West had the highest proportion of households that reported to have hired labour (22%) with Masvingo (8%) reported to have the least number of households that hired casual labour.
- The decrease is consistent with the decline of households who reported having inadequate labour compared to the previous season.
- About 12% of households were able to access agricultural labour from friends and relatives.
Sources of Seeds Used by Households During the 2015/16 Agricultural Season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crops</th>
<th>Purchase %</th>
<th>Gvt %</th>
<th>NGOs %</th>
<th>Carryover %</th>
<th>Retained %</th>
<th>Remittances %</th>
<th>Pvt Contractors %</th>
<th>Other %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Millet</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Millet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowpeas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Nuts</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Beans</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soya Beans</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paprika</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Seed purchases were the main source of seed for maize, soya beans, tobacco, sugar beans, paprika and wheat.
- The important source of seed for cotton was Government (48%). That surpassed the traditional source of seed which used to be private contractors.
- Retained seed was the dominant source for sorghum, finger millet, pearl millet, tubers, cow peas, groundnuts and sunflower.
- Contractors’ contribution was notable in tobacco, cotton and paprika.
- In the last three seasons, Government maize seed support has been declining; 45% in 2013/2014, 30% in 2014/2015 and 19% in 2016/2017.
Average Household Cereal Production by Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Maize (kg)</th>
<th>Small grains (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>396.3</td>
<td>292.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland Central</td>
<td>468.5</td>
<td>525.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>444.3</td>
<td>367.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>771.9</td>
<td>462.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland North</td>
<td>370.3</td>
<td>142.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland South</td>
<td>375.1</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>654.0</td>
<td>292.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>399.7</td>
<td>136.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>485.0</td>
<td>293.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Nationally, there was a 55% decline in average household cereal production compared to last season.
- The average household maize production was highest in Mashonaland West at 397.6kg with the least in Matabeleland South at 22.8kg.
- Mashonaland Central had the highest drop (71%) in average cereal production followed by Mashonaland East and Manicaland at over 60% with the lowest in Mashonaland West (10%)
Household Food Crop Stocks
• Maize grain was the most common cereal in stock (75%).
• Fewer households had stocks of pulses, of these, cowpeas was the most commonly held stock.
### Average Household Cereal Stocks as at 1 April 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Kilograms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland Central</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland North</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland South</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Average household cereal stocks were about 43kgs.
- Manicaland had the highest average cereal stocks (53kg) followed by Masvingo (50kg), whilst Matabeleland South had the least (30kg).
Sources of Stocks as at 1 April 2016 (% of Households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Maize</th>
<th>Sorghum</th>
<th>Millets</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
<th>Rice</th>
<th>Cowpeas</th>
<th>Sugar Beans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own production</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic purchases</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittance from outside</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittance from within</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gvt food assistance</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO food assistance</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour exchange</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The most important source for food crop stocks were own production and purchases. Rice and wheat were mainly from purchases.

- Contribution of Government food assistance for maize stocks was higher compared to that of NGO food assistance while the converse was true for sorghum.

- A significant portion of households had stocks of maize, sorghum and millet from labour exchange.
Household Access to Irrigation
Proportion of Wards with Irrigation Schemes

• About 19% of the rural wards had an irrigation scheme.

• Of these wards, 53% had functional irrigation schemes, 35% had partially functional and 37% had non functional irrigation schemes.
Reasons for Non Functionality of Irrigation Schemes

- Equipment breakdown and inadequate water continue to be the main causes of non functionality and partial functionality of irrigation schemes in the country.
Based on the sampled wards, the majority of plot holders were males except for Matabeleland North (50%) and South (48%) where there were more female plot holders.
Livestock Production
Cattle Ownership

- About 64% of rural households did not own cattle, compared to 60% last year.
- Masvingo Province (44%) had the highest proportion of households with cattle followed by Midlands (43%) and Matabeleland South (42%).
- About 14% of households owned at least 5 head of cattle and such households were in the Matabeleland provinces.
• About 31% of households owned draft cattle. 5% owned 1 draft animal and 26% owned two or more.

• Highest proportion of households with draft cattle were in Midlands province (41%), followed by Masvingo (40%).

• The proportion of households using cattle for draft power in Matabeleland South was low despite the province having the highest proportion of households with cattle and highest average household cattle holdings. This is probably due to greater dependence on donkeys for draft power in the province.
Causes of Cattle Herd Increases

- The highest contribution to increase in the herd size was from births, followed by purchases. Causes attributed to other reasons are significant (14%) and future assessments should explicitly identify them.
- It is interesting to note the dominance of cattle purchases as share of cattle increases in Mashonaland Central.
Causes of Attrition in Cattle

- The largest cause of attrition was cattle deaths (42%). Sales and theft had the same share of cattle losses (28%).

- Cattle deaths accounted for the highest proportions of cattle losses in Matabeleland North (53%) followed by Manicaland (46%) and Masvingo (42%).

- The proportion of cattle losses due to theft was highest in Mashonaland Central (40%) followed by Matabeleland South (35%).

- The proportion of herd size reduction resulting from cattle sales was highest in Mashonaland East (40%) and Mashonaland West (39%).
Cattle death rate was at 9% for the period April 2015 to March 2016, compared to the previous consumption year (7%). These rates are higher than the nationally acceptable mortality rate of 3% for cattle.

Diseases accounted for 61% of the reported cattle deaths and about 27% of cattle deaths were drought related (poor grazing and lack of water).

Manicaland province (51%) had the highest proportion of drought related deaths followed by Masvingo (45%) and Matabeleland South (38%).

The Mashonaland provinces (above 74%) had the highest proportion of deaths due to diseases.
Goats Ownership

- About 38% of rural households owned goats. Matabeleland South had the highest proportion of households with goats (57%), followed by Matabeleland North (47%).
- About 13% of households owned more than 5 goats.
- Matabeleland South (57%) followed by Matabeleland North (47%) and Masvingo (45%) had the highest proportion of households owning goats.
- The observed ownership patterns at both national and provincial levels were similar to those recorded in the past five years.
The greatest cause of attrition in goats was death (5%) followed by sales (4%).

Mashonaland Central and Matabeleland North recorded the highest death rate at 11%.

The province that had the highest proportion of goat sales was Mashonaland Central (14%) followed by Mashonaland West (11%).
Milk Production
About 54% of households with cattle had lactating cows, of these 73% were milking their cows.

The highest proportion of households milking lactating cows was in Midlands (89%) and the lowest were in Mashonaland West (54%).
Proportion of Households With Goats they were Milking

- Despite the known high nutritional value of goat milk, only 7% of households with goats were milking their goats.
- Matabeleland South (20%) and Matabeleland North (14%) had the highest proportion of households milking their goats followed by those in Midlands province (7%).
Incomes and Expenditure
About 26% of households considered casual labour their most source of cash income. This was followed by 12% who considered remittances as one of their most important sources of cash income. Vegetable and livestock sales were amongst the most important sources of cash income for about 11% of the rural households.

Food crop production was the most important source of food for about 22% of households; labour exchange for about 21% and vegetable production for about 12% of households.

Food assistance was considered amongst the most important sources of food by about 9% of the households.
Average Household Income as of April 2016

- Nationally, the average household income for the month of April was USD62. At about 28% lower than the same time last year, the April 2016 household average income was the lowest recorded in the past five years.
- Matabeleland South (USD81) had the highest average monthly income while Matabeleland North (USD50) had the lowest average monthly income. Matabeleland North has consistently registered the lowest average household incomes since 2009.
- Average monthly income declined from 2014 (USD 111) and 2015 (USD 86); a 23% decrease.
- Average household incomes in all provinces had a downward trend since 2014. The biggest drop in average household income was observed in Mashonaland West (62%) followed by Mashonaland Central (57%) province. The least decrease in the past three years was observed for households in Matabeleland South province.
Casual labour was the highest contributor to household cash income with an average contribution of 28% of the total household monthly income followed by income from agricultural production making 24% of total household monthly income.

Remittances contributed 19% to the average household monthly income whilst formal salaries, artisanship, businesses, pensions and rent together contributed 15%.
Projected Sources of Cash and Food for the Period June – November 2016

- Casual labour (25%) is projected to be the most important source of income for the remainder of the consumption year, followed by vegetable sales, remittances and livestock sales.
- Food crop production (20.8%) is projected to be the most important source of in kind food income followed by labour exchange, vegetable production and remittances. About 10% of households expect food assistance to be their main source of food.
Expenditure
• The national average household expenditure was USD49; a 26% decreased compared to same time last year. There appears to be an inverse relationship between agricultural season performance and average household monthly expenditure.
• Mashonaland East (USD60), Matabeleland South (USD59) and Mashonaland West (USD55) had the highest average expenditures while Matabeleland North (USD36) had the lowest average expenditure.
• Matabeleland South had the highest proportion of food expenditure (65%) followed by Midlands (63%).
• These were higher than the national average of 59%.
Livelihoods Based Coping Strategies
Introduction

• When households encounter food access challenges they cope by either changing consumption patterns or employing some strategies at their disposal to increase food availability.

• These strategies they employ to increase food availability outside their usual/normal livelihoods are referred to in this report as livelihoods based coping strategies.

• The coping strategies have been classified into three categories of stress, crisis and emergency based on their severity according to the WFP Technical guidance note on Consolidated Approach to Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI) – November 2015.
## Categorisation of Livelihoods Coping Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Coping strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Stress    | • Selling household assets to buy food;  
|           | • Spending savings on food;  
|           | • Borrowing money from formal lender to buy food; and/or  
|           | • Selling more livestock than usual to buy food. |
| Crisis    | • Reducing non food expenditure to buy food;  
|           | • Selling or disposing of productive assets to buy food; and/or  
|           | • Withdrawing children from school because of hunger. |
| Emergency | • Selling house or land to buy food;  
|           | • Selling last breeding livestock to buy food; and/or  
|           | • Begging to get food. |
Households Adopting at Least One Livelihoods Based Coping Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash Central</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash West</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat North</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat South</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- About 41% of households had used at least 1 of the livelihood based coping strategies 30 days prior to the time of the survey.
- Masvingo had the highest proportion (52%) while Matabeleland South had the least proportion of households (29%) adopting livelihoods coping strategies.
Proportion of Households Adopting Different Livelihoods Coping Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
<th>% Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spent Savings on food</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce non food expenditure</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold household assets</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold more animals than usual</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw children from school</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold last female breeding livestock</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold productive assets</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed money to buy food</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold house or land</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The most common livelihoods coping strategies households were employing fell in the stress and crisis categories.
- Spending savings was the most common livelihood strategy adopted by households when they faced food access challenges followed by reduction of non-food expenditure.
Three Year Comparison of Proportion of Households Adopting Different Livelihoods Coping Strategies

- There was an increase in the proportion of households selling household assets, reducing non food expenditure, withdrawing children from school, selling more animals and begging to cope with food challenges.
The type of livelihood coping strategies adopted by many households were mainly in the stress category and this was highest in Masvingo province (41%) followed by Mashonaland East (36%).

Mashonaland Central (19%) and Matabeleland North (18%) had the highest proportion of households adopting emergency livelihood coping strategies.
• Mashonaland Central (19%) and Matabeleland North (18%) had the highest proportion of households adopting more severe livelihoods coping strategies.
Loans/Debts
• There is no significant difference in the proportions of households having loans/debts in 2016 (81%) compared to 2015 (79%).
• A higher proportion of male headed households (21.2%) had loans/debts while 16.1% female headed households had loans/debts at the time of conducting the survey.
• Family and friends remained the most dominant source of loans and debts (61%) for most households in 2015/2016 as was in 2014/2015 (56%).

• There was an increase in the proportion of households accessing loans from savings and credit groups (ISALs) and a significant drop to 7% in the proportion of households accessing loans from contractors.
Proportion of Households that Had Loans by District

- Districts with the highest proportion (40-50%) of households with loans were Hurungwe, Bindura, and Chiredzi
# Reasons for Taking Loans/Borrowing by Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>To buy food</th>
<th>To cover health expenses</th>
<th>To buy agric inputs</th>
<th>To pay education cost</th>
<th>To buy livestock</th>
<th>To buy animal feed, fodder, pay vet costs</th>
<th>To buy/rent house</th>
<th>To pay social events/ce remonies</th>
<th>To pay funeral expenses</th>
<th>To repay other loans</th>
<th>To invest in trading</th>
<th>To invest in other form of business</th>
<th>Other reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash Central</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash West</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat North</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat South</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The highest proportion of households across all provinces were borrowing to buy food. Matebeleland South (54%) and Matebeleland North (52%) and Masvingo (50%) had the highest proportions of households borrowing to purchase food.
- The second most common reason for borrowing was to pay for education costs (Manicaland, Matebeleland North, Matebeleland South, Midland and Masvingo).
- Most of the loans taken or debts being incurred were for consumption across all provinces.
### Average Amounts Borrowed and Proportion with Overdue Loans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Amount USD</th>
<th>% of Households with overdue loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland Central</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland South</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland North</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The national average loan amount was significantly lower in 2016 (USD77) compared to 2015 (USD90).
- The highest average amounts borrowed of over USD150 were accessed in Mashonaland West and Mashonaland Central.
- Mashonaland Central though having the largest amounts borrowed (USD152) had the least proportion of defaulting households.
- Poor crop production was the most common reason for failure to pay debts across all provinces.
- The poor agricultural season could potentially result in cyclical indebtedness for some rural households.
Markets Access

To assess the availability and access to agricultural input and produce markets for small-holder farmers in the 2015/16 consumption year
Agricultural Input Market Challenges by Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Lack of money</th>
<th>Commodity Unavailability</th>
<th>Market Availability</th>
<th>Transport,long distances &amp; bad infrastructure</th>
<th>High Prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash Central</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash West</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat North</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat South</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Transport, long distances and bad roads as well as lack of money were the main challenges faced by most communities in trying to access input markets.
The majority of households accessed maize grain from other households in the area with Mashonaland Central having the highest proportion (78%).

Private traders were the main source of maize grain in Masvingo province (41%) which is atypical during the harvest period when the households normally depend on own production for maize.

GMB was a significant source of maize grain in Matebeleland South Province (37%).
Maize Grain - Location of Main Market

- Over 60% of all households in all provinces accessed maize grain within their wards with the highest proportions in Mashonaland West (86%) followed by Mashonaland Central (82%).
Agricultural Commodity Prices
Maize grain and maize meal were generally available on the markets across most districts in the country.
The highest maize grain prices were recorded in Gwanda, Mangwe, Tsholotsho, Kariba and Mudzi (which are traditionally cereal deficit districts) at more than USD 0.50/kg.

The lowest prices were recorded mainly in the traditionally surplus producing Mashonaland areas ranging from USD 0.21 to USD 0.35/kg.

The average maize grain prices for May 2016 were higher than the averages for the same time last year.
District Average Maize Meal Price (USD/kg) as at May 2016

- Relatively high prices (USD 0.66/kg - USD0.80/kg) were recorded in Matebeleland North and Matebeleland South compared to other provinces in the country.
- Kariba recorded the highest maize meal prices at an average of USD0.90/kg. Kariba was also one of the districts that recorded highest average maize grain prices.
The highest cattle price ranges were recorded in Gweru, Kwekwe, Bulilima, UMP, Chegutu, Umguza, Hurungwe, Matobo, Hwedza, Chirumhanzu (USD 351-USD450).

The lowest cattle price range was recorded in Mbire, Mudzi and Gokwe North (USD 160-USD200).
The highest price ranges for goats were recorded in Matabeleland South (Umguza, Matobo, Umzingwane, Bulilima and Mangwe) and Gweru district (USD 41 – USD46).

The lowest prices were recorded in the northern districts of Mbire, Binga, Makonde, Gokwe North and South, Rushinga and Mudzi (USD15 – USD 20).
• Private traders were the main buyers of cattle representing over 40% of markets in all provinces except Masvingo and Matabeleland South.

• In Masvingo (45%) and Matabeleland South (41%), the main cattle markets were other households in the same area.
• Selling within the same ward was the most common market for cattle in all provinces.

• Matabeleland North had the highest proportion of communities (27%) that sold in neighbouring wards and within the province (14%).
Goat: Type of Market

- Selling to other households in the area was the most common market type for goats in all provinces.
- Mashonaland Central (39%) and Manicaland (23%) had highest proportions of private goat traders as a type of market.
Goat Market Location

• Selling within the same ward was reported as the most common market for goats in all provinces.
Water, Sanitation & Hygiene (WASH)
Introduction
# Categories of Sanitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPEN DEFECTION</strong></td>
<td>Defecation in fields, forests, bushes, bodies of water or other open spaces or disposal of human faeces with solid waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIMPROVED</strong></td>
<td>Unimproved sanitation facilities: Facilities that do not ensure hygienic separation of human excreta from human contact. Unimproved facilities include pit latrines without a slab or platform, hanging latrines and bucket latrines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPROVED</strong></td>
<td>Improved sanitation facilities: Facilities that ensure hygienic separation of human excreta from human contact. They include flush or pour flush toilet/latrine, Blair ventilated improved pit latrine (BVIP), pit latrine with slab and upgradeable Blair latrine (UBVIP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nationally, 71% of households were accessing water from improved sources.

There was a significant increase in access to improved sanitation from 39% in 2014 to 47% in 2016.
The national average for access to improved water sources increased marginally to 71% from 70% in 2013 and 2014.

There was a general increase in access to improved drinking water in Mashonaland West (70%), Matabeleland North (81%) and South (72%) and Masvingo (69%).
Access To Improved Water Source By District

- Beitbridge, Chimanimani, Umguza, Bubi, Sanyati, Rushinga and Hwange had the highest access (85-95%) to improved water sources which was above the national average of 71%.

- Mudzi, Gokwe North, Kariba, Makonde and Mangwe Districts had the lowest access (35-50%) to improved water sources.
Reasons for Change in Main Drinking Water Source

- About 12% of households had changed their main source of drinking water in the 3 months preceding the survey. The predominant reason cited for change was drying up (54%).
- Mashonaland East and Midlands had the highest proportion of households affected by drying up of drinking water source (67%).
- In Matebeleland North, the main reason for change in main source of drinking water was the breakdown or non-functionality of water points (46%).
According to the Sphere Standards, the maximum distance that any household should travel to the nearest safe water point is 500m.

Nationally, 54% of households travelled more than 500m to the nearest water source. Of these, 25% travelled more than 1 km.

Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South and Masvingo had the highest proportion of households that travelled more than 1km (36%, 34% and 32% respectively). These provinces are in the dry Natural Regions IV and V where ground water potential is low.
The practice of water treatment continues to be generally low across all the rural provinces.

Nationally, 15% of households that used water from unimproved sources treated their drinking water, a reduction from the ZimVAC 2013 assessment.

Matabeleland North Province (18%) had the highest proportion of households treating water from unimproved sources.
• Nationally the proportion of households accessing improved sanitation facilities increased from 39% in 2014 to 47% in 2016.
• Matabeleland North continues to have the lowest proportion of households with access to improved sanitation.
• Nationally, 37% of the households are practising open defecation, which is consistent with 2014 rates.
• The highest proportion of open defecation was reported in Matabeleland North at 68%.
Prevalence of Open Defecation

- Most districts in Matabeleland North recorded the highest prevalence of open defecation ranging from 56 – 75%.
- Districts in Manicaland and Mashonaland Central had low levels of open defecation ranging from 7-16%.
Households With Hand Washing Facility With Water and Soap/Detergent

- Hand washing facilities were unavailable in 65% of the households.
- Matabeleland North had the highest proportion (78%) of households with no hand washing facilities.
- Manicaland had the highest proportion (14%) of households with handwashing facilities where soap or detergent were available.
Frequency of Hand Washing at Critical Times

- The most critical time observed for hand washing was after using the toilet (44%) followed by before eating (27%) and before handling food (24%).
- The least observed was after assisting the sick (0.5%).
Household Consumption Patterns
• Generally, the coping strategy index (CSI) increased from 25 in 2014 to 27 in 2016.

• The CSI for 2016 was higher in Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland East, Matabeleland North, Midlands and Masvingo compared to 2015.

• The 2016 CSI decreased in Manicaland, Mashonaland West and Matabeleland South compared to 2015.
• Compared to 2015, there was an increase in the proportion of households that consumed poor and borderline diets.
Mashonaland East Province had the highest proportion of households (59%) consuming acceptable diets. This is consistent with ZimVAC 2015 results.

Matabeleland North Province had the least proportion of households (44%) consuming acceptable diets. This is lower than the national average of 54%.
The proportion of households consuming iron rich foods daily was below 10% across all provinces.

Matabeleland North province had the highest proportion of households (60%) that did not consume iron rich foods 7 days prior to the assessment followed by Masvingo (54%) and Matebeleland South (51%).

Iron deficiency anaemia is of public health concern due to its impact on cognitive growth and development and pregnancy outcomes.
Household Dietary Diversity Score

- Out of a total of 12 food groups, the number of food groups consumed by a household (household dietary diversity score) is used as a proxy for food access.
- Mashonaland East Province had the highest number of food groups (6.2) followed by Manicaland at 5.8 consumed over a 24 hour period.
- Matebeleland North province had the least score (4.8)
The majority of households consumed mostly cereals, oils and vegetables.

Protein rich foods such as eggs, meat, milk and pulses were least consumed by households.

This pattern is consistent with what has been observed in the past ZimVAC RLAs.
Feeding Practices in Children 6 – 59 Months
Feeding Practices In Children 6-59 Months

- Good feeding practices of children are among the most important determinants of their health, growth and development.
- Good feeding will prevent malnutrition and early growth retardation.
- At 6 months of age, children should start to receive nutritionally adequate and safe solid, semi-solid and soft foods while breastfeeding continues for up to two years of age or beyond.
- Breastfed children should receive solids and semi-solids at least 2 times if 6–8 months old and 3 times if 9–23 months old.
- If for some reason the child aged 6-23 months old is not breastfed he/she should receive solids, semi-solid, soft foods at least 4 times per day and milk at least 2 times a day.
- Children 24 – 59 months old should receive solids that include nutritious snacks 3-4 times daily.
- The solids, semi-solid, soft foods should be from at least 4 out of 7 food groups (grains, roots and tubers, legumes and nuts, dairy products, meat and fish, eggs, vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables, other fruits and vegetables).
- Foods of animal origins such as meat, fish and milk are an important source of Iron and Vitamin A.
- Vegetables and fruits such as pumpkin, carrots, squash, yellow/orange sweet potatoes, dark green leafy vegetables, ripe mangoes, ripe paws paws are vital sources of vitamin A.
- Iron plays an important role in the prevention anaemia while vitamin A prevents nutritional blindness, significantly reduces the severity of illnesses and even death from such common childhood infections as diarrheal disease and measles.
• About 32% of children consumed iron rich foods 24 hours prior to the survey.
• Mashonaland West had the highest proportion (40%) of children consuming iron-rich foods while Matabeleland North had the lowest (23%).
Nationally, a high proportion of children (90%) consumed Vitamin A rich foods of either animal and/or plant origin 24 hours prior the survey.

About 65% consumed Vitamin A rich foods from animal and 73% from plant origins.

Mashonaland Central (67%) had the lowest proportion of children consuming Vitamin A rich foods.
The proportion of children consuming the recommended 4 food groups is very low; 9% for children 6-23 months and 12% for those 24-59 months old.
Malnutrition and Illness In Children 6-59 Months
Definition of Terms

• Measurements of weight, height and age of a child are converted to nutritional indices to indicate the nutrition status of a child.

• Any of the two measurements are combined to form indices as follows: Weight for height, Weight for age and Height for age.

• Weight for height as a measure of thinness or fatness is sensitive to sudden changes in energy balance.

• The nutrition indices can be classified.
  
  • Weight for height index of between 2 and 3 standard deviation below the mean is called **Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM)/ Wasting**.
  
  • A child with weight for height of more than 3 standard deviation below the mean or/and has oedema is classified as **Severe Acute Malnourished (SAM)**.
  
  • **MAM** or **SAM** are often due to acute starvation and/or severe disease.

• For nutrition emergencies, children less than 5 years are measured since their measurements are more sensitive to factors that influence nutritional status such as illness or food shortages.
Definition Of Terms

- Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) is a sum of Moderate Acute Malnutrition and Severe Acute Malnutrition.

- The prevalence of Global Acute Malnutrition is usually below 5 percent in any developing country provided there is no food shortage.

- Height for Age is an index of growth and development. It is an expression of long term exposure to nutritional inadequacy and indicates chronic malnutrition in children lacking essential nutrients but also related to poor sanitation, repeated infections, diarrhoea and inadequate care.

- Stunting is defined as Height for age index more than two standard deviation below the mean of the WHO reference population.
The national prevalence of GAM was 4.4%, with boys more affected than girls.

The 4.4% prevalence was lower than 5.7% observed in January (ZimVAC Rapid Assessment 2016).

Mashonaland West (6.7%) had the highest prevalence of GAM while Mashonaland East had the lowest (2.6%).

Across most provinces, boys were more affected by GAM except in Mashonaland West.
Prevalence of Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) by District

- Districts with GAM prevalence above 10% were Kariba (17.3%), Gweru (13.1%) Shamva (12.3%) and Binga (11%).
- The next highest districts with 7.1-10% GAM prevalence were Gokwe North and Chegutu (8% each).
The national prevalence of SAM was 1.9%, with boys more affected than girls.

This SAM rate was lower than 2.1% observed during the peak of the hunger season and just below the WHO 2% emergency threshold.
8 districts had a SAM prevalence above 2%. Kariba had the highest (8.3%) followed by Gweru (8.1), Shamva (6.3%), and Chegutu (6%).

This indicates serious levels of acute malnutrition.
The national prevalence of stunting was 26.6% with boys more affected than girls across all provinces.

This result is consistent with other national studies (ZimVAC, 2016; DHS, 2016; MICS, 2014).

Stunting remains a nutrition challenge of public health significance in the country.
• Mutare district had the highest stunting rate (49%) followed by Chimanimani (42.2%), and Nkayi (40%).

• All districts in Manicaland were above the national average of 26.6%.
Nationally, 57% of children were ill two weeks prior to the survey.

Mashonaland West had the highest proportion of children (65%) who were reported to have been ill.

Matabeleland South had the lowest prevalence (39%).
Prevalence of Illness in Children 6-59 Months in the Two Weeks Prior to the Survey

- Nationally, among the children reported to have been ill two weeks prior to the survey the highest proportion had Acute Respiratory Infection (ARI) (45%) followed by fever (30%) and diarrhea (20%). This pattern was similar across all the provinces.
- Mashonaland West had the highest proportion of children who were reported to have ARI while Matabeleland South had the lowest.
- Diarrhea was highest in Mashonaland West (53%) and Masvingo (50%) while Matabeleland South had the least (10%).
To estimate the rural population that is likely to be food insecure in the 2016/17 consumption year, their geographic distribution and the severity of their food insecurity.
Food Security Analytical Framework

• Food security exists when all people at all times, have physical, social and economic access to food which is safe and consumed in sufficient quantity and quality to meet their dietary needs and food preferences and it is supported by an environment of adequate sanitation, health services and care allowing for a healthy and active life (FNSP, 2012).

• The four dimensions of food security include:
  • Availability of food
  • Access to food
  • The safe and healthy utilization of food
  • The stability of food availability, access and utilization

• Household food security status was determined by measuring a household’s potential access to enough food (from various livelihood options available to the household) to give each member a minimum of 2100 kilocalories per day in the consumption period 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017.
Food Security Analytical Framework

• Each of the surveyed household’s potential food access was computed by estimating the household's likely disposable income (both cash and non-cash) in the 2016/17 consumption year from the following possible income sources;
  • cereal stocks from previous season;
  • own food crop production from 2015/16 agricultural season;
  • potential income from own cash crop production;
  • potential income from livestock;
  • Potential income from casual labour and remittances; and
  • income from other sources such as gifts, pensions, gardening and formal and informal employment

• Total energy that could be acquired by the household from the cheapest available energy source (maize was used in this assessment) using its potential disposable income was then computed and compared to the household’s minimum energy requirements.

• When the potential energy a household could acquire was greater than its minimum energy requirements, the household was deemed to be food secure. When the converse was true, the household was defined as food insecure.

• The severity of household food insecurity was computed by the margin with which its potential energy access is below its minimum energy requirements.
Main Assumptions Used in the Food Security Analytical Framework

• Households’ purchasing power will remain relatively stable from April 2016 through the end of March 2017, i.e. average household income levels are likely to track households’ cost of living. This assumption is made on the premise that year-on-year inflation will remain stable throughout the consumption year.

• The national average livestock to maize terms of trade will remain relatively stable throughout the 2016/17 consumption year.

• Staple cereals in the form of maize, small grains (sorghum and millets) or mealie meal will be available on the market for cereal deficit households with the means to purchase to do so throughout the consumption year. This assumption is based on the Government maintaining the liberalised maize trade regime.

• The 2016/17 maize prices will average out at around USD 0.40/kg nationally, USD 0.36/kg in the staple cereal surplus districts and USD 0.46 /kg in the cereal deficit districts. This assumption was informed by price trends observed in various parts of the country during the assessment and historical trends on price fluctuations.

• National cotton, tobacco and soya bean producer prices will average out at USD 0.35/kg, USD 3.71/kg and USD 0.50/kg respectively for the whole 2016/17 marketing season.
Rural food insecurity for the period April to June 2016 was estimated at 6% and is projected to reach 42% during the peak hunger period (January to March 2017). This is the highest rural food insecurity prevalence estimated since 2009.

As expected, there is a progressive increase in the proportion of food insecure households as the consumption year progresses toward the peak hunger period.
• The 2016/17 consumption year food insecurity prevalence is 40% higher than that for the 2015/16 consumption year during the peak hunger period.

• While the greatest increase in food insecurity in the last consumption year was estimated to occur between the October to December and the January to March quarters (200%) it is projected to occur between the April to June and the July to September quarters (283%) in the current consumption year.
About 4.1 million rural people are estimated to be food insecure during the January – March peak hunger season.
During the first quarter for the 2016/17 consumption year, 987,000 people could not meet their annual food requirements which was an increase from last year when 151,000 people were estimated to be food insecure during the same period.

The last quarter of the 2016/17 consumption year is projected to have a total of 4.1 million without adequate means to meet their annual food requirements compared to about 3 million during the same quarter last year.
The 2015/16 and 2016/17 have been consecutive poorest consumption years since 2009.
Cereal Production and Food Insecurity Trends

- There is an inverse relationship between levels of cereal crop production and food insecurity.
- When crop production is low, levels of food insecurity are high and vice versa which demonstrates the significant impact of cereal harvest on the food access in the majority of rural households in the country.
- Cereal production during the previous El Nino years (2002 and 2008) at around 600,000 MT is comparable to that for 2016.
• All other potential sources of cereals (stocks, food and cash crops, casual labour and remittances and livestock) except incomes rendered approximately 27% of rural households to be food secure.

• While the average household income from other income sources such as petty trading, gardening, formal and informal employment is relatively small, its addition on top of the already considered incomes sources renders about 58% of the rural households food secure; bringing the final projection of food insecurity prevalence to 42% in the 2016/17 consumption year.
• Compared to the last two consumption years, the current consumption year has all pillars to the food security scenario contributing less.

• Approximately 2% of households had cereal stocks, as at 1 April 2016, to last them the entire 2016/17 consumption year compared to about 4% at the same time last year and same during the 2013/14 consumption year.

• While the average household income from other income sources is relatively small, its addition on top of the already considered incomes sources renders about 58% of the rural households food secure in current compared which is relatively lower than 70% during the 2014/15 consumption year and 94% in the 2013/14 consumption year.
A general increase in the proportions of food insecure households is projected across all provinces when the 2016/17 consumption is compared to the previous two consumption years.

Matabeleland North (57%), Masvingo (50%) and Midlands (48%) provinces are projected to have the highest proportions of food insecure households at peak hunger period. Mashonaland West province is projected to have the least proportion of food insecure households at 23%.
• Manicaland (761,084) and Masvingo (738,291) provinces are projected to have the highest number of people estimated to be food insecure during the peak period.
## Districts with the Highest Food Insecurity Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Binga</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Chivi</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudzi</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Umzingwane</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umguza</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Tsholotsho</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhera</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Mutoko</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zvishavane</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Mbire</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwenezi</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Bubi</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mberengwa</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Bikita</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirumanzu</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Bulilima</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kariba</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Mt Darwin</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushinga</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Zaka</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Districts with the Lowest Food Insecurity Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chimanimani</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mhondoro-Ngezi</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matobo</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Chegutu</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzarabani</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Hwedza</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makoni</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mazowe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamva</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sanyati</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guruve</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Seke</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murehwa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Makonde</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwekwe</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Marondera</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zvimba</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hurungwe</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Violence Against Women
• In Zimbabwe, violence against women is widely acknowledged to be of great concern, not just from a human rights perspective, but also from an economic and social perspective.

• Violence against women is any act of gender-based violence that results in physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women (UN General Assembly Resolution 48/104 Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, 1993).

• The Inter Agency Standing Committee (IASC) 2015 notes that many forms of GBV are significantly heightened during humanitarian emergencies including natural disasters like drought.

• Food insecurity, in itself, and factors contributing to it can be key drivers of violence against women.
About 6% women experienced physical violence and 2% experienced sexual violence.

The highest proportion of women who experienced physical violence was in Masvingo and Mashonaland East at 7% while the highest proportion of sexual violence was in Mashonaland Central and Mashonaland East at 3%.
• Nationally, 7.5% of women experienced one or more types of spousal violence.

• Mashonaland East had the highest proportion of women who experienced some form of violence (10%) and the lowest was Matabeleland North and South at 5%.
Perpetrators of Physical and Sexual Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current husband/partner</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former husband/partner</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current/former boyfriend</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/step-father</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother/step-brother</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relative</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-law</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family friend</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer/someone at work</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/soldier</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest/religious leader</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother/Step Mother</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/step father</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister/brother</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter/son</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relative</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current boyfriend</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former boyfriend</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-in-law</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-in-law</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer/someone at work</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/soldier</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband/Other</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The most incidences of physical and sexual violence were perpetrated by intimate partners. These included husbands, current/former boyfriends. For physical violence it was reported husbands constituted 51% and for sexual violence, current husbands and partners constituted 59%. This is in line with the ZDHS 2015 study that reported the most commonly reported perpetrator to be the current husband or partner (54%), followed by the former husband or partner (23%).
- Sexual violence that was perpetrated by a stranger was 7%.
Community Challenges & Development Priorities
The most common community challenge is poor roads infrastructure (12%), followed by water for domestic use (10%), markets (10%) and water for production (9%).

The proportion of communities that reported drought as a challenge increased from 2% in 2015 to 8%.

Government (65%), partners (17%), community (16%) and well wishers (2%) had made some efforts to address some of these challenges.
The most common development priority was irrigation infrastructure (15%) followed by dams/water reservoirs (13%), portable water (12%), road infrastructure (11%) and markets availability and access (7%).
Shocks and Hazards
• Hazards are anything that poses a level of threat to human beings livelihoods or means of survival or anything that affects life, health, property or environment.

• The shocks and stresses included in this study were originally derived from the Zimbabwe Disaster Risk Profile provided by the Department of Civil Protection and were refined and contextualized by ZimVAC stakeholders to adapt to the ZimVAC survey methodology and study needs.

• This ultimately classified the hazards into four broad categories which are climatic and environmental shocks and stresses, economic shocks and stresses, health related, natural and manmade shocks and stresses.

• Three dimensions of these hazards were investigated that is exposure, impact and ability of households to recover and cope with the different shock and stresses in different communities.
Ranking of Hazards According to their Impact on Rural Livelihoods

Ranking of the investigated shocks and stresses by communities shows the following order with the first one being perceived to be the most livelihoods impacting hazard:

1. Drought and dry spells
2. Livestock diseases and deaths
3. Crop pests and diseases outbreaks
4. Sharp drop or increase in cereal prices
5. Sharp drop or increase in livestock prices
6. Environmental degradation
7. Diarrheal diseases outbreaks
8. HIV and AIDS related, bolt out sickness incidents
9. Malaria diseases incidents
10. Crop damage by hail storm
11. Floods
12. Veldt fire
13. Land mines
Proportion of Households that Experienced Shocks and Stresses in the 2015/16 Season

- About 79% of the households experienced some shocks.
Exposure to Hazards

There was high convergence of different types of hazards in most of the rural districts of Zimbabwe with each district experiencing a least 8 hazards in every three years (3 times in the last 10 years).

Generally, the same areas with the highest number of hazards were the same areas with the highest frequency.

These are typically bordering districts of the country and areas in the natural farming region IV and V, with some encroachment into the central parts of the country (typically food surplus districts region I,II and III).
Main impacts of Hazards Experienced in the 2015/16 Season

- The recently experienced hazards had the greatest impact on food access/consumption and production as reported by 45% of the households.

- 27% reported reduced income as the main impact of recent hazards experienced.

- 20% indicated assets loss as the main impact (sale of households assets and loss of livestock, etc.)

- Only 1% reported loss of a household member as the main impact.
Conclusions and Recommendations
Conclusions and Recommendations

• About 15% of children of school-going ages were not in school in May 216 in the rural areas. The proportion has ranged between 14% and 24% during the same time in the past four years. The major reasons reported by the households with such children have not changed much in the past four years. They are:
  • Schools being too expensive and parents/guardians having no money;
  • Children considered too young to be in school by parents/guardians; and
  • Schools being too far for children to walk to.

• The first cause for children failing to be in school raises questions on the implementation of the Government Policy for universal primary education and its complementary policy which states that no child should be denied access to schooling for failure to pay school fees. Sustainable ways of funding scaling up of the Basic Education Assistance Module (BEAM) programme should be considered.

• The other two causes speak to the relatively low school density that could be addressed through establishment of satellite schools in the short to medium term and construction of more schools in the long term. Creative public-private sector partnerships could go a long way in addressing this problem.
Conclusions and Recommendations

• The assessment found 22% of households having orphans and 23% of households having children under foster care arrangements. Such vulnerable children were more likely to be out of school, particularly when they were in households with a chronically ill member or a physically/mentally challenged member.

• While household savings are important in smoothing consumption and those with savings were resorting to this as the first coping option preserving their assets, switching of expenditure from other non-food expenses like health and education is the second most common adopted strategy to deal with food challenges. Food access challenges were already impacting on school attendance as 7.3% had withdrawn children from school at some point during the survey period because of hunger.

• In response to increased vulnerability in the past two consumption years, Government and its Development Partners expanded their coverage of food assistance beneficiaries and the flow of remittances also went up. Overall, the proportion of households that received food transfers increased, while that of households that received cash, crop and livestock input and water and sanitation inputs decreased during the 2015/16 consumption year compared to the previous one.
Conclusions and Recommendations

• With even increased vulnerability in the 2016/17 consumption year, demand on relatives to assist their rural folks is expected to increase. However, the ability of the remittances to respond is uncertain given the depressed domestic economy as well as the depreciation of the South African Rand against the United States of America Dollar; the currency of choice for the general Zimbabwean public.

• Given the level of food insecurity already obtaining in the rural areas, the Government and its Development Partners should consider continuing with food assistance programmes with plans to scale up these earlier in the consumption year than usual.

• To help farmers recover from two consecutive seasons of poor production, the Government should consider tying food assistance programmes to preparedness for the next farming season.

• The order of the most important sources of household cash income (starting with the most common) was casual labour, crop production, remittances, vegetable production and livestock production for the period 2012 -2015. This was disrupted in 2016 when remittances were the second most important source of cash followed by vegetable sales, livestock sales and crop production. This is expected given the very poor crop production most rural households experienced in the 2016 harvest. Consequently, the demand for remittances to make up for the lost crop production income was high.
Conclusions and Recommendations

- An analysis of average household incomes for the month of April from 2012 to 2016 suggests a very strong positive relationship between the rainfall season quality and average household income. This observation indicates that stabilising and growing agricultural income would be key to increasing the resilience of rural livelihoods.

- The current and past Rural Livelihoods Assessment results show that the share of rural households’ expenditure taken by food is around 60% when the prevalence of food insecurity is less than 10%. Since, it is common knowledge that the share of average household expenditure taken by food increases with increasing poverty or increased vulnerability, there is need for Government and its Development Partners to provide food assistance before households are forced to spend an increased share of their money on food.

- Proportions of households accessing loans remain low and these were predominantly given by family and friends to family members and friends; they remain largely informal. Financial inclusion in the formal institutions such as Banks, SACCOs and microfinance remains largely constrained. This may be stemming from the fact that most of these households are borrowing for consumption hence presenting a credit risk to the formal financial institutions.

- Efforts should be directed at stimulating investments in rural areas and towards supporting ISALs to improve financial inclusion. Humanitarian programmes that improve access to food may also assist in redirecting the decision of farmers in borrowing for investment rather than consumption to improve their credit rating with formalised financial institutions.
Conclusions and Recommendations

• Investments in climate smart agriculture should also be put in place as most of the farmers who had overdue loans indicated that the reason for such a state attaining was that they had obtained less than expected crop production due to poor rainfall seasons.

• With the exception of maize, tobacco and cotton, the proportion of households that grew the major food and cash crops in 2015 increased significantly compared to those that did in 2014. However, the poorer rainfall season experienced in the 2015/16 agricultural season resulted in reduced household crop harvests in all districts and rural provinces.

• Inadequate household agricultural labour, limited ability to hire and commandeer additional labour from friends, relatives and neighbours coupled with a rather high dependence on retained and unimproved seed varieties for most food crops, other than maize, continue to constrain households’ crop productivity.

• The El Nino-induced drought that ravaged Zimbabwe and many other SADC countries highlighted, once more, the importance and urgency of efforts to build resilience against climate variability and climate change amongst the rural populations of Zimbabwe. These efforts could include stepping up the promotion of climate-smart agriculture, water harvesting and irrigation development, particularly in the most drought-prone areas.
Conclusions and Recommendations

• The consecutive poor rainfall seasons marginally reduced the proportion of households that own cattle and those that own goats. The proportion of households with cattle and goat herd sizes greater than five (5) were at their lowest in April 2016 compared to the same time in the past 4 years.

• Livestock drought mitigation strategies need to be prioritized in areas that suffered most from the Eli Nino induced drought and where livestock makes the most significant contribution to households’ livelihoods. The mitigation strategies could include:
  • Provision of subsidised livestock feeds and animal drugs; and
  • Facilitating access to relief grazing; and

• There is need to capacitate the Department of Livestock and Veterinary Services’ disease surveillance and disease control. This should include increased mobility, refresher training of front line staff and provision of relevant work tools and equipment.

• Government remains the dominant source of agricultural (crop and livestock) extension for most rural communities whose livelihoods are mainly based on agriculture. Therefore, there is need to strengthen the Government extension system with capacity enhancement and financial resources while promoting complementary and viable private sector extension models.
Conclusions and Recommendations

• Rural Communities continue to face challenges in accessing markets for agricultural inputs and outputs as well as for food. Most rural communities are generally far from markets and have poor road and communication infrastructure connecting them. There is need to strengthen District Development Fund (DDF) with capacity enhancement and financial resources for maintenance of rural feeder roads.

• Markets play an important role in household food security. The driving forces of markets such as supply, demand and macroeconomic conditions have played a role in the current situation and the projected food security situation for the 2016/17 consumption year. Monitoring changes in the market should therefore be one of the key food security monitoring activities.

• There was a notable decline in the proportion of households consuming acceptable diets and an increase in households having poor food consumption which shows deterioration in household food security in May 2016 compared to same time last year. Furthermore, the consumption based coping strategies were highest in 2016 compared to the past three years.

• Overall, the consumption frequency of foods rich in haemoglobin iron was the poorest followed by the consumption of proteins and Vitamin A. Matabeleland North consistently recorded low consumption of all the nutrient rich foods. Inclusion of milk and other animal source proteins in the diet of households was higher in those Provinces with higher proportions of households who are milking either Goats or cows. Most households were found not to be consuming goat milk despite its nutritive value. Households which recorded low/no consumption of iron and Vitamin A could be at risk of micronutrient deficiencies. There is need to strengthen the implementation of nutrition sensitive agriculture with emphasis on production of Vitamin A rich and Iron rich fruits and vegetables.
Conclusions and Recommendations

• The Ministry of Health and Child Care should strengthen micro-nutrient supplementation programmes targeting children under 5, adolescents and women of child bearing age.

• Most households were found not to be consuming goat milk despite its nutritive value. There is need to further interrogate the issue and come up with effective strategies to promote consumption of goat milk.

• WASH practices continue to be of concern across all provinces. Matabeleland North is the worse off province for all WASH indicators. In-depth research is required to understand the causal factors of the relatively high prevalence of open defecation across the country, particularly in Matabeleland North province.

• There is need to intensify key hygiene messages targeting hand-washing with soap at critical times. Promotion of demand-led approaches to WASH is needed for effective uptake of interventions, with a particular focus on behaviour change. Scaling up the repair and rehabilitation of broken down water points could reduce the distance travelled by households to access water in many areas.
Conclusions and Recommendations

• Focus on drilling or construction of new water points to improve access to safe water in the dry regions should be prioritized. Community Based Management around repaired and rehabilitated boreholes and or newly constructed water points needs to be encouraged.

• There is need for the WASH sector to promote the use of renewable energy for the motorization of high yielding boreholes, as this can also reduce distances travelled to access water, hence lightening the burden on women.

• The majority of the rural districts experienced a number of hazards once in every three years. Generally the hazards experienced had the greatest impact on households’ food access, assets loss and cash incomes for most households. Yet a majority of the rural population lacks capacities to cope and recover from the compounded impact of different types of hazards they experience.

• There is, therefore, an urgent need review and revamp policies and programmes that help communities and households to strengthen their capacities to deal with compounded and recurrent effects of shocks and stresses to ensure sustainable livelihoods and economic growth in the rural areas.
Conclusions and Recommendations

• Violence against women (both physical and sexual) continues to be a national problem. Efforts to address this must focus on the factors that are likely to drive violence including food insecurity and interventions to address this as well as income vulnerabilities.

• Future assessments should be improved to link better demographics (such as marital status by age, education level), income levels and access to food/cash assistance to the actual respondent with questions on gender based violence. This will strengthen the analysis of drivers of violence in emergency situations.

• The national prevalence of Global Acute Malnutrition was 4.4%, with boys more affected than girls. The GAM rate was lower than 5.7% observed in January (ZimVAC 2016). The national prevalence of Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) was 1.9%, with boys more affected than girls. This SAM rate is lower than 2.1% observed during the peak of the hunger season and just below the WHO 2% emergency threshold.

• Mashonaland West (6.7%) had the highest prevalence of GAM while Mashonaland East had the lowest (2.6%). GAM prevalence was above 10% Kariba (17.3%), Gweru (13.1%) Shamva (12.3%) and Binga (11%).
Conclusions and Recommendations

• The national prevalence of stunting was 26.6% with boys more affected than girls across all provinces. This result is consistent with other national studies (ZimVAC, 2016, DHS, 2016, MICS, 2014). Stunting remains a nutrition challenge of public health significance in the country that requires sustained efforts to address it underlying causes.

• An in-depth understanding of the malnutrition situation exercise is required for Kariba, Gweru, Chegutu and Shamva districts that showed exceptionally high rates of malnutrition to ensure timely appropriate response and to prevent further deterioration of the situation.

• Blanket supplementary feeding is recommended for districts with GAM above 7% and targeted supplementary feeding for children under five and pregnant and lactating women with moderate acute malnutrition is recommended for all other districts prioritised with order of severity.
Conclusions and Recommendations

• There is need for a robust and real time community based surveillance system to constantly monitor the tenuous nutritional situation especially as the season progresses towards the hunger or lean months of year.

• Livelihood and food security interventions coupled with nutrition education programmes should be implemented alongside emergency response programmes to ensure consumption of diverse and micronutrient rich foods while simultaneously building community resilience to future shocks that compromise household food and nutrition security.

• Rural food insecurity prevalence in June 2016 was estimated at 6% and is projected to reach 42% during the peak hunger period (January to March 2017). This is the highest rural food insecurity prevalence estimated since 2009. It is 40% higher than that for the 2015/16 year (30%) during the peak hunger period. This food insecurity prevalence translates to about 4.1million rural people compared to 3million people for the previous consumption year.
Conclusions and Recommendations

- There is an inverse relationship between levels of cereal crop production and food insecurity prevalence. When crop production is low, levels of food insecurity are high and vice versa. This demonstrates the significant impact cereal harvests have on household food access for the majority of rural households in the country.

- Matabeleland North (57%), Masvingo (50%) and Midlands (48%) provinces are projected to have the highest proportions of food insecure households at peak hunger period. Mashonaland West province (23%) is projected to have the least proportion of food insecure households. Twenty districts are projected to have more 50% of their households having inadequate means to meet their food needs without resorting to severe livelihoods and consumption coping strategies.

- Manicaland (761,084) and Masvingo (738,291) provinces are projected to have the highest number of food insecure people during the peak period.

- Food assistance programmes should be continued to reflect the current food insecurity estimates and they should have built-in strategies to scale-up in tandem with the projected increase in food insecurity prevalence. About 380,000MT of maize or an equivalent assortment of food stuffs that can provide the same amount of energy is needed to close the projected food gap of the food insecure households.

- This projected food security situation is made assuming that Government and the Private sector will, once more, collaborate to import maize enough to fill the 2016 cereal (maize, sorghum and millets) harvest deficit estimated by the Ministry of Agriculture Mechanisation and Irrigation Development at 964,032MT.

- Given that the food insecurity projections are made on the basis of a number of assumptions, there is need to regularly monitor these and update the food security projections situation accordingly throughout the 2016/17 consumption year.
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