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Foreword

The National Food and Nutrition Security Information System is essential for understanding the breadth and scope of food and nutrition insecurity thereby assisting in prioritising and planning food and nutrition interventions and broader livelihoods. In its endeavour to ‘promote and ensure adequate food and nutrition security for all people at all times’, the Government of Zimbabwe has continued to exhibit its commitment for reducing food and nutrition insecurity, improving livelihoods and reducing poverty amongst the vulnerable populations in Zimbabwe. In this light ZimVAC, acting as the technical advisory committee on assessments, undertook the 17th edition of the Rural Livelihoods Assessment in May 2017.

The 2017 Rural Livelihoods Assessment (RLA) provides updates on pertinent rural livelihoods issues such as education, food and income sources, income levels, expenditure patterns and food security among other issues. It recognises and draws from other contemporary surveys that define the socio-economic context of rural livelihoods.

This report provides a summation of the results of the processes undertaken and focuses on the following thematic areas: Household demographics, social protection, education, food consumption patterns, food sources and nutrition, income and expenditure patterns and levels, agriculture, markets, household food security, health and nutrition, water, sanitation and hygiene, community livelihood challenges and development priorities, resilience, shocks and hazards and gender based violence. The report concludes by giving specific recommendations on each of the thematic areas outlined in the report. It is our hope that these recommendations will aide to your development of response strategies.

The active participation of all food and nutrition structures at National, Provincial, District levels and the community at large is greatly appreciated. The Government of Zimbabwe and Development partners’ financial support provided all the impetus the ZimVAC required to meet the cost for this exercise. We also want to thank our staff at the Food and Nutrition Council (FNC) for providing leadership, coordination and management to the whole 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 in a manner that ensures 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 insecurity, and:
  - Supporting and building national capacity for food and nutrition security including at sub-national levels.
Background

- Since 2011, Zimbabwe’s Gross Domestic Product growth rate has been declining from a high of 11.9% to 1.5% in 2015. It was estimated at 0.6% in 2016 but is now projected to rise to 3.7% in 2017 and to taper off slightly to 3.4% in 2018 mainly on the back of improved performance of the agricultural sector (Ministry of Finance, 2017; World Bank, 2017).
- Year on year inflation rate has been in the negative for the whole of 2016 but has accelerated into the positive, from -0.7% in January 2017 to 0.5% in April 2017. The increase in annual headline inflation was mainly driven by food inflation (ZIMSTAT, 2017).
- Decent and secure employment remain subdued and the economy continues to be gripped in the throes of deep and widespread cash shortages that have mainly arisen from sustained higher imports against lower export earnings. As of May 2017, the country was experiencing a cash shortage of USD347 million, which is an improvement from an average shortage of USD450 million experienced during the greater part of 2016 (Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe, 2017).
- The ZimSTAT 2011/2012 Poverty Income and Consumption Survey estimated 76% of rural households to be poor and 23% were deemed extremely poor. This situation is likely to have worsened given the economic performance in the intervening period up to 2016.
- The normal to above normal 2016/17 rainfall season, coming after a devastating El Nino induced drought, coupled with support from both Government and the Private sector through the Special Maize Programme as well as other supportive initiatives such as contract farming had a positive impact on the agriculture sector.
- Given the importance of the agricultural sector to rural livelihoods as well as the Zimbabwean economy, this significant improvement in the agricultural sector denotes improvements in rural livelihoods in general.
- Most dams in the seven catchment areas were full and spilling over. Average national dam levels as at 5 May 2017 were 81.3%, up from 71.5% reported in February (Zimbabwe National Water Authority, 2017).
Background - The 2016/17 Rainfall and Agricultural Season Quality

- The 2016/17 rainfall season started in November 2016 for most parts of the country. The bulk of the country received effective rainfall during the 2nd dekad of November.

- The rains were generally on time for most parts of the country and slightly early in some parts of the country and it was 10-30 days late in most of the areas where its onset was in December 2016.
Background - The 2016/17 Rainfall and Agricultural Season Quality

- Generally, the rainfall distributions in space and time over the season were good. By the end of the rainfall season in April 2017, most areas across the country had received normal to above normal rains.

- Given the normal to above normal rains received across the country as well as the generally good distribution, the maize crop performance ranged from good to very good for most areas and was average in the southern part of the country. A few isolated areas had mediocre maize crop performance.
Background - 2016/17 Rainfall and Agriculture Season Challenges

- Zimbabwe faced critical shortages of fertilizers this season as fertilizer companies experienced liquidity challenges to pay for raw materials. As a result, most communal farmers planted without basal fertilizers.

- The Fall Armyworm wreaked havoc initially in the western parts of the country but spread to all provinces and some peri-urban areas, attacking crops (maize, small grains and others).

- The worm proved more difficult to control compared to the common African Armyworm. Shortage of the right chemicals and poor liquidity among farmers made it difficult to contain the outbreak. However, the pest’s impact on crop yields were minimal. Nonetheless, this pest has potential to undermine future crop production and overall national food security if effective control strategies are not put in place urgently.

- In mid-February, the southern parts of the country (mainly Masvingo, southern Midlands and the Matabeleland Provinces) were hit by the effects of the tropical depression Dineo, which precipitated flooding that destroyed crops, livestock, property, infrastructure (roads, bridges, dams etc.), worsening the preceding damage from the persistent rains that had been received across the country (FEWSNET, 2017).

- Due to the extent of the problem, His Excellency the President of the Republic of Zimbabwe Cde. R.G. Mugabe, in accordance with Subsection (1) of Section 27 of the Civil Protection Act of 1989 declared a State of Flood Disaster on 2 March 2017. The declaration covered severely flood affected areas in communal, resettlement lands and urban areas of Zimbabwe.
Background - Areas Most Affected by the Effects of the Tropical Depression Dineo

- Areas most affected by flooding and waterlogging include Tsholotsho, Lupane, Nkayi, Binga, Umguza, Hwange urban, Matobo, Umzingwane, Bulilima, Insiza, Beitbridge, Gwanda, Gokwe North, Gokwe South, and Mberengwa, Chivi, Mwenezi, Chiredzi, Masvingo rural, Bikita, Kariba, Zvimba, Hurungwe, Mutare rural, Mutasa, Buhera, Chipinge, Chimanimani, Guruve, Mt. Darwin, Mutoko and Marondera (rural) District.

- The worst affected district was Tsholotsho where a total of 859 people were left homeless.
Assessment Purpose

• The overall purpose of the 2017 Rural Livelihoods Assessment was to provide an annual update on rural livelihoods for the purposes of informing policy formulation and programming appropriate interventions.
Specific Objectives

The 2017 ZimVAC Rural Livelihoods Assessment was conducted with the broad objective of assessing the prevailing food and nutrition insecurity situation and impact of the food assistance and input support programmes on rural livelihoods in Zimbabwe. The assessment’s specific objectives were:

- To estimate the population that is likely to be food insecure in the 2017/18 consumption year, their geographic distribution, gender distribution and the severity of their food insecurity;

- To assess the nutrition status of children of 6 – 59 months in rural households;

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

- To determine the coverage and impact of livelihoods interventions in rural households;

- To identify viable response interventions to community challenges in rural households;

- To identify development priorities for rural communities in rural provinces of the country; and

- To measure household resilience and identify constraints to improving community resilience and rural livelihoods including opportunities and pathways of addressing them in the face of prevailing and unpredictable shocks and stresses.
Technical Scope

The 2017 RLA collected and analysed information on the following thematic areas:

- Household demographics
- Social Protection
- Education
- Food consumption patterns
- Income and expenditure patterns and levels
- Agriculture
- Markets
- Household food security
- Nutrition
- Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
- Community livelihood challenges and development priorities.
- Resilience, Shocks and hazards
- Gender Based Violence
Assessment Methodology
Methodology and Assessment Process

- The assessment design was informed by the multi-sectoral objectives generated through a multi-stakeholder consultation process.

- An appropriate survey design and protocol, informed by the survey objectives, was developed.

- The assessment used a structured household questionnaire, a community Focus Group Discussion questionnaire and 2 District key informant questionnaires as the primary data collection instruments.

- ZimVAC national supervisors and enumerators were recruited from Government, United Nations, Technical partners and Non-Governmental Organisations. These underwent training in all aspects of the assessment (background, data collection tools, assessment sampling strategy and assessment supervision).

- The Ministry of Rural Development, Promotion and Preservation of National Culture and Heritage through the Provincial Administrators’ offices coordinated the recruitment of district level enumerators and mobilisation of vehicles in each of the 60 rural districts of Zimbabwe.

- District enumeration teams comprised of officers from Government and local NGOs. Each district enumeration team had one Anthropometrist who had the responsibility of measuring children aged 6-59 months. District enumeration teams were trained by national supervisors.

- Primary data collection took place from the 8th to the 28th of May 2017, followed by data entry and cleaning from the 22nd to the 30th of May 2017.

- Data analysis, report writing and editing ran from the 29th of May 2017 to the 15th of June 2017. Various secondary data sources were used to contextualise the analysis and reporting.

- Data analysis and report writing were done by a team of 30 technical officers from Government, United Nations and technical partners under the leadership and coordination of FNC.
Data Collection Methods and Sample Size

- The sample was drawn from the ZIMSTAT 2012 Master sample.
- The sampling design was multi-pronged and comprised of:
  - non-probability sampling (purposive sampling) for district level key informant interviews and community level focus group discussions
  - probability sampling for household surveys where
    - household food insecurity prevalence was used as the key indicator for sample size determination
    - results for the key indicators are statistically representative at district, provincial and national level at 95% level of confidence
  - a two stage cluster sampling was employed with
    - the first stage involved EA selection using the PPS principle
    - the second stage involved household selection using systematic random sampling
- 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 11,858 and that for children aged 6 to 59 months was 4,422
- One community key informant Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was held in each of the selected wards, bringing the total community key informant FGDs to 1,170.
- Two district level key informant interviews on food assistance and school feeding interventions were administered in each of the 60 rural districts.
- In addition to the above, field observations and systematic secondary data review yielded valuable information that was used in the analysis and writing of the assessment report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Children under 5</th>
<th>Community FGDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland Central</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland North</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland South</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11858</strong></td>
<td><strong>4422</strong></td>
<td><strong>1170</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sampled Wards
Data Preparation and Analysis

- All primary data was captured using CSPro and was consolidated and converted into SPSS datasets for:
  - Household analysis
  - Child Nutrition
  - Community key informant interviews
  - District key informant interviews
- Data cleaning and analysis were done using SPSS, ENA, Stata, Microsoft Excel and GIS packages.
- Analyses of the different thematic areas covered by the assessment were informed and guided by relevant local and international frameworks, where they exist.
- Gender, as a cross cutting issue, was recognised throughout the analysis.
Demographic Description of the Sample
• The highest population group in the sampled households was in the 18-59 years age category.

• The pattern is similar to the one observed last year and in previous surveys.
Nationally, the 18 – 59 age group had the highest proportion (42.0%) of the sampled households followed by age group 5 - 17 (36.7%).

Children aged 0-4 years constituted 12.1% while the elderly age group 60 years and above were 9.2%.
Most households (67%) were headed by males while 33% were female headed.

Of these household heads, 0.5% represented child headed households while 32% represented the elderly headed households.

There was a decrease in child headed households from 2% (2016) whereas the elderly headed households increased from 27%.

The average age of household heads was 50 years.

The average household size was 5.
A greater proportion of household heads (64.3%) were married and living together with their spouses while (21.5%) were widows and widowers.
The above results show a declining trend in households’ burden of vulnerability from 2015 to 2017.
Dependency Ratio

- Household dependency ratio was calculated as follows:

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

- The average household dependency ratio was 1.7.

- The highest dependency ratio was recorded in Masvingo, Matabeleland North and Matabeleland South (1.8).

- The lowest dependency ratio was recorded in Mashonaland West at 1.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>2016 Dependency Ratio</th>
<th>2017 Dependency Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland Central</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland North</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland South</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Protection
Background to 2016/17 Social Assistance and Protection

- The 2015/16 production year was affected by adverse weather conditions (El-Nino) which resulted in the nation declaring a state of emergency as well as launching the Domestic and International Appeal for food supply assistance in February 2016.
- The 2016 Rural Livelihoods Assessment estimated that 4.1 million rural people would be food insecure in the peak hunger period (Jan-March 2017).
- Government and partners mobilised resources from both within and outside the country and supported the vulnerable and food insecure populations.
- Over the period October 2015 through to May 2017, Government had distributed more than 550 000 Mt of maize grain to food insecure households (Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare) while UN/NGO partners imported and distributed 39 423.20Mt of maize grain between February 2016 and May 2017 (WFP).
During the 2016/17 consumption year, about 71% of rural households received some support in at least one of the following forms; food, cash, crop inputs, livestock inputs as well as Water, Sanitation and Hygiene.

There has been an increase in the proportion of households that received support during the 2016/17 consumption year compared to the previous one.

All the rural provinces reported an increase in the proportion of households that received support except for Mashonaland West which had a slight drop from 70% in 2015/16 to 68% in 2016/17.
## 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>74.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash Central</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash West</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat North</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat South</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There was a remarkable increase in Government support from 48.5% (2015/16) to 76.7% (2016/17).
- Mashonaland West (93.3%) had the highest proportion of households receiving support from Government followed by Mashonaland Central (90.5%).
- UN/NGOs support was highest in Manicaland (44.3%) followed by Masvingo (40.3%).
- Matabeleland South (31.4%) had the highest percentage of remittances from outside Zimbabwe followed by Matabeleland North (11.2%).
- UN/NGO support also doubled from 16.4% (2015/16) to 32% (2016/17).
- Support from churches, from relatives within and outside Zimbabwe increased marginally in 2016/17 from their 2015/16 levels.
Forms of Support

- Food as a form of support to vulnerable households increased from 40% (2015) to 59% (2017) whereas cash support dropped from 31% (2015) to 24% (2016 and 2017).

- Crop input support has also been fluctuating from a high of 72% in 2015 down to 30% in 2016 then rising to 34% in 2017.

- Livestock inputs and WASH inputs as forms of support have been on a downward trend since 2015.
### Forms of Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Food Support %</th>
<th>Cash support %</th>
<th>Crop Input support %</th>
<th>Livestock support %</th>
<th>WASH support %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash Central</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash West</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat North</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat South</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The most common form of support received by households was food (59.0%) followed by crop inputs (34.2%).
- Matabeleland North had the highest proportion of households receiving food (69.4%) followed by Matabeleland South (66.9%).
- Livestock support remained very low across all provinces.
- Crop Inputs support was high in Mashonaland Central (49.5%) followed by Midlands (40.4%).
Education
About 88.4% of the children of school going age were in school during the survey period.

The proportion of children out of school during the survey period decreased from 15.3% in 2016 to 11.6% in 2017.
• About 89.3% of female children and 88% of male children were in school at the time of the survey.
• Of those children who were not in school during the survey period, 42% were not in school due to financial constraints followed by 23% who were considered too young.

• The reason that children were being considered too young to go to school and that of schools being too far may be suggestive of limited physical access to school, particularly those that cater for Early Child Development levels.

• About 7% were not in school due to illness.
This graph shows the proportion of children of school going age who were turned away from school, at one time or another, during the first term of 2017 due to non-payment of school fees.

Nationally, at least 63% of the children experienced being turned away for non payment of school fees. Generally, the proportion of children who were turned away from school during the first term of 2017 was high in all provinces. This is so despite there being in place a policy that discourages this practice.
Access to Agricultural Extension Services
Households which Received Agricultural Training

- The proportion of households receiving agricultural training has remained relatively low for the past 3 years at 38% in 2014/15, 35% in 2015/16 and 34% in 2016/17.
- This calls for the need to capacitate extension service.
Access to Agricultural Training by Household Characteristics

- Mothers and fathers participated more in agricultural training at 44% and 39% respectively.
- With the exception of Mashonaland West province, households with mothers that participated in the trainings were more than those with fathers that did so across all provinces.
- Matabeleland South and Matabeleland North had the highest proportion of households with mothers who participated in training at 55% and 49% respectively.
- Mashonaland West had the highest proportion of households with fathers who participated in the trainings at 59%.
The proportion of households that received extension visits marginally increased from 28% to 31% between 2015/16 and 2016/17, but generally remained low across all provinces.

The proportion of households that received extension visits increased in all provinces except Midlands where it remained unchanged.
Households which Sought Agricultural Advice

- The proportion of households which sought cropping advice was high in Mashonaland Central and Manicaland.

- The proportion of households which sought livestock advice was high in Matabeleland North and Matabeleland South, Midlands and Masvingo Provinces.

- There was no significant increase in the proportion of households that sought cropping advice out of their own initiative from 25% in the 2015/16 season to 26% in the 2016/17 season.
• Government was reported as the most common provider of crop extension services in all provinces (88%) followed by NGOs (7%).

• The highest proportion of households which received support services from Lead Farmers was reported in Matabeleland South (4%).
Livestock Extension Providers

- Government was reported as the major provider of livestock extension services in all provinces (92%) followed by NGOs (4%)
- The highest proportion of households which received support services from Lead Farmers was recorded in Matabeleland South (7%)
Households with Livestock that were Vaccinated

- About 62% of rural households with cattle reported that their cattle were vaccinated against Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) and 55% reported vaccination against Anthrax.

- About 39% of households with chickens reported their flock was vaccinated against New Castle disease.

- The highest proportion of households with cattle that were vaccinated against FMD was in Matabeleland North (71%), Masvingo had the highest vaccinations against anthrax (64%) and Mashonaland Central had the highest vaccinations against New Castle disease (50%).
Households Trained in Participatory Disease Surveillance

- About 41% of the households owning cattle received training in participatory disease surveillance between April 2016 and March 2017.
- Matabeleland South had the highest proportion of households that received training (50%) and Mashonaland Central had the lowest proportion of households (33%).
Effects of the Fall Armyworm

Maize Crop Damaged by the Fall Armyworm

Fall Armyworm on Growing Cob

Premature Drying on Damaged Cob
• At least 36% of households were affected by the Fall Armyworm in the 2016/17 agricultural season.

• Mashonaland Central had highest proportion of affected households (53%) while Manicaland had the least affected (16%).
• About 96% of the households reported that their maize crop was affected by the Fall armyworm.

• Other crops of major agricultural importance attacked by the pest include sorghum, millets, cowpeas, groundnuts, potatoes, soyabean and cotton.
• About 63.8% of the households whose crops were infested by fall armyworm indicated that their crops were mostly first attacked when they were in their vegetative stage.
The Fall armyworm was observed for the first time in September 2016 in isolated cases and became more prevalent in January and February 2017 when most households observed it across all the provinces.

Infestation levels of the pest were highest in February 2017 when about 43.1% of those households that were affected by fall armyworm first observed the worm on their crop. As the majority of the crop was planted mid November 2016, in February the crop was at its optimum vegetative stage.

Infestation in April (12%) decreased as most crops had reached physiological maturity although the pest feeds on kernels as well.
Of the households whose crops were attacked by fall armyworm, about 62.5% of them did not take any measures to control the pest resulting in extensive damage to crops.

Other households used commercial pesticides (including recommended ones) while others applied other substances like sand and ground amaranthus. Other households resorted to handpicking and squashing the worms in an attempt to control them.
• About 47.2% of the affected households reported that the methods used were not effective. This includes those who applied pesticides at different levels which were less than the recommended dosage, the recommended dosage and more than the recommended dosage.
• About 77% of households that did nothing did so because of lack of money to purchase chemicals, 4% the households could not find the pesticides and 4% did not know the pesticides to apply.
Methods Used to Apply Pesticide or Substance

- About 69% of the households that sprayed the pest used knapsack sprayers to apply pesticides against the recommended method of pouring used by 29% of the households.

- Spot spraying of affected plants directly into the funnel increases chances of contact between pest and insecticide. Drenching funnels also increases chances of drowning and suffocating the pest.
Provision of Extension Advice to Households Affected by Fall Armyworm

- About 36% of the households affected by the fall armyworm received extension advice.

- Of these 69% received it from Government extension officers and 26% from neighbours or friends.

- Some households also received relevant information on the Fall armyworm through the mass media (radios, television, flyers and newspapers).
Crop Production
Maize (88%), groundnuts (47%) and cowpeas (40%) were the most common planted crops by households. The proportion of households growing small grains remains low, despite all the efforts and rhetoric to promote the growing of these crops.

There was a general increase in the proportion of households that planted all crops. The greatest increase was in the proportion of households that grew tobacco and cotton due to support these crops got from the private sector and the Government, respectively.
Proportion of Households which Planted Cereals by Province

- Over 80% of households in all the provinces planted maize.
- As in the previous seasons, Matabeleland South, Matabeleland North and Masvingo had high proportions of households which grew small grains in the 2016/2017 agricultural season.
• Nationally, 92% of the households practiced agriculture. Of these, 54% of the households reported inadequacy of agricultural labour during the agricultural season.

• The inadequacy of agricultural labour across all provinces calls for increased use of agricultural labour saving technologies.
• About 19% of the households hired casual labour for agricultural purposes.

• Mashonaland East and Mashonaland West had the highest proportion of households that reported to have hired labour (22%) and Masvingo the least (15%).

• About 17% of the households accessed agricultural labour from relatives and friends.
Sources of Seeds Used by Households During the 2016/2017 Agricultural Season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crops</th>
<th>Purchase (%)</th>
<th>Government (%)</th>
<th>NGOs (%)</th>
<th>Carryover (%)</th>
<th>Retained (%)</th>
<th>Remittance (%)</th>
<th>Private Companies (%)</th>
<th>Labour exchange (%)</th>
<th>Other (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Millet</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Millet</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubers</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowpeas</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundnuts</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Beans</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soyabean</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paprika</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Purchases were the main source of seed for maize, tobacco, paprika and sugar beans.
- Retained seed was the major source for small grains, cowpeas, tubers, groundnuts and round nuts.
- The main source of inputs for cotton was Government.
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>292.4</td>
<td>108.6 335.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash Central</td>
<td>525.8</td>
<td>136.2 517.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>367.0</td>
<td>124.1 378.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mash West</td>
<td>462.2</td>
<td>397.6 739.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat North</td>
<td>142.8</td>
<td>48.1 240.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat South</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>22.8 174.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>292.7</td>
<td>132.3 522.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>136.4</td>
<td>42.3 356.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>293.5</td>
<td>126.5 480.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Nationally there was a 266% increase in average household cereal production, 280% increase in average household maize production and 157% increase in average household small grains production from last season.
- The average household production was highest in Mashonaland West 739.2kg and the least in Matabeleland South with 174.5kg.
- Masvingo had the highest increase from 42.3kg to 356.7kg and Mashonaland West had the least from 397.6kg to 739.2kg.
- Considering the high household cereal production and findings from previous ZimVAC assessments which indicated that most households use improper facilities to store their grain, there is need to foster good post harvest management to minimize potentially high post harvest losses.
Household Access to Irrigation
Proportion of Wards with Irrigation Schemes

- About 22.1% of the wards had irrigation schemes
- Of these, 55.4% of the irrigation schemes were functional, 22.0% partially functional and 22.6% were non-functional.
• Equipment breakdown, the need for infield works habilitation and seasonality of water sources, lack of capital and failure to afford inputs continue to be the main challenges faced in most irrigation schemes.
Livestock Production
- About 45% of rural households own cattle, a 9% increase from last year with 32% owning more than 2 beasts and 13% owning 1 or 2 beasts.
- The highest proportion of households owning cattle was in Masvingo (54%) followed by Matabeleland North and Midlands (53%).
- The lowest proportion of households with cattle was in Manicaland (28%).
- Matabeleland North (25%) had the highest proportion of households with more than 5 cattle.
About 36% of rural households own draft cattle, 5% more than the previous season. 6% owned 1 draft animal and 30% owned 2 or more.

The highest proportion of households with draft cattle was in Midlands at 50%.
Cattle Herd Dynamics

- Increases in the cattle herd during the period April 2016 to March 2017 were due to births (92%), purchases (5.4%) and assistance (1.7%).
- Losses in cattle were due to deaths (56%) and sales (30%).
- Stolen or lost cattle contributed 5% of the total attrition.
Mortality rates for cattle and goats were high (10% for cattle and 17% for goats). These were above the national threshold levels of 5% for cattle and 8% for goats.

High cattle mortality rates were reported in Matabeleland South (14%) and high goat mortality rates were reported in Midlands (25%).

Low cattle mortality rates were reported in Mashonaland West (6%), whilst low goat mortality rates were reported in Mashonaland Central (11%).
• About 58% of total cattle deaths were due to diseases, followed by 33% due to drought.

• Mashonaland East and Mashonaland West reported high deaths due to diseases (76%).
• Most households sold cattle to purchase food (31.3%) and pay education expenses (18.7%).

• About 10.5% of the households sold cattle because they were no-longer needed and had exhausted their usefulness.
• About 46% of households owned goats, an increase from last year’s 38%. Of these, 34% own 3 or more goats, while 13% own 1 to 2 goats.

• The highest proportion of households which owned livestock was in Matabeleland South (60%) and the lowest proportion was in Manicaland (34%).
The increases in goats during the period April 2016 to March 2017 were due to births (91.9%), purchases (6.5%) and assistance (0.7%).

About 43.4% of the total attrition was due to deaths, 27.1% due to slaughter and 25% due to sales.

Stolen or lost goats contributed 4.5% of the total attrition.
Most households sold goats to purchase food (46%) and pay education expenses (22.1%).
Causes of Goats Deaths

- About 67.6% of deaths were due to diseases, 14.6% due to drought and 10.6% due to predators.
- Mashonaland West reported the highest deaths due to diseases (81.1%)
- Cases of drowning were recorded in most provinces with high incidences recorded in Midlands (6.2%).
Agricultural Produce Market Access
Most households accessed food crops from within their wards.

About 3% of the wards had households which accessed pearl millet from outside Zimbabwe and 1% which accessed maize meal and sorghum from outside Zimbabwe.
Most households sold crops to other households in the area and private traders.

About 5% of wards had households which sold maize to the Grain Marketing Board (GMB) while 2% had sold sorghum to GMB.
Agricultural Commodity Prices
Cereal Availability by District as at May 2017

- At the time of the assessment, maize meal was readily available in more districts compared to maize grain.
District Average Maize Grain Prices (USD/kg) as at May 2017

- The highest maize grain prices were reported in Mangwe, Tsholotsho and Bulilima at above USD 0.50/kg
- Lowest prices were reported in Gokwe South, Gokwe North, Zvimba, Makonde, Mhondoro and Mwenezi ranging between USD 0.17/kg and USD 0.21/kg
- The National average maize grain price dropped slightly from USD 0.40 in 2016 to USD 0.38 this year.
District Average Maize Meal Prices (USD/kg) as at May 2017

- High maize meal prices ranged between USD 0.52 to USD 0.70/kg
- The National average maize meal price changed, insignificantly, from USD 0.61 in 2016 to USD 0.60 this year.
District Average Cattle Prices (USD) as at May 2017

- The highest Cattle prices were reported in Hwange, Masvingo, Umzingwane, Umguza and Mberengwa ranging between USD 390 and USD 400.
- Lowest Average price was reported in Mbire (USD 151).
- Nationally, the average cattle price increased from USD 306 in 2016 to USD 320 this year.
District Average Goats Prices (USD) as at May 2017

- Highest goat prices were reported in Umzingwane, Bubi, Bulilima, Umguza, Insiza and Matobo ranging between USD 41 and USD 48.
- Lowest Average price was reported in Mbire at USD 13.
- The National average goat price increased slightly from USD 29 in 2016 to USD 30 this year.
• About 45% of the wards sold cattle to other households in the area whilst 38%, 11% and 6% sold to private traders, abattoirs and auctions respectively.

• Matabeleland South (24%) had the highest proportion of wards with households which sold cattle through auctions.
• Goats were mostly sold to other households in the area and private traders.

• Matabeleland South had the largest proportion of households that sold goats through auctions (8%).
Incomes and Expenditure
• The most important sources of income were casual labour and food crop production.

• Vegetable production and sales and remittances were amongst the most important sources of income for about 7.8% of the households.
Nationally, the average household income for the month of April was USD 74, about 20% higher than the same time last year, April 2016.

Mashonaland West (USD 120) had the highest average monthly income while Midlands (USD 55) had the lowest average monthly income.

The biggest increase in average household income was observed in Mashonaland West (88%) followed by Mashonaland Central (64%).
Expenditure
The national average household expenditure increased from USD 49 to USD 52.

Mashonaland West (USD 61), Matabeleland South (USD 60) and Mashonaland East (USD 60) had the highest average expenditure while Matabeleland North (USD 42) and Masvingo (USD 43) had the lowest average expenditure.
Nationally, the proportion of food expenditure decreased from 59% to 54%. This pattern was also observed across all provinces.

Matabeleland South had the highest proportion of food expenditure (59%) followed by Matabeleland North (57%).

Mashonaland East had the least proportion of food expenditure (49%).
• Average household expenditure for six months was highest for agriculture (USD 56.73) followed by education expenditure (USD 51.77). Taxes (USD 2.06) had the lowest expenditure.

• Other expenditure included expenditure on clothes, social occasions, funerals and loan repayment.
• Generally, decision making on household expenditure was mostly done by mothers except in Mashonaland West where fathers (39%) were the main decision makers compared to mothers (28%).
Livelihoods Based Coping Strategies
Introduction

- Households engage in various methods of coping when faced with food access challenges.

- Livelihood coping strategies are employed in order to increase food availability outside of their normal livelihoods.

- The livelihood coping strategies have been classified into three categories namely stress, crisis and emergency as according to the WFP Technical Guidance note 2015.
# Categorisation of Livelihoods Coping Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>• Borrowing money, spending savings, selling assets and more livestock than usual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>• Selling productive assets directly reduces future productivity, including human capital formation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Withdrawing children from school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing non food expenditure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>• Selling one’s land affects future productivity, but is more difficult to reverse or more dramatic in nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Begging for food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Selling last breeding stock to buy food.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Households Engaging at Least one Livelihoods Based Coping Strategy

- The proportion of households that engaged at least one livelihoods based coping strategy in April decreased from 41% in 2016 to 6% in 2017. This indicates an improved food access situation which led to less coping than last year where households had experienced two consecutive poor food crop production seasons.

- Mashonaland Central and Mashonaland West had the highest proportion of households which engaged at least one livelihood coping strategy during the month of April 2017.
The households that did not engage any coping strategy in April 2017 did not do so mainly because it was not necessary (71%) whilst 28% did not have any assets to dispose of and 1% had already disposed of the assets or done the activity prior to April and could no longer continue to do so.
The proportion of households which engaged at least one coping strategy in the stress category was 9% with 5% of the households engaging crisis and emergency strategies each.

Matabeleland North and Mashonaland Central engaged the most stress strategies whilst Mashonaland Central engaged the highest crisis strategies.

Matabeleland North and Manicaland engaged the most emergency strategies.
The proportion of households which did not engage any livelihood coping strategies was 87% followed by 5% of the households which engaged only stress strategies.

About 3% engaged a combination of strategies but their most severe was crisis and 5% engaged in a combination but their most severe being emergency strategies.
ISALS/Mukando
• About 13.3% of households had a member of their household who was in an ISAL/Mukando group.

• Of the households with members in ISAL groups, the majority of members were reported to be mothers (79%).
• Manicaland had the highest proportion of households (18.3%) with a member in any ISAL/Mukando group.

• Mashonaland West had the lowest number (9.4%).
The largest proportion of ISAL groups reported were cash only groups (66%).
Household Consumption Patterns
Average Household Cereal Stocks as at 1 April 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Cereal Stocks 2016 (kgs)</th>
<th>Cereal Stocks 2017 (kgs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>145.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland Central</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>157.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland North</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>122.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland South</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>101.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>108.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>109.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Average household cereal stocks were about 109.6kgs as at 1 April 2017.
- Mashonaland West had the highest average cereal stocks (157.2kgs), Matabeleland South had the least (57.7kgs).
- Generally, this year households had more stocks as compared to the same time the previous year.
Household Consumption Coping Strategies

- Coping Strategy Index (CSI) is an indicator used to compare the hardship faced by households by measuring the frequency and severity of the behaviours they engage in when faced with food shortages.

- The (CSI) decreased greatly from 27 in 2016 to 15 in 2017. This shows improved food access from 2016 which is partly attributable to the emergency food assistance by Government and its partners as well as the improved main harvest.

- All provinces showed an improvement in the consumption coping strategies employed from the extreme methods adopted last year to the less severe and less frequent coping habits employed this year.
The Household Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a food consumption indicator that is used as a proxy for household food security. Food consumption indicators are designed to reflect the quantity and quality of people’s diet.

The FCS is a measure of dietary diversity, food frequency and the relative nutritional importance of the food consumed. A high food consumption score increases the possibility that a household achieves nutrient adequacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Consumption Score Groups</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0-21</td>
<td>An expected consumption of staple 7 days, vegetables 5-6 days, sugar 3-4 days, oil/fat 1 day a week, while animal proteins are totally absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>21.5-35</td>
<td>An expected consumption of staple 7 days, vegetables 6-7 days, sugar 3-4 days, oil/fat 3 days, meat/fish/egg/pulses 1-2 days a week, while dairy products are totally absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>&gt;35</td>
<td>As defined for the borderline group with more number of days a week eating meat, fish, egg, oil, and complemented by other foods such as pulses, fruits, milk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• There has been a decrease in the proportion of households which are consuming an acceptable diet from 63% in 2015 to 55% in 2017.

• However, the proportion of households consuming a poor diet has increased from 8% in 2015 to 16% in 2017.
The proportion of households with acceptable food consumption scores improved from 54% in 2016 to 55% in 2017, those with borderline consumption decreased from 33% to 29% and those with poor consumption patterns increased from 12% to 16%.

Matabeleland North (25%) had the highest proportion of households consuming poor diets and had worsened from last year where 19% had poor food consumption patterns.
The proportion of households consuming iron rich foods daily remained below 10% across all provinces except in Mashonaland West (12%).

Matabeleland North had the highest proportion of households that were not consuming iron rich foods 7 days prior to the assessment (52%).

As Iron deficiency continues to be of public health concern, nutrition sensitive livelihoods programming is recommended.
Proportion of Households Consuming Protein-Rich Foods

- The proportion of households that consumed protein rich foods at least daily in the 7 days prior to the survey was 41% whilst 44% consumed between 1 to 6 days and 15% had not consumed at all.

- Matabeleland South had the highest proportion of households which consumed protein rich foods at least daily (47%).
• About 67% of the households consumed Vitamin A rich foods at least daily, 25% consumed sometimes and 8% never consumed during the 7 days prior to the survey.
The Dietary Diversity indicator is the number of different food groups consumed over a given reference period of time. It gives an estimation of the quality of the diet. The Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) shows the number of food groups consumed by households out of a total of 12 food groups and is used as a proxy for food access. Even among households that satisfy calorie requirements, those which consume a non-diversified, unbalanced and unhealthy diet can be classified as food insecure.

Nationally, the HDDS was 5.8, a slight improvement from 2016 (5.6).

All provinces except for Mashonaland Central had improved HDDS from 2016.

On average, households consumed about 6 out of the 12 food groups within the seven day recall period.

Mashonaland East and Manicaland consumed the highest number of food groups (6.3 and 6.1 respectively) while Matabeleland North had the lowest score (5.4). This trend is similar to that of 2016.
The majority of households consumed mostly cereals while meat was consumed the least.

This pattern is consistent with what has been observed in previous ZimVAC RLAs.
The Household Hunger Score is a household food deprivation scale which focuses on the food quantity dimension of food access.

Most households in the rural communities were experiencing little to no hunger (90%) whilst 10% experienced moderate to severe hunger.

Mashonaland West had the highest proportion of households facing moderate to severe hunger (16.9%) whilst Mashonaland East had the lowest proportion (6.2%).
Nationally, 84.8% of households used iodised salt. This is above the 80% threshold for universal salt iodisation.

Mashonaland Central (72.8%) and Matabeleland South (77.9%) had the least proportion of households that used iodised salt.
Resilience
Introduction

Why Resilience in Zimbabwe?

- Persistent food insecurity, stunting levels and poverty levels in the country remain topical issues despite huge investments made by Government and its development partners to address them.
- This led the Government of Zimbabwe and its development partners to spearhead the development of the Resilience Strategic Framework for Zimbabwe in 2015.
- The framework lays down what resilience means for Zimbabwe, provides a conceptual framework and key principles to be used in resilience programming.

Definition of Terms

Resilience: The ability of at risk individuals, households, communities and systems to anticipate, cushion, adapt, bounce back better and move on from the effects of shocks and hazards in a manner that protects livelihoods and recovery gains and supports sustainable transformation’. (Zimbabwe Resilience Strategic Framework 2015).

Hazard: A process, phenomenon or human activity that may cause loss of life, injury or other health impacts, property damage, social and economic disruption or environmental degradation (UNISDR, 2007). Hazards may be natural or anthropogenic in origin. Natural hazards are predominantly associated with natural processes and phenomena. Anthropogenic hazards, or human-induced hazards, are induced by human activities.
Resilience Conceptual Framework
Shocks

Tsholotsho Siphepha Flood Disaster Source: DCP
Cash shortages (46.9%), water logging (42.7%), drought (32.3%) and crop pests (29.9%) were reported as shocks which affected households between April 2016 and March 2017.

Some households experienced localised shocks which included flooding (9.6%), human wildlife conflict (4.8%) and veld fires (0.9%).
Severity of Impact of Shocks Experienced Between April 2016 and March 2017

A proportion of households who experienced shocks reported severe impact of cash shortages (64%), water logging (59%), impact of the 2015-2016 El Nino induced drought (69%) and crop pests (50%).

Less commonly experienced shocks which had severe impact include human wildlife conflict (62%), floods (59%), death of main income earner (76%) veld fires (70%) and loss of employment by breadwinner (72%).
Households’ Preparedness Levels for Anticipated Hazards In The Next 12 Months

- About 40% of the sampled households who indicated that they experienced shocks and hazards in the last 12 months reported that they will be unable to cope with similar shocks and stressors if they recur in the next 12 months,

- At least 45% of the households reported that they will be able to cope but with difficulties.

- Only 16% indicated that they will be able to cope without difficulties.
Without external assistance, the majority of households reported that they will either be unable to cope or may cope with difficulties if they are to experience either drought, floods, livestock diseases, crop pests or crop diseases in the next season.
Resilience Measurement

• **Customised KPI4 Methodology** – Measures the number of people/communities whose resilience has been improved as a result of humanitarian and development support.

• The methodology was developed by DfID in one of its projects- Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters (BRACED) in Ethiopia and Nepal.

• The methodology was customised to suit the Zimbabwean context and it taps from the existing resilience indicators in ZimVAC surveys to form a resilience score based on;
  1. Livelihoods and assets based Coping Strategy Index score
  2. Food Consumption Score
  3. Average number of income sources per household
  4. Average monthly household income per household
  5. Perceived ability to cope with shocks and stresses
  6. Households Hunger Scale (HHS)
• The majority of the households were at the wellness threshold (60%), 38% were in the resilient category while 2% were in the vulnerability trap.
Household Food Security Status Projections

To estimate the rural population that is likely to be food insecure in the 2017/18 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 (Food and Nutrition Security Policy, 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 2017 to 31 March 2018.
Food Security Analytical Framework

• Each of the surveyed households’ potential food access was computed by estimating the household's likely disposable income (both cash and non cash) in the 2017/18 consumption year from the following possible income sources;
  • cereal stocks from the previous season;
  • own food crop production from the 2016/17 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 2017 through the end of March 2018, 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 2017/18 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.

- National cotton, tobacco and soya bean producer prices will average out at USD 0.36/kg, USD 2.75/kg and USD 0.50/kg respectively for the whole 2017/18 marketing season.
Rural food insecurity for the period April to June 2017 was estimated at 1% and is projected to reach 11% during the peak hunger period (January to March 2018).

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 2017/18 consumption year food insecurity prevalence is 11% and is lower than that for the 2016/17 consumption year during the peak hunger period.
About 1.1 million rural people are estimated to be food insecure during the January – March peak hunger season.
At least 1.1 million are projected to be food insecure during the peak hunger period.
• All other potential sources of cereals (stocks, food and cash crops, casual labour and remittances and livestock) except incomes rendered approximately 49% of rural households to be food secure.

• Adding all other incomes, the food insecurity prevalence is projected to be 11% in the 2017/18 consumption year.
• Approximately 4% of the households had cereal stocks as at 1 April 2017 to last them the entire 2017/18 consumption year compared to about 2% at the same time in 2016.
A general increase in the proportion of food insecure households is projected across all provinces.

Matabeleland North (18%), Matabeleland South (16%), Masvingo and Midlands (12%) are projected to have the highest proportions of food insecure households at peak hunger period.

Mashonaland East (7%) and Mashonaland West (8%) are projected to have the least proportions of food insecure households.
Masvingo (176,956), Manicaland (175,285), and Midlands (156,936) 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>Buhera</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangwe</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Umzingwane</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binga</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chivi</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulilima</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mutare</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkayi</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bindura</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbire</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Insiza</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsholotsho</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kariba</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gokwe North</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chirumanzu</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwenezi</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Umguza</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupane</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Zvishavane</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14</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>Hurungwe</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marondera</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gwanda</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murewa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hwedza</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwekwe</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mazowe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makonde</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chegutu</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutasa</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gokwe South</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guruve</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shamva</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutoko</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chipinge</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seke</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chikomba</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimanimani</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gutu</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Food Insecure Population During the Peak Hunger Period by Province
District Food Insecure Proportion During the Peak Hunger Period
Food Insecure Population by District
Livelihood Zone Food Insecure Proportion During the Peak Hunger Period
Nutrition
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, semisolid and soft foods while breastfeeding continues for up to two years of age or beyond.

- 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. While vegetables and fruits such as pumpkin, carrots, squash, yellow/orange sweet potatoes dark green leafy vegetables; ripe mangoes, ripe paw-paws are vital sources of vitamin A.

- Iron plays an important role in the prevention of anaemia while vitamin A prevents nutritional blindness, significantly reduces the severity of illnesses and even death from such common childhood infections such as diarrhoea and measles.
Definitions of Key Child Feeding Terms

• **Minimum Dietary Diversity (MDD)**: A child is considered consuming a diet of minimum dietary diversity if the diet is made up from 4 or more of the 7 food groups below:
  ✓ grains, roots and tubers
  ✓ legumes and nuts
  ✓ dairy products (milk, yogurt, cheese)
  ✓ flesh foods (meat, fish, poultry and liver/organ meats)
  ✓ eggs
  ✓ vitamin A rich fruits and vegetables
  ✓ other fruits and vegetables

• **Minimum Meal Frequency (MMF)** refers to the minimum number of times solid, semi-solid, or soft foods or milk feeds are consumed by children of a specific age group. The minimum recommended number of times (frequency) depends on whether a child 6-23 months of age is breastfed or non-breastfed. The recommended minimum meal frequency for the specific age groups is given below:
  ✓ 2 times for breastfed infants 6–8 months
  ✓ 3 times for breastfed children 9–23 months
  ✓ 4 times for non-breastfed children 6–23 months

• **Minimum Acceptable Diet (MAD)** measures the quality of diets consumed by children aged 6-23 months by combining both MDD and MMF.
The proportion of children that consumed diets that met the minimum dietary diversity remained generally very low across all the provinces of the country.

Nationally, 13% of children aged 6 to 23 months consumed a minimum dietary diversity. This is lower than 18% reported in 2015.
Compared to 2016, there has been a general decrease in the proportion of children consuming iron-rich foods across all provinces.

About 29.1% of children aged 6-59 months consumed iron-rich foods 24 hours prior to the survey.

Matabeleland North and Matabeleland South (23%) had the lowest proportion of children 6-59 months who consumed iron-rich foods.
Proportion of Children 6-59 Consuming Vitamin A Rich Foods

- Nationally, 93% of children 6-59 months consumed Vitamin A-rich foods 24-hours prior to the survey and this is higher than what was observed last year (90%).

- The lowest proportion of children 6-59 months who consumed vitamin A rich foods was in Matabeleland North and Matabeleland South (90%).
Minimum Acceptable Diet for Children 6-23 Months

- The proportion of children 6-23 months consuming a minimum acceptable diet was very low across all the provinces since 2015.
- Nationally, 8.6% received a minimum acceptable diet 24 hours prior to the survey.
- Mashonaland West had the lowest proportion at 4.8%.
Women of child bearing age (WCBA) (15-49 years) are often nutritionally vulnerable because of the physiological demands of pregnancy and lactation.

Requirements for most nutrients are higher for pregnant and lactating women than for adult men.

Outside of pregnancy and lactation, other than for iron women require a more nutrient-dense diet to meet their increased micronutrient needs.

Insufficient nutrient intakes before and during pregnancy and lactation can affect both women and their infants.

The Minimum Dietary Diversity for WCBA (MDD-W) indicator is a food group diversity indicator that has been shown to reflect one key dimension of diet quality, that is micronutrient adequacy.
Nationally 40% of women of childbearing age achieved a minimum dietary diversity (MDD) and therefore more likely to have adequate micronutrient intakes.

- Matabeleland South and Matabeleland North had the least proportion of women whose diets met MDD.
- The average dietary diversity for women of child bearing age was 4 across all provinces.
Average Number of Food Groups Eaten 24hrs Prior to the Survey by WCBA

- Nationally 17% of women consumed foods from 1-2 food groups indicating that they are not likely to receive adequate micronutrients from their diets.
Community Health Services

- One strategy for stunting reduction is to scale up high impact interventions which include community health services.

- Provision of individual Community Infant and Young Child Feeding (cIYCF) at community level has been shown to greatly improve caring and feeding practices.

- Continued support within the first 1000 days, a window of opportunity for addressing stunting, at community level has been proven to have positive health outcomes for the mother and child dyad.
Nationally, the proportion of pregnant and lactating women visited by a Village Health Worker was 8.3%.

Manicaland (11.5%) had the highest proportion of pregnant and lactating women visited by a Village Health Worker whilst Mashonaland East had the lowest (5.9%).
Out of the 8.3% of women that received community health services from a Village Health Worker, 36% received general care services and 24% received antenatal care.
Nationally, only 13% of households with children under 2 years of age were visited by a Village Health Worker. Mashonaland East (8%) had the least proportion.
Community Health Services Received by Children Under 2 years

- Of the 13% of households with children under 2 years of age visited by Village Health Workers, 45% received growth monitoring services.
Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)
## Categories of Sanitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Defecation</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 Sanitation Facilities</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 Sanitation Facilities</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 (BVIP), pit latrine with slab and upgradeable Blair latrine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved water sources</strong></td>
<td>Improved” drinking water sources are further defined by the quality of the water they produce, and are protected from fecal contamination by the nature of their construction or through an intervention to protect from outside contamination. Such sources include: piped water into dwelling, plot, or yard; public tap/standpipe; tube well/borehole; protected dug well; protected spring; or rainwater collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unimproved water sources</strong></td>
<td>Unprotected dug well, unprotected spring, cart with small tank/drum, tanker truck, surface water (river, dam, lake, pond, stream, canal, irrigation channel), and bottled water are not considered improved sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Nationally there was an improvement in access to safe drinking water and sanitation.

• Open defecation decreased from 37% to 30%.
The national average for access to improved water sources increased marginally from 71% to 73% in 2016.

There was a general increase in all provinces, with the exception of Mashonaland West, Matabeleland North and Masvingo.
Districts such as Gokwe North, Hurungwe, Binga and Chiredzi had the lowest proportion of households with access to improved water sources ranging from 36.4-50%.
Nationally 10% of the households changed their main source of water during the 3 months preceding the survey.
Of the households that changed their main drinking water source, 42% of them did so as a result of the availability of alternative water sources being closer by due to the good rains.

Masvingo and Matabeleland South had the highest proportion of households accessing water from a nearer source at 53% and 51% respectively.
• According to Sphere Standards, the maximum distance that any household should travel to the nearest safe water point is 500m.

• The proportion of households travelling more than 1km to fetch water decreased from 25% in 2016 to 17% in 2017.

• Nationally, 55% of households travelled less than 500m to the nearest water source, whilst 17% travelled more than 1km.

• Matabeleland South, Matabeleland North and Masvingo had the highest proportion of households that travelled more than 1 km at 24% and 23% respectively.
Adult women were the predominant household members reported to be fetching water. This scenario remained constant regardless of the distance travelled to the water source.
• The practice of water treatment remains generally low across all rural provinces.

• Nationally, 12% of households that used water from unimproved sources did not treat their drinking water. This is of concern as it exposes households to waterborne diseases, a situation which is exacerbated when there is excess rainfall and flooding.
The proportion of households which accessed improved sanitation facilities was 61%.

Matabeleland North Province had the lowest proportion of households with access to improved sanitation (42%).

Open defecation was practiced by 30% of households nationally, while Matabeleland North had the highest (55%).
Prevalence of Open Defecation

- Most districts in Matabeleland North province recorded the highest prevalence of open defecation ranging from 56.1-75%.
- Most districts in Manicaland recorded the lowest prevalence of open defecation ranging between 0.5-16%.
At least 16% of the households with sanitation facilities had handwashing facilities. Of these, 40% had water available at the handwashing facility, 25% had soap whilst 3% had both water and soap available at the handwashing facility.

Mashonaland Central had the highest proportion of households without handwashing facilities (93%) whilst Matabeleland North and South had the highest proportion of households with handwashing facilities where both water and soap or detergents were available.
The critical times most observed by households for handwashing were after using the toilet and before or eating (84%) and before handling food (63%).

The least observed critical time was after assisting the sick (3%).
Child Nutrition Status
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, Height for age
• Weight for height is a measure of thinness or fatness which is sensitive to sudden change in energy balance.
• 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 and or 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.
• 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% 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.
• Nationally, the prevalence of GAM was 3.2%.
• The prevalence is lower than the 4.4% observed in the 2016 May ZimVAC RLA.
• Matabeleland North had the highest prevalence of GAM (5.2%) with girls (6.4%) more affected than boys (3.9%).
• Generally across most provinces, girls were most affected than boys except in Manicaland, Mashonaland East, Midlands and Masvingo.
In comparison with findings from the 2016 ZimVAC RLA, there has been a general decrease in GAM across most provinces except in Manicaland and Matabeleland North.

There was a significant decrease in Mashonaland West from 6.7% in 2016 to 2.1% in 2017.
Prevalence of Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) by Province

- The prevalence of severe acute malnutrition was 1.2%. This was lower than that of the 2016 ZimVAC RLA (1.9%).
- Manicaland (2.2%) and Midlands (2.1%) had prevalence above the World Health Organisation (WHO) emergency threshold of 2%.
Gender Based Violence
More males and females reported having experienced physical violence than sexual violence.

Physical violence was experienced by about 3.3% of the men and 4.2% of the women.

The highest proportion of men that experienced physical violence was in Mashonaland Central (4.7%) and that of women was in Manicaland (7.7%).

The highest proportion of men that experienced sexual violence was in Mashonaland Central (1.0%) and that of women was in Manicaland (1.6%).
## Perpetrators of Physical and Sexual Violence

### Physical Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Males (%)</th>
<th>Females (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother/Step Mother</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/Step Father</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister/Brother</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Relative</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Boyfriend/Girlfriend</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sexual Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Males (%)</th>
<th>Females (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current husband/ Partner</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former husband/ partner</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current/ former boyfriend</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relative</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In law</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Spouses were reported as the perpetrators by 35.8% of the females and 19% of the males who had experienced physical violence.
- Of concern were incidences of sexual violence in both males and females that were mostly perpetrated by other relatives (19.6% and 24.4% respectively).
Nationally, about 4.2% of women reported having experienced spousal violence.

Manicaland had the highest reports of spousal violence among both women and men (5.7% and 3.0% respectively).
Community Development Challenges and Development Priorities
### Community Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unavailability of crop/livestock inputs on the local market</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor access to livestock/produce markets</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of /intermittent Electricity supply</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredictable and unreliable rainfall patterns</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of cash</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor road infrastructure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Irrigation infrastructure</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of/ limited Water for domestic use</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cost of Inputs and implements</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Water and sanitation facilities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor/ lack of Health and infrastructure</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate markets</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of income generating projects</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Irrigation infrastructure</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor road infrastructure</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of cash</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The greatest proportion of communities indicated drought, shortage of cash, poor road infrastructure (9%) and lack of irrigation infrastructure (7%) as their major development challenges.
## Community Challenges by Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Manicaland</th>
<th>Mash Central</th>
<th>Mash East</th>
<th>Mash West</th>
<th>Mat North</th>
<th>Mat South</th>
<th>Midlands</th>
<th>Masvingo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of income generating projects</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draught Power shortage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No primary/secondary school in the ward</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor/ lack of Health and infrastructure</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate markets</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cost of Inputs and implements</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Irrigation infrastructure</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of cash</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor road infrastructure</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredictable and unreliable rainfall patterns</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Water and sanitation facilities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of/ limited Water for domestic use</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of/ limited Water for crop and livestock production</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Matabeleland South and Midlands reported drought as their major development challenge (59% and 51%) respectively.
- Mashonaland West and Manicaland highlighted poor road infrastructure as their major challenge (46% and 42%) respectively.
At least 12% of the communities reported income generation projects as their major development priority.

Revival and development of industries, skills and capacity development and control of wildlife were considered less important on the priority list.
### Development Priorities by Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manicaland</th>
<th>Mash Central</th>
<th>Mash East</th>
<th>Mash West</th>
<th>Mat North</th>
<th>Mat South</th>
<th>Midlands</th>
<th>Masvingo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dams/Water reservoirs construction</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and related infrastructure improvement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity infrastructure development</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment creation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services and related infrastructure improvement</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Generation Projects promotion</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation infrastructure development</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural markets availability and access development</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road infrastructure development</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply- boreholes, piped water scheme</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mashonaland Central cited water supply as their major development priority (64%).
- Matabeleland North and Matabeleland South indicated water reservoir construction as their major priority (57% and 58%) respectively.
Conclusions and Recommendations
Conclusions and Recommendations

- Joint efforts by both Government and partners in food distribution through various interventions ensured that most vulnerable and food insecure rural households had access to food. Government and UN/NGO support to vulnerable households increased remarkably during the 2016/17 consumption period (71.6%) compared to the 2015/16 consumption period (65%).

- In 2016/2017, the bulk of resources from both Government and partners went towards emergency and immediate food requirements for households. However, it is recommended that during the 2017/18 consumption year, more resources be channelled towards Government input support, household economy strengthening and building productive community assets. Interventions that strengthen households’ economy and resilience are thus recommended to ensure households remain food and nutrition secure.

- The proportion of children not attending school due to illness is a cause of concern. We recommend the prioritisation of resource allocation towards the strengthening of the School Feeding and School Health Programmes.

- The proportion of children of school going age who were not in school due to financial constraints remains significant. There is need for the Government to increase Basic Education Assistance Module (BEAM) funds so that vulnerable children can be supported.

- The high proportion of children who were turned away from school due to non-payment of school fees is worrisome. This calls for stricter monitoring of 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.
Conclusions and Recommendations

- The proportion of households that grew the major food and cash crops increased as compared to last season. The good rainfall season coupled with the different input programmes that were put in place resulted in increased household production. However some areas were affected by water logging and some farmers failed to get enough fertiliser. This calls for efforts to urgently ensure that inputs are readily available on the market.

- Inadequate labour, coupled with use of unimproved seed varieties continue to constrain agriculture production and productivity among small-holder farmers and hence the need for extension to capacitate farmers on the need for good agricultural practices.

- There is need to promote labour saving technologies given the fact that many households had inadequate agricultural labour.

- The level of average household production this season was significantly high. This calls for good post-harvest handling techniques at household level so as to reduce post-harvest losses.

- The increase in cereal production is likely to increase supply of grain on the market which in turn offers the country the opportunity to replenish its Strategic Grain Reserves. Therefore the Grain Marketing Board should be capacitated to be able to collect, timeously pay farmers and properly store the grain in the Strategic Grain Reserve.

- Equipment breakdown and seasonality of water have been cited as reasons for partial and non functionality of irrigation schemes. Given that climate change is real and that the country has been experiencing droughts there is need for Government and partners to facilitate rehabilitation of partially functional and non-functional irrigation schemes. This also calls for promotion of water harvesting technologies so as reduce the effects of climate change and variability.
Conclusions and Recommendations

- There is need for capacity building for Government extension service providers to increase coverage of extension services for small-holder farmers.
- The proportion of Households selling livestock as a business is very low, raising issues on the quality of meat produced. There is need for Government to come up with strategies and packages that support farming as a business.
- There is need for Government to increase sale pens and auctions across all provinces to reduce inclusion of middlemen.
- The household consumption indicators show an improved food access situation for the majority of households compared to last year.
- The coping strategies, Household Hunger Scores, Household Dietary Diversity as well as consumption of protein, iron and vitamin A rich foods improved from last year mainly due to the presence of the diverse field crops and food assistance.
- The livelihood coping strategies engaged by households have decreased this year which shows that there is an improved food access situation. The livelihood coping strategies however remain a cause of concern as depletion of assets directly reduces future productivity and affects households’ ability to cope with future shocks and may lead to future food consumption gaps. Resilient livelihood activities are therefore recommended for all rural households.
Conclusions and Recommendations

- Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) education programmes need to be integrated to achieve improved public health by scaling up sanitation-focused participatory hygiene and health education, schools health clubs, sanitation action groups and community health clubs.
- Specific material resources are needed to support national behaviour change programmes and to re-equip and enhance the impetus of the Environmental Health Practitioners who are the primary extension officers for household sanitation, water supplies, hygiene promotion and health education.
- A paradigm shift from primarily relying on unimproved drinking water sources to improved communal water points and improved piped water into households using renewable energy sources (solar) is recommended.
- Elimination of open defecation through availing of resources (both soft and hardware) for the construction of latrines using locally available resources is recommended. Customised service standards should reconcile with technology choice and service levels with the economic capacity of user groups.
- Women were identified as the primary household member fetching water for household consumption. Participants within the WASH sector should consider support and promotion of time and labour saving technologies such as ‘roller drums’ that reduce the burden on women and therefore increase their time to engage in economically productive activities.
Conclusions and Recommendations

- Generally incomes for rural households are following a downwards trend since 2014. We therefore recommend some income generating projects for rural households to be initiated.
- Casual labour and food crop production were been reported as the most important sources of income for the majority of rural households. We therefore recommend that markets for crops should be made available.
- ISALs have proven successful as an approach that protects household assets, smooth cashflow, improves number of meals consumed, and increases household incomes and expenditure. As such, ISAL groups should be scaled up in poor rural communities in all provinces to improve food security and livelihoods.
- Communities continue to face challenges of drought, cash shortages and poor road infrastructure among other challenges. Efforts to address rural community development challenges should focus on construction and rehabilitation of water bodies as well as promotion of climate smart technologies.
Conclusions and Recommendations

- The national prevalence of GAM was 3.2% and this is below the 5% emergency threshold. Matabeleland North had the highest prevalence of GAM (5.2%) with girls being more affected at 6.4%. Generally across most provinces girls were most affected than boys except in Manicaland, Midlands and Masvingo.

- The minimum dietary diversity for children 6-23months remains below the cut-off to contribute to meaningful reduction to stunting. More multisectoral efforts are recommended to improve on the quality of children’s diets.

- The minimum dietary diversity for women aged 15-49years was 40% and this reflects that most women are not consuming a quality diet that is adequate to meet their micronutrient requirements. A multisectoral approach to address and strengthen interventions to enhance the nutritional content of family diets is required. Strategies to employ include production of diverse plant and animal food sources, promotion of consumption of diverse diets and value addition of locally available foods.

- The food consumption score reflects that there has been an increase in the proportion of rural households consuming poor diets. Multisectoral efforts to improve consumption patterns are recommended to impact greatly on nutrition outcomes. Emphasis should be put on broadening national agricultural programmes through diversification of both crop and livestock production.
Conclusions and Recommendations

• The proportion of children under 2 and pregnant and lactating women who were reached by community health services is below the 80% national target. CIYCF and similar community based interventions should be strengthened to scale-up coverage of stunting prevention activities within their local context.

• More than 80% of rural households consumed iodised salt. Efforts to increase coverage is recommended for provinces with low coverage and regular monitoring for those at the recommended coverage of 80%.

• Fall armyworm affected all the provinces with 36% of the households managing to identify it as a new pest. Maize is the crop most infested and against the background that 88% of the households grew maize in 2016/17 season it is unlikely that farmers will want to abandon maize. There is a likelihood of the new pest to affect wheat during the winter season.

• About 62.5% of the households affected by the new pest did not take any measures to control it. Households which took initiatives to control it used a variety of methods which included biological control, application of commercial pesticides, traditional control and other methods. However, these measures were generally not successful. It is therefore recommended to build capacity of;
  • Extension agencies in providing the relevant and high quality information to farmers on Fall armyworm
  • Research institutions to determine sustainable ways of managing the pest including efficacy of pesticides and indigenous control measures, most effective, lowest-risk, economical, accessible and easily used by smallholders (without sophisticated machinery).
Conclusions and Recommendations

- The adult female moth of the Fall armyworm is a strong flyer and will continue to spread across the country. Populations of the pest may continue to build as they find more host plants to multiply on and in the absence of natural biological enemies (general predators like ants and earwigs,) specialized parasitoids and a host of insect pathogens (virus, bacteria and fungi). It is therefore important to increase awareness raising on the new pest among different stakeholders, strengthen monitoring mechanisms/capacities (identification, information relaying systems) and response systems from national to sub-national levels.

- About 36.5% of households used various measures to control Fall armyworm both conventional and traditional. It is important to learn from the experiences of farmers and researchers locally and internationally. The best recommended practices will be tried and adapted in the field through Farmers’ Field Schools. It is therefore recommended that support for designing and testing of a sustainable pest management programme for smallholders should be provided. The best recommendations will then be communicated and shared with farmers, farmers’ organizations and Government.

- The true extent of Gender Based Violence is difficult to measure as it is often under-reported in most cases. It is perceived that reported cases in this report represent only a small fraction of the overall total that could be present. Gender Based Violence campaigns need to be scaled-up to empower women and men and encourage them to report and seek help.

- Further research is required to understand the underpinning causes of physical violence which was reported more than sexual violence.
Conclusions and Recommendations

- Communities are faced with a host of shocks and hazards both natural and anthropogenic impacting negatively on their ability to access their food and non-food requirements. The situation is being compounded by the recurrent under-performing macro-economic situation with cash shortages being one of the immediate areas requiring the attention of Government and stakeholders.
- There is need for proactive multi-stakeholder resilience building interventions to ensure that vulnerable communities meet their daily food and non-food requirements before they venture into negative coping strategies that may lead to loss of their productive assets.
- Considering that communities have limited capacities to recover from disasters, Government and development partners should consider improving and broadening community social protection and resilience building programmes to enhance early recovery from emergencies and disasters. This may include scaling up of programmes such as Harmonised Social Cash Transfers and Productive Community Works.
- Government with support from partners should consider scaling up structural and non-structural measures to deal with flooding and human wildlife conflict taking advantage of the ongoing land re-distribution programme to relocate communities at risk.
- Rural food insecurity prevalence in June 2017 was estimated at 1% and is projected to reach 11% during the peak hunger period (January to March 2017). This is lower compared to last year. This food insecurity prevalence translates to 1,052,768 rural people compared to 4.1 million in the previous consumption year.
- Food assistance programmes should be targeted to those households that have been found to be food insecure
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