





Zimbabwe Urban Areas Food Security and Vulnerability Assessment – September 2003



Zimbabwe National Vulnerability Assessment Committee
in collaboration with the SADC FANR Vulnerability Assessment Committee



ZIMBABWE
Some 7.5 million people (2.5 in urban areas and 5.01 million in rural areas) of the population is food insecure in 2003/04 marketing year.

Urban Report No. 1 February 2004 Harare

Prepared in collaboration with SIRDC – Food and Nutrition Programme, Ministry of Agriculture- National Early Warning Unit, Civil Protection Unit, CSO, MOHCW, Ministry of Public Service Labour and Social Welfare, Ministry of Education, WFP, Unicef, FEWS NET, GOAL, MEDAIR and ACF. With financial support from Government of Zimbabwe, UNDP, DFID and SADC FANR VAC

For Full Report Contact:

Joyce Chanetsa at jchanets@mweb.co.zw; Tel: 263 4 860320-9 or 263 11 865640, Fax 263 4860340
Elliot Vhurumuku at evhurumuku@fews.net; Tel: 263 4 729196 or 263 11 430397, Fax 263 4 729196
Isaac Tarakidzwa at Isaac.Tarakidzwa@wfp.org; Tel 263 4 252471/3 or 263 11 412548, Fax 263 4 799214

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	2
LIST OF FIGURES	3
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	4
PREFACE.....	6
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	6
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
1. INTRODUCTION	9
1.1 Country Context -	9
1.2. Purpose of the Assessment	14
1.3. Overall Objectives of Urban Assessment:.....	15
2. METHODS USED IN THE ASSESSMENT	16
2.1. Survey design.....	16
2.2. Data Collection.....	17
2.3. Data Management	18
2.4. Management of the survey	19
2.5. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample	19
3. ZIMBABWE HOUSEHOLD POVERTY AND FOOD SECURITY	21
3.1. Introduction	21
3.2. Poverty in Zimbabwe urban areas.....	21
3.3. Food Security Vulnerability in urban areas.....	26
3.4. Factors affecting household poverty and food security	29
3.5. Characterization of food security	31
3.6. Education, health, water and sanitation and linkages to Food Security.....	33
3.8. Household Coping Strategies.....	38
4. HOUSEHOLD LIVELIHOODS AND VULNERABILITY	40
4.1. Household Poverty and Vulnerability.....	40
4.2. Household Food Security.....	42
4.3. Household Food Access.....	47
4.4. Household Consumption Patterns.....	48
4.5. Household Income Patterns and Food Access	50
4.6. Household Expenditure Patterns.....	56
5. URBAN FOOD SECURITY, POVERTY VULNERABILITY AND LINKAGES	60
5.1. Urban institutions capacity	60
5.2. General Household Housing, Water and Sanitation conditions in urban areas by urban type, suburb and socio economic conditions.....	64
5.3. Linkage food Security/Accommodation.....	65
5.4. Health	65
5.5. Linkage Food security/orphans	66
5.6. Educational Issues.....	67
5.7. Other Linkages	71
6. RECOMMENDATIONS	74
6.1. General Recommendations.....	74
6.2. Food Security	74
6.3. Social safety nets.....	74
6.4. Health and HIV and AIDS.....	75
6.5. Water and Sanitation	75

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Urban Areas and Number of Households Sampled per Province.....	16
Table 2.2: Dependency Ratio by Province.....	19
Table 2.3: Household selected demographic characteristics by income, gender, marital status.....	20
Table 3.1: Poverty Levels by Socio Economic Groups using CCZ and CSO based CPI thresholds as in September 2003.....	22
Table 3.2: Poverty Level by Suburb Type.....	26
Table 3.3: Food Security Status in Urban Areas September 2003.....	27
Table 3.4: Population Food Insecure by Province.....	28
Table 3.5: Food security by suburb type.....	28
Table 3.6: Shocks and hazards that affected households in the last six months and their rank by income group.....	30
Table 3.7: Food security by sex of head of household.....	32
Table 3.8: Housing status by income group.....	34
Table 3.9: The most common coping strategies practiced by the very poor and poor socio-economic groups.....	39
Table 4.1: Poverty and Vulnerability matrix: assessing potential signs /indicators of increasing and decreasing vulnerability among urban households.....	41
Table 4.2: Source of cereal focus group perceptions.....	43
Table 4.3: Source of food aid.....	45
Table 4.4: Cereal availability, community perceptions.....	45
Table 4.5: Quantities of cereal in kgs available per household by income group.....	46
Table 4.6: Quantities of sweet potatoes in kgs available per household by income group.....	46
Table 4.7: Household rural-urban linkages.....	47
Table 4.8: Maize meal and prices by province.....	48
Table 4.9: Available mean monthly food quantities per capita by income group.....	49
Table 4.10: Number of times item was eaten over the last 7 days, entire Population.....	50
Table 4.11: Number of meals eaten per day by socio economic group.....	50
Table 4.12: Community perceptions of livelihood activities.....	55
Table 4.13: Household expenditure shares composition by income socio-economic groups.....	589
Table 5.1: Sample size by institution Type.....	60
Table 5.2: Institutional constraints.....	61
Table 5.3: Source of financial support.....	61
Table 5.4: Reasons for posts being vacant.....	61
Table 5.5: Source of institution food.....	62
Table 5.6: Number of meals eaten per day.....	62
Table 5.7: Health facilities available for the institution.....	62
Table 5.8: Source of water for the institution.....	63
Table 5.9: Food security and presence of orphans.....	67
Table 5.10: Early marriages and presence of orphans.....	67

Table 5.11: Targeting for the very poor and poor	70
Table 5.12: Access to urban land and food status	72
Table 5.13: Remittances in and food status	72
Table 5.14: Rural cultivation and food security	73

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Distribution of Population across Provinces	10
Figure 3.1: Households living below survival and reproduction levels	23
Figure 3.2: Levels of Poverty in Zimbabwe Comparing the CCZ & CSO to the 1995 threshold	23
Figure 3.3: Poverty head count index and average expenditure per capita of the Poor (very poor and poor) group by provinces	24
Figure 3.4: Average expenditure per capita by gender and elderly headed households	25
Figure 3.5: Household expenditure per capita by marital status of the head of Household	25
Figure 3.6: Food security by province	28
Figure 3.7: Shocks and Hazards that affected household in the last six months and their rank by income group	29
Figure 3.8: Comparative analysis of households perceptions and rank of most important shocks that affected their poverty and food security (1995–2003)	31
Figure 3.9: Food security by income group	31
Figure 3.10: Food security by marital status	32
Figure 3.11: Food status by age of head of household	32
Figure 3.12: Food security by household size	33
Figure 3.13: Tenure status by income group	34
Figure 3.14: Type of dwelling unit by income group	35
Figure 3.15: Main sources of water for urban dwellers	35
Figure 3.16: Toilet type by income group	36
Figure 4.1: Population Leaving below US\$ a day	40
Figure 4.2: Cereal source by province	43
Figure 4.3: Maize source excluding food aid by province	44
Figure 4.4: Consumption pattern for the Very poor	48
Figure 4.5: Diet composition for the poor	49
Figure 4.6: Diet composition for the better off	49
Figure 4.7: Mean percent calorie contribution by income group	49
Figure 4.8: Income shares per capita by province	51
Figure 4.9: Income share by income group	53
Figure 4.10: Income source by gender	55
Figure 4.11: Relationship between income and food security	56
Figure 4.12: Household food and non-food expenditure shares by income	57
Figure 4.13: Household food expenditure shares composition by income	57
Figure 4.14: Household non-food expenditure shares composition by income	57
Figure 4.15: Household expenditure shares across provinces	59

4.16: Household expenditure shares by head of household gender, elderly and non-elderly and marital status.....	59
Figure 5.1: Proportion of institutions by optimum status.....	60
Figure 5.2: Proportion of institutions not meeting requirements.....	60
Figure 5.3: Proportion of budget funded by institute.....	61
Figure 5.4: Food security and morbidity.....	65
Figure 5.5: Food security and mortality.....	66
Figure 5.6: Mean Number of orphans per Socio economic Group.....	66
Figure 5.7: Mean number of children in primary school by income group.....	67
Figure 5.8: School drop outs by income group.....	68
Figure 5.9a: Reasons for boys dropping out of school.....	69
Figure 5.9b: Reasons for girls dropping out of school.....	69
Figure 5.10: Households in school arrears by income group.....	69
Figure 5.11: Households that received educational assistance by income group.....	69
Figure 5.12: Households BEAM awareness by income group.....	70
Figure 5.13: Percent of Households aware of Aids action committee by income group.....	70
Figure 5.14: Reasons for selling assets.....	71

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Household Questionnaire.....	76
Appendix B: Community (Focus Group) Questionnaire.....	88
Appendix C: Institutional Questionnaire.....	92
Appendix D: Urban Sampling Methodology & sampling at Household.....	98
Appendix E: List of Researchers, National team and Organizations represented.....	109
Appendix F: Distribution of Provinces, Cities visited & number of sites covered.....	112
Appendix G: Data Analysis Process.....	114
Appendix H: Calories Conversions.....	116
Appendix I : Additional Food Security Analysis Tables.....	118

ACRONMYS

CCZ	Consumer Council of Zimbabwe
CPI	Consumer Price Index
CSO	Central Statistical Office
EA	Enumeration Area
FCL	Food Consumption Line
FPL	Food Poverty Line
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GMB	Grain Marketing Board
HH	Household
Kcal	Kilo-Calories
LBVA	Livelihoods-based Vulnerability Analysis
MT	Metric Tones
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
PDL	Poverty Datum Line
RRU	Relief and Recovery Unit
SADC FANR	Southern Africa Development Community– Food Agriculture and Natural Resources
SD	Standard Deviation
SGR	Strategic Grain Reserve
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Scientists
TPL	Total Poverty Line
UNDP	United Nations Development Programmes
UN	United Nations
VAC	Vulnerability Assessment Committee
ZCTU	Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions
ZIMVAC	Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
FEWSNET	Famine Early Warning System Network
WFP	World Food Programme

PREFACE

This food security assessment is regionally coordinated by the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) Food, Agriculture, and Natural resources (FANR) Vulnerability Assessment Committee (VAC), in collaboration with international partners (WFP, FEWS NET, SC (UK), FAO, UNICEF and IFRC).

The Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee (ZimVAC) – a subcommittee of the Social Services Cabinet Action Committee (SSCAC) composed of a consortium of government, NGO and UN Agencies, coordinated the assessments at national level. This is the first urban assessment undertaken by the Zim VAC (the first of its kind in the SADC region) and becomes the fourth in a series of other three rolling rural food security assessments, with the first in August 2002, the second subsequently conducted in December 2002 and the third in April 2003. The three rolling assessments were subsequently conducted in six SADC countries affected by the food crisis in the region.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This report follows an assessment, which was made possible through the generous financial contributions made by the Government of Zimbabwe, UNDP and DFID. The SADC VAC initiated the whole assessment process including the mobilization of resources from donors. WFP, GOAL, UNDP, UNICEF, CRS, FEWSNET, and GOZ provided vehicles and in-kind support. The Government, NGOs and UN organizations participated in the field research. Their names and organizations are listed in Appendix F.

The ZimVAC warmly acknowledges this invaluable support from these multiple organizations and the warm response from all households and communities contacted during this survey.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background: The assessment was carried out in an environment with economic conditions worsening, the country experiencing food shortages due to droughts and other factors and hyperinflation standing at 455.6 percent in September 2003.

Survey Design: A livelihoods based structured questionnaires covering over 5,123 households, 660 focus groups and 256 institutions were administered over two weeks by 124 researchers through funding from UNDP and SADC FANR VAC. The survey was drawn from the CSO sample frame, by stratifying urban areas and considering population distribution and randomly sampling the households.

Where are the most Vulnerable? The very poor and poor who live in squatter camps (90 percent), the back yard shacks in high density areas (78 percent) and peri urban areas (80 percent) are all food insecure, do not have better access to services, such as health, clean safe water and are exposed to diseases such as diarrhea. Using the Consumer Council basic consumption basket and the total cost of the basket for September 2003, at least 51 percent of the households were found to be very poor and 21 percent poor (giving a total for the poor of 72 percent of the urban population)

Who are the most vulnerable? The elderly and female headed households (widowed or divorced) had the least income compared to the non elderly and male headed households. Households with large number of people normally carter for orphans and are the most food insecure, food insecurity increases with household size, such that households with more than 7 members were more vulnerable.

Who and where are the food insecure? A total of 64.2 percent (2.5 million people) of the estimated 3.8 million urban people are food insecure (could not meet a minimum caloric requirement of 2,100 Kcal/person/day). Their distribution is such that; Harare Province has about 1.2 million people (63 percent of the city's population is food insecure), Bulawayo has 477,135 people (71 percent of population insecure), Midlands with 65 percent (223,378 people), Manicaland (64 percent – 150,180 people), Mashonaland Central (58 percent - 39,493 people), Mashonaland East (62 percent – 66,043 people), Mashonaland West (62 percent – 183,937 people), Matebeleland North (68 percent – 53,910 people), Matebeleland South (59 percent – 27,111 people) and Masvingo Province urban areas (50 percent – 50,343 people) .

What is the food Access and food availability situation? Over 50 percent of the communities reported that cereals and maize were either occasionally or rarely available except for Harare and Bulawayo. Households sourced over 60 percent of their cereals from parallel markets and small proportions from shops, own production and the GMB. Urban and rural agriculture contributed very little to cereals availability. Only a few suburbs benefited from food aid, mainly provided by NGOs, with Matebeleland South urban areas with greatest percentage benefiting from food aid 64.7 percent.

What is the consumption pattern? About 57 percent of the urban population was having 2 or less meals per day. Of these, 62 percent were from the very poor socioeconomic group with the percentage decreasing to about 10 percent for the middle and better off. Urban households consume mainly maize, with carbohydrates consumption increasing with the increase in the socio economic status. The very poor consumed mostly carbohydrates (80 percent) followed by vegetables 16 percent and very little protein and oils, whilst the better off increased their carbohydrates consumption to 87 percent , vegetable consumption decreased to 6.7 percent and protein increasing to 4.9 percent.

What shocks and Hazards are prevalent in urban areas? All income groups cited inflation, followed by cost of services (school fees and other services), followed by unemployment and taxes, then followed by deaths, illness and hospital bills as the greatest shocks that affect their livelihoods. This is different from the 1995 PASS study which cited unemployment as the greatest shock.

What is the health status? The analysis shows that 91 percent of communities had clinics in their suburbs and 57 percent had private doctors facilities in the suburb. Of the households that reported at least one member falling sick in the past three months, 66 percent were food insecure households and 34 percent were food secure. Of the households that lost a member through death about 69 percent were food insecure and 31 percent food secure.

What is the status of HIV and AIDS based on proxies? Most households showing HIV and AIDS proxies were among the poor and very poor and were in the food insecure category. Approximately 39 percent of communities in low density suburbs had no access to HIV and AIDS services, 37 percent in medium density and 25 percent in high density suburbs.

What is the education status? Of the households with at least one child dropping out of school, 85 percent were food insecure and 78 percent of the food insecure households received educational assistance. About 88 percent of the very poor and poor households indicated that they had cut on education expenditure to buy food.

What is the accommodation situation? From the survey, at least 38 percent owned houses whilst 33 percent were lodgers/tenants. House ownership varied across the socio economic groups, with at least 44 percent of the better off owning houses. Most of the poor and very poor lived in shacks. The average number of rooms occupied by the very poor was 2.8 and increased with the socio economic group to 4.3 for the better off.

Water and sanitation status? At least 90 percent of the households had access to piped water and this include over 40 percent of the very poor. About 87 percent had their water on the premises. Most households in squatter camps used water from unprotected sources. About 55 percent of the population used flush toilets and only 2.6 percent used the bucket or bush for toilet facilities. The number sharing a toilet was as high as 18 people for the very poor and improved with socio economic status decreasing to half for the better off. About 15 percent of the communities reported that refuse was not being collected, with 83 percent of the squatter camps reporting that refuse was not collected. In the high density areas 44 percent of the communities reported that refuse was collected regularly and the rate increased to 57 percent in medium and low density suburbs.

What are the Recommendations?

- Economic stabilization is required as most households reported price increases/inflation as the greatest shock.
- Market liberalization of cereals will help the poor as most poor households buy their cereals from parallel markets.
- The Government through GMB to use the (strategic grain reserve) SGR to stabilize prices in the market as parallel market prices are very high.
- Health and Education assistance programs should be more properly targeted as even the middle and better off HH benefit from the programs
- Food aid in the form of targeted subsidies (food stamps, cereals or market targeting) is required for the poor.
- Production of pulses to increase protein content of the poor in their diet should be encouraged in both rural and urban areas.

1. INTRODUCTION


1.1 Country Context -

1.1.1. Background to Urban settlements

The formation of urban settlements in Zimbabwe can be traced back to the colonial era when (colonial towns) namely Fort Salisbury (Harare), Bulawayo, Umtali (Mutare), Fort Victoria (Masvingo) were established. Other towns and small towns were later on developed and found their basis for development on economic, social or political arena. Some towns developed either due to agriculture, tourism or mining, whilst others were strategically located due to political and historical reasons. For an example, Mutare now the third largest city was developed as a border town with Mozambique, providing a link to the Indian Ocean, whilst Bulawayo provides linkage with South Africa and Botswana. Mining towns developed include among others Redcliffe, KweKwe, Bindura, Zvishavane, Hwange, etc. Most of the towns were first developed along the great dyke that stretches from the agriculturally high potential area of Guruve District in the north east to West Nicholson (a low potential area) in the south.

Since early 1980s, different types of settlements/ centres were developed in the rural areas with the intention of bringing the rural population in close contact with services and markets. The differences among such centres depend upon different types and levels of services that are provided. Service centers can be useful in the provision of education, health and other government services and the general administration. The centers should also offer commercial services including production and marketing services. Most urban areas started as service centers which later grew to the town status. It was the intention of Government that the service centers (growth points) would graduate into towns over a period of 15 years.

The hierarchy of towns by size is as follows;




In the government classification of levels of settlements, “growth points” are normally district service centers that have grown close to town status, provincial capitals are those which harbour all administrative offices of the provinces such as, Harare, Bulawayo, Gwanda, Chinhoyi, Gweru, Bindura, Marondera, Mutare, Masvingo, etc.

Residential areas have been historically divided into low density, middle density and high-density suburbs. High density, for the black people (where the poor now reside), middle density for the coloureds (where the middle income now reside) and low density meant for the white (where the better off now reside). In recent years, due to increased shortage of accommodation, more settlements such as Epworth and Hatcliffe in Harare started sprawling as peri-urban areas.

In addition, satellite or dormitory towns for cities such as Chitungwiza, Norton and Ruwa developed due to shortages and high cost of accommodation in Harare. However; industrial activities and marketing services started to build up in these areas, making them independent towns.

1.1.2. Country Demographics

From the CSO census of August 2002, Zimbabwe has a total population of 11.6 million, of which 33% or 3.8 million are in the urban areas. Figure 1.1 below summarizes the distribution of the urban and rural population across provinces.



1.1.3. Review of 2002/03 National Food Security Situation.

The review discusses first the quality of the season with respect to agricultural production and tries to make some inference on food security at national level. The first half of the season was characterized by poor and patchy rains, which were generally inadequate for agriculture, whereas the second half brought significant improvement in the rainfall amount and distribution across the whole country. The distribution of rainfall was largely fair in the major maize producing provinces of Mashonaland West and Mashonaland Central from about the beginning of December onwards. This had implications to the towns' water supply and harvest for 2003/04 marketing year.

The gross harvest estimate of cereals was 1,170,279 MT of which maize was 929,619 MT, millets was 90,660 MT and 15,000 MT of winter/early summer maize against opening stocks of 51,000 MT, giving the country 1,247,845 MT of grain available for human consumption in the

2003/04 marketing year. This figure includes 175,000 MT of wheat and 7,566 MT of rice. The current supply of maize and millets is about 63% higher than that of last season's total maize and millet supply of 650,332 MT.

The gross annual requirement estimated at 2,522,464 MT, includes human and livestock consumption, strategic reserve sufficient for three months and other uses. This leaves the country with a deficit of 1,274,619 MT (51%) that will partly be met by planned carryover imports by the Grain Marketing Board and Food Aid commitments. However, even with these imports there is need to import a further 961,779 MT to meet consumption requirements in this current consumption year. From the Zim VAC rural assessment, food security situation has remained critical in the grain deficit regions of Matabeleland South and North, southern Midlands and parts of Masvingo. The Government and non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) need to import sufficient grain to meet the above deficit.

In addition to grain deficit, the general deteriorating services in some areas and lack of chemicals for livestock has resulted in at least 40,000 cattle dying as at the end of February 2003. As at the end of December 2003, about 300,000 cattle mainly in communal and resettlement areas were in danger. Given the state of livestock vulnerability, food insecurity and risk of water shortage in the various parts of the communal, resettlement and urban centers, the President declared a state of disaster in Matabeleland South on the 7th of March 2003. To avert the disaster, the Department of Livestock and Veterinary Services put a proposal of Z\$1 billion to fund the livestock drought relief program for the whole country where priority animals will be fed at designated feeding points for ten months.

1.1.4. Public Works Programme

The public works program is a strategy introduced by government and administered through the Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare to alleviate the impact of economic hardships and natural disasters including drought and flooding on poor rural and urban communities. The purpose of the program is to provide a social safety net to vulnerable households and individuals by supplementing their incomes through cash transfers whenever it is necessary through labour intensive public works provided by local authorities. The program has two components, (a) the Free Cash component benefiting the elderly, disabled, chronically ill, child headed households and (b) the Cash for Work benefiting selected able bodied vulnerable households who work for a maximum of 15 days per month in public works projects. When programs operate consistently, at least \$5,000 per month per household is received by households that participate.

This program is currently operating in all the 58 Rural Districts and the 28 Urban Councils in the country. A total of 1.3 million households benefited from the program during the 2002/2003-drought period. All the rural districts and urban councils in the country were covered by Government food aid response.

1.1.5. Food Aid Programs

The NGOs and WFP are running food aid programs mainly in the rural areas, and at least about 2.8 million people have benefited from free food in December 2003. There are intentions to expand the programs to resettlement areas. In addition assistance is already being given by some NGOs to children, HIV/AIDS home based care patients and some vulnerable households in some high density and peri-urban areas.

1.1.6. Health, HIV and AIDS

Zimbabwe is hard hit by the HIV and AIDS epidemic like most countries in the Southern Africa with a prevalence rate of 25 percent. Livelihoods are being devastated and the food and nutrition security of millions of households seriously undermined.

Zimbabwe is currently going through a difficult period politically and economically (high interest rates, low investment and high employment) and the effects of HIV and AIDS will see Zimbabwe unable to achieve its Millennium Development Goals by the year 2015. There have been high levels of morbidity and mortality both in adults and the young generation reversing previous gains in health statistics. Health infrastructure previously very good, is steadily deteriorating because of the economic difficulties.

The pandemic comes at a time when household poverty is worsening because HIV and AIDS pandemic aggravate this precarious food security environment, causing a large loss of life, undermining family and community structures. Other basic services such as education and essential public health utilities such as water and sanitation are similarly affected by under funding and the effects of HIV and AIDS on staff resources. From the above the effects of HIV and AIDS cut across all parts of the country and all wealth groups.

Food security and HIV and AIDS have multiple linkages in both directions. HIV and AIDS reduces food security by requiring that more household expenditure is devoted to healthcare, while at the same time reducing the amount of labour available to households to engage in food and income generating activities. Agricultural production in particular can decline as there is less labour available to cultivate and therefore families are forced to cultivate smaller area or switch on to less productive and labour intensive crops. The household often loses a breadwinner to illness and eventually death, while other household members' time is required to care for the sick and for dependants such as orphans and elderly who remain behind. In the other direction, the problems of increasing food insecurity can push people into high risk activities, such as engaging in commercial sex work as a means of earning money.

1.1.7. Macroeconomic Environment

The September / October 2003 Urban Vulnerability assessment was carried out against the background of severe socio-economic difficulties, characterized by the following macro economic conditions, which critically affected urban households :

a) Hyperinflation: Rate of inflation was 455.6 % and 525.8 % in September and October 2003 respectively. Increase in food prices accounted for 190.2% points and non food items in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) accounted for 335.6% points. Food inflation prone to transitory shocks, stood at and 419.0 % in September and 491.2% in October 2003. Non food inflation stood at 474.1% in September and 543.4 in October 2003. The increase in the rate of inflation was largely accounted for by increases in the average prices of beverages, meat, bread, cereals, fruits and vegetables. These figures are believed to be part of a larger pattern of under-estimation, as in the parallel market where the rate of inflation is reportedly well above 800% according to the Consumer Council of Zimbabwe. These figures clearly indicate that the purchasing power has been drastically reduced and the most hurt are urban households.

The average inflation, which rose to about two hundred percent during December of the last consumption year, is estimated to rise to 700% by December this current consumption period.

b) Low investment: Overall Savings and Investment fell to low levels of about 9.2% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) by the end of 2002 due to high fiscal deficit, inflation and declining economic activity. This has engendered shortages and consequently led to the flourishing of parallel market. Shortage of foreign exchange has also impacted negatively on investment. The very low official exchange rate of US\$1 to Z\$826,468 has led to the flourishing of the parallel market where US\$1 is exchanging for Z\$5500 as in November 2003. This scenario has led to low production; giving rise to shortages of food , other basic commodities and fuel.

c) Shortage of currency: It is suggested that externalization of the country's currency may have led to the shortage of money supply as evidenced by long queues at banks and building societies. People spent most of their productive time looking for money. Urban households could not access their money from banks to buy food and other basic necessities. This, coupled with high bank charges worsened the food insecurity in urban areas.

d) Taxation: The 45% income tax and 3% AIDS levy has literally dwindled disposable incomes for households, the majority of whom can no longer afford three meals per day and decent accommodation. To augment their meager incomes, households resort to informal economic activities.

e) Drought: A below normal season 2001/02 and 2002/03 farming season , together with the initial uncertainties surrounding the land reform program, saw agricultural output fall from – 12.9% in 2001 to –20.8% in 2002. An estimated value of US\$359.3 million worth of grain had to be imported. The whole economy and indeed urban households are still recuperating from the impact of these two transitory shocks. As a result the government has adopted stringent control measures restricting the private movement of maize grain from rural to urban areas, worsening food security for urban households.

f) Retrenchments: The UN estimates unemployment in Zimbabwe at 70 to 80 % and the situation is worsening. This very high and still increasing unemployment rate combined with high and increasing cost of living has worsened off the poverty situation. Company relocations, closures and downsizing have led to a huge number of workers losing their jobs. An estimated 6,475 workers were retrenched in 2003 and approximately, 7.9 % of companies operating in urban areas closed shop between June and September 2003. Retrenchment figures for 2001 and 2002 have been estimated at 4,327 and 5,293 workers respectively. The impact of the closures could lead to an increase of 22% in households that are food insecure in urban areas, if salaries and wages are considered, as the primary largest source of income.

g) Overall Performance of the economy: Gross Domestic Product: In real terms, GDP at market prices decreased from Z\$22,033 million in 2001 to Z\$20,786 million in 2002, reflecting a 6 per cent decline. This is estimated to further decline to Z\$19,609 million by the end of 2003 about 5.7 percent decline. However, excluding taxes on production and on products, the economy declined in real terms by 6.18 per cent in 2002 compared to -3.6 percent in 2001. A decline of 6.18 percent by the end 2003 is estimated. For an example the manufacturing output declined by 5.7 per cent in 2001 and further by 30 per cent in 2002 and is expected to decline by 29 percent in 2003. Low production (-29%) in manufacturing has led to shortages and consequently sky rocketing prices, which many urban dwellers can no longer afford.

1.2. Purpose of the Assessment

In the absence of recent systematic and comprehensive vulnerability assessment updates in a changing macroeconomic environment in the urban sector, the magnitude of problems have never been fully unveiled. It has not been given due attention at policy and operational levels by both government and the international community. A number of stakeholders have however observed the worsening conditions in the urban sector and have called for an appropriate response to the plight of the people, as a matter of urgency.

There is thus mounting demand from decision-makers and practitioners for timely and accurate information and analysis on the urban poor. Previous attempts to understand and monitor urban poverty and food insecurity have been fragmented and have not fully explained poverty and livelihood vulnerabilities in the urban areas. With the economic decline, humanitarian crisis and HIV and AIDS as predominant features of the current situation, there is need for a broad livelihoods model that would increase the understanding of food security conditions and livelihoods vulnerability. Most ideally one that would enable a comparison with the ZIMVAC assessments carried out in the rural areas.

The proposed vulnerability assessment is therefore aimed at filling gaps in information, through the pursuance of a methodology that will add value to existing initiatives so far done in Zimbabwe. This will provide decision-makers with essential information on the urban population that is vulnerable to food insecurity, percentage of the population that is falling under, or coming close to a minimum threshold, that will help in the design of effective responses or pre-emptive actions to keep urban populations above this threshold.

1.3. Overall Objectives of Urban Assessment:

- To identify food security and livelihoods problems, constraints, strategies and coping mechanisms among different social and economic groups in the urban sector.
- To do an in-depth analysis of the predisposing factors to food and livelihoods insecurity in the urban areas in order to inform policy and programme design as well as intervention.
- To study household food expenditure and food access patterns among different socio-economic groups in the urban areas.
- To establish baseline data on urban vulnerability and lay foundation for developing a practical monitoring system that provides an early indication of food security and livelihoods vulnerability.
- Examine the linkages between food security, HIV and AIDS, education, child protection and health
- Identify food and non food interventions and policy implications

2. METHODS USED IN THE ASSESSMENT

2.1. Survey design

2.1.1. Specifications of the sampling frames and sample sizes

A “livelihoods-based vulnerability analysis⁹” (LBVA) framework, based on household surveys, focus group discussions and institutional survey were used to establish baseline information on food security and vulnerability¹⁰.

Household questionnaires were administered to randomly selected urban sites proportionate to the 3.8 million urban population, category of the urban area and province. A multi stage sampling procedure on a stratified population was used to select the study sample. The first stage was to stratify all the urban areas into some form of category (urban councils, administrative centres, others, growth points) by province. The number of sites, were then determined by the size of the population with Harare and Bulawayo taken as separate provinces because of their population size. Additional sites were included in the sample to cater for small sample sizes for peri-urban areas, mining towns to ensure a representative sample. During sampling, it was also ensured that a) the high-income suburbs or areas, b) medium income suburbs, c) the low income areas or suburbs, d) the squatter camps and e) peri-urban areas were included to capture the diversity of the urban population. The number of households, focus groups and institutions sampled and used after data cleaning are as indicated in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1: Urban Areas and Number of Households Sampled per Province

	Household	Focus Group	Institutions	%
	Final numbers sampled after data cleaning			HH sample
Bulawayo	533	87	35	10.40%
Manicaland	540	96	47	10.50%
Mashonaland Central	271	33	38	5.30%
Mashonaland East	273	55	28	5.30%
Mashonaland West	543	35	22	10.60%
Matabeleland North	272	51	22	5.30%
Matabeleland South	266	17	22	5.20%
Midlands	547	41	10	10.70%
Masvingo	269	38	9	5.30%
Harare	1609	207	23	31.40%
Total	5123	660	256	100%

⁹ A livelihood can be defined as the sum of ways in which people make a living

¹⁰ Vulnerability refers to the level of exposure of a household or community to particular shocks (external vulnerability) and their capacity to cope with that shock (internal vulnerability). A comprehensive analysis of livelihoods must cover a wide range of issues, including food, water, shelter, health (including HIV and AIDS), education, protection etc.

2.1.2. Sampling techniques

The Enumeration Areas (EAs) were randomly sampled and this took into account the suburb type¹¹. An EA is an area in a ward with a population of 80- 100 households. EAs selected within suburb type covered different socio-economic groups; high income, medium income, low income and squatter camps. The selection was proportionally done by suburb type population. Provincial boundaries were also considered in the sampling as well as the urban category. The urban categorization enabled a deeper understanding of the vulnerability status of the different urban areas of Zimbabwe. The sample covered urban councils, administrative centers, growth points, mining towns, resort towns, border towns and other urban centers.

2.1.3. Selection of sites

A computer program at CSO was used to randomly pick the EAs. The names of the provinces, districts, suburbs and wards were sampled by using the codebook from CSO.

2.1.4. Selection of sampling units (stands) within a site.

Two approaches were considered in the selection of housing stands; random selection of households was done using housing listing and transect. Housing listing approach involved the use of an existing list of households per EA in the suburb and each house was taken as a sampling unit e.g. Number 2 Chabvuta Street in Zengeza 3 suburb was considered a sampling unit.

Transect approach involved drawing an imaginary straight line connecting the center of the suburb or EA with the outer limit of the suburb/EA. Alternatively transects were mapped based on the streets in the suburb.

2.1.5. Selection of Households within a stand

Within the selected EAs, sample households were randomly selected. However it was ensured that a cross section of households was covered and this considered flats, cottages, shacks and the main house.

2.2. Data Collection

2.2.1. Type and number of researchers who collected primary data

A total of 124 researchers¹² were involved in data collection and these were drawn from various sectors interest in food security, this included government departments, NGOs and the UN. Researchers selected had experience in surveys and others had participated in the previous ZIMVAC assessments. During field work the researchers were supervised by both provincial

¹¹See Appendix D. Urban Sampling Methodology and sampling scheme at household level.

¹² See Appendix E. For list of researchers, national team and organizations represented.

coordinators and members from the national team. Each team consisted of 6 members and the teams were distributed differently among provinces.¹³

2.2.2. Survey instruments and nature of information collected

The urban survey instruments consisted of (i) a household questionnaire covering household demographics, education, asset ownership, urban agriculture, consumption patterns, expenditure pattern, coping mechanisms, health, nutrition, water and sanitation; (Appendix A), (ii) a community (focus group) questionnaire looking at food availability, market prices and coping strategies (Appendix B) and (iii) an institution questionnaire which covered issues on institutional capacity, management, food security, education, health, water and sanitation, perceptions of coping strategies, perceptions of vulnerability and poverty in institutions (Appendix C).

2.2.3. Methods of checking the accuracy of primary data at the time of collection

To ensure quality and accurate primary data collection, the researchers had five days training before field work and the instruments were field-tested. Researchers also received support from the national team which discussed and gave guidance to the teams before and during the field work, this process supported the quality control process. The Provincial Coordinators also acted as quality controllers and these were with the researchers all the time.

2.2.4. Secondary data collected

During the assessment, Provincial coordinators were tasked to collect secondary data on health, water and sanitation, which complemented information generated from the primary sources (the household, focus group and institution questionnaires). For an example for institutions, secondary information on names of institutions in the towns and the people they cater for and contact details for each institution were collected.

2.3. Data Management

Data entry was carried out at the University of Zimbabwe, Statistics Department.¹⁴ Data entry ran concurrently with data collection and it took two weeks. EPI INFO version 6 was used for data entry. Data cleaning on the original data files was conducted using EPI INFO and SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Scientist) version 10. Thorough cleaning was conducted on prices and units of commodities purchased. Tabulation and further statistical analysis was conducted in SPSS version 10 and 11. Verification was done on almost 5% of the forms. Cleaning was continuous up to report writing.

The assessment and report has the following major limitations due to resource and time constraints, hence the results are indicative of urban food security and poverty;

a) The sample size was small but attempts were made to have a representative sample

¹³ See Appendix F. For Distribution of Teams by Province, cities visited and number of sites covered

¹⁴ Appendix G. Data analysis process

b) The assessment did not take seasonality into account and the month the assessment was taken as an average month.

2.4. Management of the survey

The survey was made possible through funds provided by SADC FANR VAC and UNDP RRU. The Government provided most of the personnel who did the survey. A National Project Coordinator was hired for a period of 45 days to organize the survey and ten provincial coordinators were hired, with each coordinator responsible for putting up the teams of researchers drawn from the province and mainly those involved in previous surveys. Vehicles for the survey were hired for the teams and some came from Government, NGOs and the UN.

Admittedly, delays were met in the release of funds for the survey, such that some of the researchers obtained their living allowances the second week whilst already in the field. Provincial coordinators assisted by the national team helped to monitor the researchers whilst in the field.

2.5. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

2.5.1. Dependency across Provinces

Demographic characteristics, household size for Harare was not different from that for Bulawayo, Manicaland, Mashonaland central, Mashonaland west and Midlands which have an average of greater than 5. Mean levels of selected demographic characteristics on dependency ratio and other household characteristics are shown in Tables 2.2 and 2.3 respectively.

Table 2.2: Dependency Ratio¹⁵ by Province

PROVINCE	Mean HH Size	Standard error mean HH size	No. Sampled	Mean dependency ratio	Standard error mean Dependency ratio	Median Dependency ratio
Bulawayo	5.39	0.16	533	0.2453	0.00939	0.2000
Manicaland	5.12	0.14	540	0.2868	0.0104	0.2500
Mashonaland Central	5.33	0.15	271	0.3093	0.0153	0.2500
Mashonaland East	5.00	0.16	273	0.2322	0.0143	0.2000
Mashonaland West	5.17	0.0955	543	0.3000	0.00892	0.2500
Matabeleland North	4.93	0.15	272	0.2476	0.0144	0.2000
Matabeleland South	4.93	0.16	266	0.3406	0.02196	0.2857
Midlands	5.07	0.10	547	0.2710	0.0106	0.2000
Masvingo	4.97	0.16	269	0.2528	0.0210	0.2000
Harare	5.19	0.0813	1609	0.2811	0.0627	0.2500
Weighted average	5.19	0.02304		0.2741	0.002217	

There were no statistically significant differences between provinces. Results presented provide strong evidence that household size and dependency ratio was similar across all provinces. The median dependency ratio shows that for half of the provinces, the ratio was 1:5 and for the remainder it was 1:4, with the exception of Matabeleland South where it was approximately 1:3.

¹⁵ Dependency ratio is the number of people actively engaged in both formal and informal employment divided by size of household.

2.5.2. Dependency across suburb type, gender and marital status

Across gender of the household head, there was no much difference in the proportion of households with orphans. On average about 29 percent of the households live with orphans. Bulawayo, Manicaland, Midlands and Mashonaland Central have a relatively higher proportion of households with orphans, whereas Mashonaland East has the least proportion. On marital status, at least two thirds of the widow headed households live with orphans. Household demographics among the income groups seem not to be different save for the fact that the very poor households have a relatively higher dependency ratio and higher proportion of household living with orphans.

There is very little variation in median dependency ratio across, suburbs, gender and marital status (Table 2.3). Female headed and the widowed had high dependency ratios 1:5 compared to other groups 1:4. Single mothers had the lowest approximately 1:3.

Table 2.3: Household selected demographic characteristics by income, gender, marital status

Suburb Type	Number in Sample	Mean Dependency ratio	Median Dependency ratio	Standard Error Mean
Low density	603	0.3015	0.2500	0.0110
Medium density	294	0.2914	0.2500	0.01276
High density	2996	0.2697	0.2500	0.003915
Per-urban	222	0.2627	0.2000	0.01379
Squatter camp	36	0.4369	0.3095	0.05647
Compound	24	0.4310	0.3333	0.06158
Mine	78	0.2564	0.2000	0.03062
Total	4253	0.2774	0.2500	
Gender				0.003953
Male headed	3111	0.2809	0.2500	0.007295
Female Headed	1124	0.2677	0.2000	
Marital Status				0.003237
Married	3032	0.2593	0.2500	0.009345
Widowed	526	0.2290	0.2000	0.01982
Divorced/Sepereted	240	0.3383	0.2500	0.02242
Single	330	0.4649	0.3333	0.02135
Other	125	0.3081	0.2500	0.0110
Elderly headed	417	0.2057	0.1667	0.01050

3. ZIMBABWE HOUSEHOLD POVERTY AND FOOD SECURITY

3.1. Introduction

Urban poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon, and the poor suffer from various deprivations: insufficient income and consumption, lack of access to employment, inadequate housing and services including health and education.

This section will start by describing Zimbabwe urban poverty measured by expenditure per capita, an income proxy¹⁶. Income (or consumption) is the most frequently used proxy for poverty measurement. Money-based poverty definitions provide a standard scale to compare different population groups.

An evaluation of household food security will follow, taking into account household food and nutrition levels measured by household caloric intake for an individual or household to carry out a normal healthy and reproductive life. In the PASS of 1995, the value of a food basket providing a minimum of 2100 Kcal per person was used in considering the person very poor. In the analysis, poverty is analyzed by using the CCZ food basket – the Food Consumption Line (FCL) and the total cost of the basket – Total Cost Line (TCL). Since the CCZ threshold, for the very poor closely resemble the percentage of people who are food insecure i.e. households that fall below the 2100 Kcal per person, these thresholds have been used in describing those who are very poor and poor in the report.

An assessment of other poverty dimensions, namely: household asset ownership, access to health, education, sanitation services and tenure insecurity (for housing and land) were looked at but a more detailed analysis calculating vulnerability index would be done in a separate report to capture both the multiple dimension of poverty and examine poverty with reference to vulnerability and asset ownership. It is expected that the combination of these indicators will provide a picture of Zimbabwe urban vulnerability.

3.2. Poverty in Zimbabwe urban areas

3.2.1. Methods of Determining Poverty

There are three methods which could be used to determine poverty (the PDL) namely a) the food energy method, b) the least cost diet method and c) the cost of basic needs method. The CCZ seem to be using the latter method. In the current analysis of urban poverty the food energy method was used to determine the levels of food insecurity in urban areas. Incidentally the percentage of the food insecure (households with less than 2100 Kcal per person per day) the lower PDL of FPL almost coincided with the percentage generated by the CCZ threshold of September 2003 (see Figure 3.1 and Table 3.1).

¹⁶ This chapter uses term income and expenditure per capita interchangeably. It is understood that expenditure per capita are proxy for income. The Central Statistical Office (CSO) defines the Food Poverty Line (FPL) as the survival level that indicates the *minimum wage necessary to feed a family of five, providing a minimum of 2100 Kcal per day per person.*

3.2.2. The Income Dimension of Poverty¹⁷ – Who is Poor?

The study used expenditure per capita indicator to measure the income dimension of poverty. This indicator is associated with the September 2003 expenditure basket of the Consumer Council of Zimbabwe. It is used to categorize Zimbabwe urban dwellers into very poor, poor, middle and better off socio-economic groups.

The Consumer Council of Zimbabwe (CCZ) defines the Food Consumption Line (FCL) as the cost of the minimum basket for six people per month. The CCZ estimated this line at Z\$33,346.93 per capita for September 2003, and is taken as the lower poverty line. The Total Consumption line (TCL) or the Total Poverty Line (TPL) is the reproduction level that indicates *the minimum wage necessary to feed a family and to have access to health, school, education, services (transport) and to be able to renew agricultural inputs each year*. The TPL or TCL for September 2003, was estimated at Z\$53,658.26 per capita for the CCZ, and serves as the upper poverty line.

The non-poor (middle and better off) segment is defined as the income mid-point above the upper bound poverty line. This is the *median* value indicated by the 50th percentile above the Total Consumption Line. Table 3.1 shows the average estimates of expenditure per capita (income proxy) of urban Zimbabwe by the four socio-economic groups¹⁸.

Table 3.1: Poverty Levels by Socio Economic Groups using CCZ thresholds as in September 2003


Socio Economic Group	% of HHs	Median	Mean	Standard Error Mean
		(Zim \$)		
Poor				
Very Poor	51.00	17,979.50	18,230.56	158,18
Poor	21.00	41,957.00	42,579.86	182,81
Non Poor				
Middle	14.00	65,700.00	66,715.37	314,00
Better off	14.00	120,111.10	153,562.30	3,617,72
Total	100.00	32,415.65	49,579.67	832,12

The median expenditure per capita is estimated at Z\$32,415.65 for all urban population, but more than 50 percent of the whole population (the very poor) have much lower income per capita estimated at Z\$17,979.50. Comparing these income levels with Zimbabwe poverty lines, we note that about 72 percent of households are below the Zimbabwe Total Consumption level, and more than 50 percent live below survival level as defined by the Food Consumption line (Figure 3.1).

¹⁷ Poverty is defined as the inability to afford a defined food and non-food consumption basket [Government Of Zimbabwe (1995). Poverty Assessment Study Survey]


¹⁸ It has been the intention of this report to use the official Poverty Lines from CSO, but these have not been produced as the CSO has discontinued the updates due to an ever increasing inflation rate and other technical factors.

Figure 3.1: Households living below survival and reproduction levels



A comparison of the poverty gap for CCZ and the 1995 poverty study indicates that the CCZ data depicts what is more realistic given the decline in the macroeconomic environment and also this is supported by the survey data (Figure 3.2 below).

Figure 3.2: Levels of Poverty in Zimbabwe Comparing the CCZ and the 1995 PASS threshold




3.2.3. Geographical distribution of Poverty

A summary of selected income-poverty indicators by province is presented on Figure 3.3. The headcount index¹⁹ and the poverty gap ratio²⁰ indicate respectively the proportion of the urban population falling below the Zimbabwe poverty line and the poverty depth.

Comparative analysis across provinces does not suggest substantive differences on average income levels and incidence of poverty amongst the poor (very poor and poor). However, Matabeleland South has the higher expenditure per capita for both total and urban poor, with a population of 58 percent below poverty line (TCL). Bulawayo, Mashonaland West and Manicaland have higher proportion of households living below survival level, the corresponding poverty headcount indices are about 74 percent. Poverty depth is higher in Manicaland and Bulawayo at 26 and 24 percent respectively. A brief comparison with 1995 data shows that the situation has worsened. The proportion of households living below poverty line has almost doubled, with Harare and Bulawayo having higher percentage of urban population below poverty line.

Figure 3.3: Poverty head count index and average expenditure per capita of the Poor (very poor and poor) group by provinces



¹⁹ Poverty headcount Index is the share of the population for whom their consumption/income is less than income defined at the poverty line (population falling below poverty line).

²⁰ Poverty Gap is a measure of poverty deficit of the entire population, where the notion of “poverty deficit” captures the resources that would be needed to lift all the poor out of poverty through a perfectly targeted cash transfers. Both Poverty Headcount Index and Poverty Gap are Foster-Greer-Thorbecke class poverty measures. From: “ Well –Being Measurement and Analysis Technical Notes”.

3.2.4. How income-poverty varies across selected population segments that require “special” attention

The analysis looked at income distribution among gender and the elderly headed households. Not surprisingly, the data suggests that female-headed households have a relatively lower income than male-headed households. Hence, women need to be considered as a potential target group. Similarly elderly headed households have low income levels, with their *median* income as low as that of the very poor (about Z\$17,000) and about half of the survival income requirements (Figure 3.4).

As regard to Child headed households, the sample size is too small to derive meaningful results. A different dimension of analysis, looking at income distribution by household head’s marital status shows that widows and divorced/separated headed households have the lowest *median* income per capita, making these groups to be potential candidates for targeted assistance. Figure 3.5 illustrate the average expenditure per capita by marital status of the head of household. The proportion of female, widowed and divorced headed households was highest among the very poor (16.4 percent) and 10.1 percent for the poor compared to the other expenditure groups (better off 8 percent).

3.2.5. Poverty Levels by Suburb Type

The very poor people mostly live in the squatter camps²¹, followed by the high density suburbs, whilst the better off are found in the low and medium density suburbs. Surprisingly compounds²² have a very high percentage of better off, this could be explained by the fact that some of the gold panners could be living in these areas and hence their incomes are much higher. Table 3.2 shows that about 90 percent of people living in squatter camps²³ were among the very poor and poor. Eighty seven percent of peri-urban dwellers were among the very poor and poor. In high density areas the very poor and poor constitute 78 percent of the total households sampled.

Figure 3.4: Average expenditure per capita by gender and elderly headed households





Figure 3.5: Household expenditure per capita by marital status of the head of household



²¹ Squatter camps are overcrowded areas like Hatcliffe extension, Porta farm etc where people live mostly in shacks and most of them have inadequate access to piped water and good toilet facilities.

²² Compounds for this study were areas where people lived in mines separate from senior staff members.

²³ Sample size for the squatter camps and compounds were too small for a meaningful inference.

Table 3.2. Poverty Level by Suburb Type

	EXPENDITURE GROUP				Total
	VERY POOR	POOR	MIDDLE	BETTER	Count
SURBURB LowDensity	27.1%	18.1%	21.4%	33.4%	763
Medium Density	27.5%	23.1%	19.6%	29.8%	363
High Density	57.2%	20.4%	12.6%	9.9%	3506
Peri-urban	67.1%	19.5%	9.4%	3.9%	307
Squatter Camp	85.0%	5.0%	7.5%	2.5%	40
Compound	29.2%	20.8%	25.0%	25.0%	24
All (Mine)	49.2%	25.8%	19.2%	5.8%	120
Total	51.1%	20.2%	14.4%	14.4%	5123

3.3. Food Security Vulnerability in urban areas

3.3.1. Brief background on household food security

Food security assessments aim at identifying households that are food insecure or those that are likely to become food insecure over a given period of time. A household's ability to achieve food security is derived from the household's human, material and institutional resource base. Food security factors can include demographic factors (high dependency ratio, low educational level of household head, female or child headed households, etc), employment and income factors (unemployment of working age group and single income source), wealth and asset factors (asset poor, lack of diversity in assets like liquid assets, no savings or inadequate savings), health factors (high incidence of illness and deaths, limited access to health care, inadequate access to clean water, poor sanitation) and environmental factors (high cost of living, high incidence of crime, etc). Hence there is a strong linkage between poverty and food insecurity. Unlike in rural areas where most households derive their food requirements from agricultural production, food security in urban areas is market dependant as most households depend on purchases for their food and urban agriculture contribution to food security is insignificant. However, strong rural urban linkages can lessen food insecurity in urban populations.

3.3.2. Method used to determine the food security status of households.

The assessment calculated food security status on the basis of the caloric contribution of all foods available to the family in the month of September 2003. Food availability was derived by summing up food quantities from purchases, urban agriculture contribution, rural areas production, gifts and food aid. The summed up quantity for each household per month and for

each food item was then converted into calories using conversions values shown in the Appendices (H). Using caloric requirements for different age groups, the ideal caloric monthly requirements for each household was calculated. The food security status of each household was then calculated by subtracting required calories per household from the calories available to the household in September 2003. Households remaining with negative calories were assigned the food insecure status and households remaining with positive calories were assigned the food secure status.

3.3.3. Food security status in urban areas.

Table 3.3. Food Security Status in Urban Areas September 2003.


Food Insecurity Status	Without food aid		With food aid	
	Population	Percent	Population	Percent
Food Deficit of less than 50% of 2,100 Kcal/person/day			1,598,865	64.6
Food Deficit of 50% of 2,100 Kcal/person/day and above			876,158	35.4
Urban population food insecure (weighted average)	2,532,851	65.7	2,475,023	64.2
Urban population food secure	1,322,325	34.3	1,380,153	35.8
Total Urban population 2003	3,855,176	100	3,855,176	100
Total Country population	11,630,484		11,630,484	

Food insecurity levels in urban areas are much higher than the earlier estimate of 1.1 million people. The assessment indicates that a total of 66 percent of the 3.8 million urban population is food insecure, without food aid and this is reduced to 64 percent if food aid is considered. At least 37 percent of the food insecure if food aid is not considered and 35 percent if food aid is considered survive on less than 50 percent of Kcal requirements. This means at least 945,000 people (without food aid) and 866,000 (after considering food aid) are extremely food insecure (Table 3.3). The percentage of food insecure urban dwellers is comparable to the rural percentage with a ZIM VAC revised November 2003 figure of 64 percent of the rural population or 5.019 million people food insecure in the rural areas. This gives a total national population of 7.5 million people food insecure in Zimbabwe in 2003/04. The statistics indicate that food insecurity could be a factor of the macroeconomic environment and prices rather than the difference in resource endowments.

3.3.4. Geographical Distribution of food insecurity

This section will describe the Zimbabwean Urban food security status as measured by consumption patterns of households that participated in the study. The assessment investigated the differences in vulnerability to food insecurity among different socio economic groups, special groups, and regions.

Figure 3.6 and Table 3.4 summarizes the prevalence of food insecurity by province. At provincial level, Bulawayo had the highest percentage of food insecure households (71%), followed by Matebeleland North (68%). Masvingo had the least percentage (50%) and the number in Matebeleland South is as low as 59% and this maybe due to food aid supplied. Masvingo had the lowest food insecurity due to the high contribution of rural agriculture to urban food security during an exceptionally good year of harvest in the province.



3.3.5. Food Insecurity Status by Suburb Type

At suburb type level, the assessment found out that food insecure households are found in all suburbs. Fifty four percent of households were food insecure in low density and medium density suburbs, whilst 68 percent was insecure in the high density suburb. In the peri-urban areas, 70 percent of the households, 87 percent in squatter camps, 54 percent in compound and mines respectively are food insecure. Its surprising that food insecure households were also found in low density and medium density suburbs, this may be due to the presence of gardeners and domestic workers who are characterized as poor by their communities.

Table 3.5: Food security by suburb type

	FOOD STATUS				Total
	food insecure		food secure		
	% within SURBURB CODE	Count	% within SURBURB CODE	Count	
SURBURB					
LowDensity	54.3%	345	45.7%	755	
Medium Density	54.3%	166	45.7%	363	
High Density	67.8%	1125	32.2%	3497	
Peri-urban	70.3%	91	29.7%	306	
Squatter Camp	86.8%	5	13.2%	38	
Compound	54.2%	11	45.8%	24	
All(Mine)	54.2%	54	45.8%	118	

3.4. Factors affecting household poverty and food security


3.4.1. Current Factors affecting Food Security

To assess factors that affect household poverty and food security, the study recorded perceptions at two levels; a) household ranking of shocks that affect their livelihoods and b) institutions and group opinions about main causes of poverty in the community.

Household poverty and food security are associated with a notion of vulnerability and risk. If risks materialize they become a “shock” that may affect the vulnerability of the household. It is important to note that this study is concerned about shocks that are likely to damage household well-being, i.e. downside shocks.

From the analysis (Table 3.6 and Figure 3.7), there is very little variation in the type of shock among the different income groups. Inflation, health and education fees feature as the highly perceived shocks affecting households across all income groups. Factors such as cash shortage, low salaries, high transport costs, drought, food shortages, accidents and divorces were also identified as shocks affecting household well being by very few households (less than 4 percent) amongst all urban households.

Economic related shocks are the most important factors that currently affect the urban household in Zimbabwe. Not surprisingly, the analysis revealed that inflation is the major and most important shock that affects most urban households. More than 90 percent of households indicated this shock as the most important factor that is pushing them into poverty and food insecurity.



The second important shock was services (utility rates), of which about 46 percent of households indicated paying for services as an important factor affecting their livelihoods. The third important factor was paying for school fees, 44 percent of households were affected by this factor. It should be noted that these shocks are closely associated with inflation (Table 3.6). The fourth important factor was unemployment. One third of households reported unemployment as one of the greatest shocks. The lack of access to job opportunities, perpetuate informal work and increases household vulnerability.


Other shocks included taxes and health. Households referred to taxes (income taxes) as an important shock affecting their livelihoods, particularly among the non-poor (middle and better of) socio economic groups. About 28 percent of households declared being affected by high hospital bills, long illness (18.3 percent) and deaths in the family (19.0 percent).

Table 3.6: Shocks and hazards that affected household in the last six months and their rank by income group

	[n]	% Total	Rank	Very Poor	Poor	Middle	Better	
Economic	Inflation/price increases	4729	92.30	1	91.4	92.4	93.1	94.1
	Unemployment	1758	34.30	4	41.8	31.5	26	19.8
	Taxes	1511	29.50	5	22.2	30.4	37.9	45.7
	Retrenchment	272	5.30	9	5.6	5.9	5.2	3.5
	Cash shortage, low salary and high transport costs	152	3	10	2.5	4	3.2	2.9
Natural	Drought	26	0.50	13	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.3
	Food shortages	138	2.70	11	2.9	2.5	2.2	2.6
Health	Deaths	975	19.00	7	18.1	18.8	19.3	22.6
	Long illness	935	18.30	8	19.7	19.4	14.3	15.4
	Accidents	116	2.30	12	1.7	1.9	3.8	3.1
	Hospital bill	1430	27.90	6	26.4	29.4	28.4	30.8
Social	Divorce	154	3.00	10	2.9	3.3	2.4	3.4
Educational	Paying for school fees	2269	44.30	3	48.5	41.5	38.2	39.3
	Paying for services	2348	45.80	2	43.8	47.7	47.7	48.8

3.4.2. Differences between current shocks and the 1995 PASS

It is interesting to note that inflation, unemployment and retrenchment are the most common shocks reported in both 1995 and 2003, although the impact of inflation on household's poverty and food security is much higher in 2003. Major shock perception change is also reported for health related causes and high payments required for school fees and services (Figure 3.8).




3.5. Characterization of food security

At national level the following were identified as vulnerable to food insecurity using the institutional instrument, orphans (98.7%), elderly headed household (71.9%), child headed households (71.1%), widows/female headed household (65.2%), unemployed (52.6%), disabled (48.6%), households with no income, assets or inputs (47%), young children (43.55%) and ex commercial workers (30.9%).

A similar response was obtained using the focus group questionnaire, where communities in the different suburbs identified the following in order of importance as vulnerable to food insecurity child headed households , elderly headed , widows/female headed, chronically ill, unemployed, young children, disabled, households with no income, no assets or inputs and lastly ex commercial farm workers.

3.5.1. Food security by income group

From Figure 3.9, food insecurity was highest among the very poor income group and least among the better off. The percent food insecure for the very poor was 81 percent, 57 percent for the poor, 43 percent for the middle and 29 percent for the better off. The very poor and poor are almost 5 times more likely to be food insecure compared to the better off.



3.5.2. Food security and gender.

Households headed by females tend to be slightly food insecure compared to those headed by men. Sixty four percent of female headed households were food insecure compared to 63 percent for male headed households (Table 3.9) This could be due to the fact that the majority of females are not formally employed (61% of female headed households) therefore do not have a stable source of income. Their major source of income was found to be cereal and cash crop sales which contributed 27 percent to total monthly income share for female headed households followed by livestock sales (16 percent).


Table 3.7: Food security by sex of head of household

Sex of Household Head	Food Security Status		Total Count
	Food Insecure % within Sex of HH Head	Food Secure % within Sex of HH Head	
Male	62.9	37.1	3705
Female	63.80	36.2	1374

3.5.3. Food security and marital status

Fig 3.10 summarizes the percentages of food insecure households by marital status. The widowed were more vulnerable to food insecurity compared to the other marital status groups. Seventy two percent of widow headed households were food insecure. Literature says single headed households are more prone to food insecurity compared to households headed by married people. The single headed household referred in Figure 3.10, were single males combined with single females. Splitting these two could result in single female headed households being more vulnerable to food insecurity compared to single male households. The other category refers to couples that were cohabiting.


Fig 3.10: Food security by marital status.



3.5.4. Age of head of household and food security.

Fig 3.11 shows the distribution of households by age group of the HH head. Only 15 households were found to be headed by children. This sample size is too small to make any meaningful conclusions. Food insecurity was seen to increase with age of head. Elderly headed household were the most vulnerable to food insecurity. Seventy six percent of elderly headed households were food insecure.

Fig 3.11: Food status by age of head of household




Literature says child headed households are nearly always food insecure, but this assessment found the opposite. This could be due to the small sample size which may not be representative of the true sample. Further analysis indicated that about 60 percent of the child headed households had at least one member in formal employment and 40% in informal employment.

3.5.5. Size of household and food security.

Food insecurity increases as household size increases (Fig 3.12). Households with 7 or more members were more vulnerable to food insecurity compared to those with less members. Households with one or two members had the least percentage of food insecure households, as long as the members are not elderly or children. The odds ratio for the 6 or less members compared to 7 or more members indicated that household with 7 or more members are almost 3 times more likely to be food insecure compared to those with less members ($p=0.001$).

Figure 3.12: Food security by household size



3.6. The status of education, health, water and sanitation and linkages to Food Security.

3.6.1. Introduction to housing, health, water and sanitation

There is a close relationship between food security, housing, health, water and sanitation:

- a) Diseases have an adverse effect on proper utilization of ingested food and may also prevent household members in participating in income generating activities.
- b) Prolonged illnesses result in huge medical bills and this could reduce the household's ability to purchase food.
- c) Constant physical stress brought by illness makes the working household members less productive and may not be able to earn income.
- d) Frequent illness may also inhibit children from going to school taking part in care giving to the sick.
- e) HIV and AIDS related deaths resulted in many child headed households. It has been shown that child headed households are among the very poor and most food insecure.
- f) Deaths entails funeral expenses which drains on household resources. A household may loose its breadwinner through death due to illnesses thereby eroding the income base of the household.
- g) Inadequate health infrastructure may result in high morbidity and mortality rates.
- h) The quality of water and sanitation affect food security through utilization, which is one of the three main pillars of food security. Insufficient sanitation leads to poor water quality and may result in disease outbreaks especially diarrhea, cholera, typhoid, etc.

Several indicators of access to health facilities and health conditions of urban populations were looked at during the urban ZIMVAC assessment. The Household survey instrument focused on mortality and morbidity of under fives, 5-14 years, 15-60 yrs from any ailment. Prevalence of Malaria, Tuberculosis, Diarrhea and Bilharzias in households was also captured. Community perceptions were also recorded on health facilities available in the suburb, at institutions and services available for the HIV and AIDS infected and disadvantaged children.

The assessment also focused on several issues on housing, water and sanitation. These included tenure status of the household, type of dwelling unit, main source of drinking water, distance to water source, type of toilet facility, number of people sharing toilet, number of households sharing yard and number of rooms occupied by a household. In addition community perceptions were also captured on frequency of refuse collection and frequency of water and electricity cuts.

3.6.2. Housing Conditions


Table 3.8: Housing status by income group

Socio economic group	Owner	Tenant	lodger	Family accommodation	Tied/ Employment	Plot/ permit holder	Other	Total
Very Poor	36.9%	7.2%	34.6%	6.4%	13.2%	0%	1.7%	2581
Poor	36%	8.0%	35.7%	6.3%	13.2%	0.1%	0.8%	1023
Middle	35.2%	9.6%	32.7%	4.9%	16.6%		1.1%	731
Better off	44.1%	14.7%	24.0%	3.7%	13.5%			728
Total	37.5%	8.8%	33.0%	5.8%	13.7%	0%	1.2	5063

Table 3.8 and Figure 3.13, summarizes the tenure status of urban dwellers at national level. Approximately 38 percent of respondents owned houses and 33% were lodgers.

Figure 3.13: Tenure status by income group


Figure 3.13 shows that there is little variation in percentages of households that own houses and lodgers among the very poor, poor and middle class. For the better off the percentage of house owners is quite high (44 percent) compared to other income groups.



At national level, 54 percent of households lived in detached houses, 4% in backyard shacks, 8 percent in backyard brick cottages and its mostly the very poor and poor who live in shacks. Mean number of households staying at a yard were 3.24 and a standard error of 0.10 for the

very poor, a mean of 3.09 and standard error of 0.15 for the poor, a mean of 2.72 and standard error of 0.15 for the middle income and an average of 2.40 and standard error of 0.15 for the better off. The mean number of rooms occupied by the very poor and poor was 2.87 with a standard error of 0.03 and an average of 3.12 with a standard error of 0.06 respectively. For the middle class, the average was 3.70 with a standard error of 0.08 and an average of 4.29 with a standard error of 0.09 for the better off. The data suggests that owning a house does not improve the food security status of households because some house owners were also among the food insecure.


Figure 3.14 Type of dwelling unit by income group



Number of persons per room by income group is such that the very poor had 2.54 people per room with a standard error of 0.037, the poor had 1.90 people per room with a standard error of 0.035, the middle had 1.51 with a standard error of 0.039 and the better off had 1.13 with a standard error of 0.03 (Appendix I).

3.6.3. Water and Sanitation Conditions

Figure 3.15: Main sources of water for urban dwellers




At national level, 90 percent of households had access to piped water. Five percent accessed their water from communal taps, 2 percent from protected boreholes and 3 percent from unprotected sources. Forty one percent of the very poor have access to piped water inside and 44 percent have access to piped water outside the house. Fifty two percent of the poor have access to piped water inside the house and 41 percent have access to piped water outside the house. Seven percent of the very poor use communal tapes, 2.9 percent obtain their water from protected

boreholes, 4.3 percent access water from unprotected wells. Households that obtained water from unprotected wells were mostly squatter camp dwellers.

At national level, 87 percent of households had their source of water on the premises, 10 percent had the water source less than 500m away, 2 percent 500m to 1km away and 1 percent more than a kilometer away. Eight two percent of the very poor and 91 percent of the poor had water on premises. The analysis show that distance to water source is not a problem for the majority of urban dwellers.

Figure 3.16: Toilet type by income group



Fifty five percent of households used flush private toilets, 32 percent flush shared toilets, 3.4 percent blair private, 3.1 percent blair communal, 2.4 percent pit private to household, 2.3 percent pit communal and 2.6 percent other toilet facilities (Figure 3.16). The other toilet facilities that were reported were bucket system, bush and temporary structures especially by people dwelling in squatter camps.

The average number sharing toilet facilities was 18.61 with a standard error of 1.09 for the very poor and an average of 15.68 with a standard error of 1.57 for the poor. For the better off and middle class the mean number sharing a toilet was 8.38 with a standard error of 0.69 and an average of 9.36 with a standard error of 0.83 respectively. The standard deviations are so high showing that there is a lot of variation within the four income groups.

Fifteen percent of communities reported that refuse was not collected at all in their suburbs. Forty five percent of communities had their refuse collected regularly and thirteen percent frequently. In low density and medium density areas above 57 percent of communities reported that their refuse was collected regularly and the rate (44 percent) was lower for high density areas. Eighty three percent of communities in squatter camps reported that refuse was not collected regularly.

Twenty five percent of the communities reported a frequency of water cut of 7 times in 7 days. Thirty two percent were cut off once in 7 days. Water cuts were frequent in mines. The variation in water cuts by suburb type is insignificant.

The housing, water and sanitation analysis showed that some not many of these poor households used sub standard toilet facilities, drink unprotected water, lived in overcrowded conditions in pathetic backyard shacks and did not own houses. These non-rich households were found in all suburb types but were mostly concentrated in the high density, squatter camps and peri-urban areas. The majority of these households were also found to be food insecure.

3.6.4. Health Conditions in Urban Areas

The assessment found out that at national level 91 percent of communities had clinics in their suburbs and 57 percent had private doctors in their suburbs. Only 14 percent of communities who lived in squatter camps reported having private doctors in their camps. Comparative analysis of health infrastructure across provinces show very little variations and hence the reporting is at national level and suburb type level (Tables for provinces can be supplied on request to whoever needs them). Eleven percent of the communities had health services for disadvantaged children. Fifty six percent of communities had home based care facilities for HIV and AIDS infected people. Thirty two percent of the communities had general health services for HIV/infected people. Twenty six percent had no services available for HIV and AIDS infected people. Sixty one percent of communities indicated that they also had traditional /faith healers in their suburbs. Approximately 39 percent of communities in low density, 37 percent in medium density and 25 percent in high density areas reported having no services for HIV and AIDS in their suburbs. The situation was more severe in squatter camps where 71 percent of communities had no services for HIV and AIDS. In peri urban areas only 7 percent had no services for HIV and AIDS.

At suburb type level almost 93 percent of the communities reported to have clinics/hospitals in high density areas, 87 percent low density and 82 percent in medium density areas. Eighty nine percent of communities reported having clinics/hospitals in peri urban, 57 percent in squatter camps and 100 percent in mine settlements.

The majority of households with high mortality and morbidity rates were also found to be food insecure and these were mostly among the very poor and poor income group. Most of the households showing HIV and AIDS proxies were also among the food insecure.

3.6.5. Education Issues in Urban Areas

Increases in the costs of education compromise household food security (Moser 1996). Many urban dwellers value the education of their children and would rather prefer to forgo some activities including buying adequate food in order to send children to school. Withdrawing a child from school in order to buy food shows that the household is in a desperate situation and normally in poverty.

No information was collected on the educational status of the head or spouse. Only educational status of children in the 5-14 yr group was collected. This assessment therefore will not relate the educational status of head or spouse to food security. Educational issues as they relate to food status will only focus on number of children in primary school, households failing to send children to school and drop outs.

The analysis indicates that 66 percent of the households had children in primary school. The percentages of households with children in primary school were 72 percent for the very poor, 62 percent for the poor, 60 percent for the middle and 56 percent for the better off. Among the households with children in primary school, 79 percent had 1-2 children in school, 20 percent had 3-6 children and 0.8 percent had 7 or more. The majority of the households had 1-2 children in primary school. The median number of children in primary school is approximately 1 and the mean is 1.27 with a standard error of 0.03. Thirty percent of the very poor had school going children not going to school and 26 percent for the poor. The highest percentage of school going children not in school was in the peri-urban areas(30 percent) followed by the high density areas(see appendix I).

Increases in school fees was identified by the very poor and poor as a major shock to them. If school fees are skyrocketing draining heavily from the household resources then the very poor and poor are likely to reduce their food expenditure thereby affecting their nutrition. A point will be reached where reduction of food expenditure does not help and households may resort to cut on education. Eighty eight percent of the very poor and poor households indicated that they had reduced on education to buy food.

3.8. Household Coping Strategies

3.8.1 How do Households respond to adversity?

The analysis looks at how do Zimbabwe urban households respond to a decline in incomes, job scarcity and how they allocate their resources with increase in food and services prices. Basically this section looks at the households' risk management strategy (ex-ante²⁴ risk management or ex post²⁵ risk management).

The analysis of survey data suggests that:

- a) About 50 percent of total population reported that they borrowed money to buy food or they either substitute maize by less preferred foods, or reduced the number and quantity of meals eaten per day. Of this population, more than 80 percent are amongst the very poor and poor groups.
- b) Around a third of the total population reported switching expenditure on health, education, transport, water and electricity for food spending. Out of those, more than 80 percent are the most vulnerable (very poor and poor).
- c) Less than 10 percent of urban population reported selling assets and goods for food. Among these, 80 percent are part of the most vulnerable segment of the population.
- d) About 10 percent of the population admitted engaging children in income generation activities, of which 90 percent of them belong to the most vulnerable segment of the population.

²⁴ Ex-ante risk management is action taken before the risk materializes ie. Becoming either a shock/ risk reduction (reducing the risk) or risk mitigation (providing compensation against expected loss)

²⁵ Ex post risk management is action taken after the risk/ shock has materialized. Coping with the risk/ shock (accepting and doing something about the loss) – Source: Heitzmann, Canagarajah and Siegel, 2001.

- e) It is interesting to note that 7 percent of the population reported begging for money to buy food and 90 percent of them are the very poor and poor.

By the design of the household survey instrument, most of collected data reflects coping strategies by definition. Questions about coping strategies are all related to household access to food.

The data does not suggest much on household mitigation or risk reduction strategies. One may consider that migration strategies are the ones associated with risk reduction strategy. However, this is not quite clear. The following responses were found regarding migration-coping related strategies:

- a) About a quarter of the entire population is considering downgrading their type of accommodation. More than 80 percent of population considering this strategy was from the most vulnerable group.
- b) Consider the extended family as the most common primary safety net in Africa, the survey data indicates that only 10 percent of the households are relying on this (sending children to relatives and friends). About 80 percent of households who practice this strategy are from very poor and poor households.

Table 3.9 summarizes the most common coping strategies in practice by the very poor and poor Zimbabwe urban citizens. From household responses, it is clear that Zimbabwe urban households are adopting an “expenditure –minimizing” strategy: cutting total spending, changing dietary habits, and cutting back on purchases of non-essential goods.

In addition to the above strategies, few (seven percent) households do send their children to work to mobilize additional income.

Table 3.9: The most common coping strategies practiced by the very poor and poor socio-economic groups.

Coping Strategy	%	Rank
Has hh begged for money for food?	89.74	1
Has hh engaged children in income generation?	89.7	2
Has hh reduced spending on education for food?	88.34	3
Has hh regularly skipped days without meals due to lack of money or food?	87.06	4
Has hh sold assets and goods for food?	84.57	5
Has hh sublet part of their assets for food?	83.96	6
Has hh sent children away to friends or relatives?	83.73	7
Has hh avoided spending on health care for food?	83.65	8
Has hh reduced spending on water and electricity for food?	82.37	9
Has hh borrow food or money to by food?	82.28	10
Has hh relied on less preferred food as substitutes for maize?	80.6	11
Has hh reduced spending on transport for food?	80.3	12
Has hh regularly reduced number of meals eaten per day?	80.23	13
Is hh thinking of moving to cheaper accommodation?	79.94	14

4. HOUSEHOLD LIVELIHOODS AND VULNERABILITY

4.1. Household Poverty and Vulnerability

4.1.1. Poverty and Vulnerability

To compare poverty indicators in Zimbabwe with other countries, similar analysis was done to assess the percentage of population living below an “international” poverty line. The US \$ 1 equivalent a day standard was adopted. Results suggest that about 40 percent of households live with less than a US\$1.00 (US\$1 equals ZW\$860.00 using the official rate) a day, and more than 90 percent live with less than US\$1.00 (US\$1 equals ZW\$4,200.00 using the parallel rate) a day. The later poverty indicator should be addressed cautiously, since the equivalent consumption basket is not fully accounted at a market exchange rate.


The expenditure per capita *standard deviation* (SD) estimates in Table 4.1 suggest a relatively high dispersion of income. This is supported by the estimated *Gini*²⁶ index of 0.49 that measures the extent to which the distribution of income among urban households deviates from an equal income distribution.

Identifying poverty by income (expenditure) or a consumption level is not fully adequate, since other dimensions of poverty may not be captured completely. Therefore, it is important to take into account other poverty dimensions into account for the multifaceted character of poverty and assess household assets ownership.

Vulnerability is closely linked to asset ownership. The more assets people have, the less vulnerable they are. And the greater the erosion of their assets, the greater their insecurity. Household assets are the stock of wealth that can be used to generate well-being and can buffer against vulnerability.

Furthermore, many households, while not currently in poverty, they may be vulnerable to events/shocks that could push them into poverty. This notion of vulnerability is not captured by poverty defined as a function of the shortfall of current expenditure /consumption against a poverty line.

Figure 4.1: Population Leaving below US\$ a day



²⁶ Gini Index measures the distribution of income. It varies from 0 to 1. A Gini index of zero represents perfect equality, while an index of 1 implies perfect inequality.

To help assess signs of vulnerability in urban Zimbabwe we attempt to expand the poverty concept to vulnerability by looking at household asset ownership, access to services and household disposal (sell) of assets and goods. We map these variables on a vulnerability matrix, which attempts to identify signs of increasing or decreasing vulnerability (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Poverty and Vulnerability matrix: assessing potential signs /indicators of increasing and decreasing vulnerability among urban households

Dimens ions of poverty	Visible causes or contributing factors to poverty in urban Zimbabwe	Income socio-economic groups				
		Poor		Non-poor		Urban Total
		Very Poor	Poor	Middle	Better Of	
	Expenditure per capita (Z\$) Median	\$17, 979.50	\$41, 957.00	\$65,700.00	\$120,111.10	\$ 32,415.65
Income Poverty	HH per capita (pc) expenditure share in food (Median)	47%	43%	41%	32%	43%
	HH pc expenditure share on housing	5%	3%	3%	3%	4%
	HH pc expenditure on transport	12%	11%	10%	12%	11%
	Share of HH in informal employment	79%	78%	64%	71%	75%
Assets Ownership	% HHs who own Non Movable Assets	45%	20%	16%	20%	40%
	% HHs who own Movable Assets	49%	21%	15%	15%	94%
	% HHs who own No Assets	60%	15%	11%	14%	8%
	% HHs who sold assets last 3 months	56%	20%	11%	13%	9%
Health & Education	Per Capita per room (overcrowded living conditions)	85%	9%	3%	2%	6%
	% HHs without access to safe water	83%	9%	4%	4%	3%
	% HHs with drop out of primary	12%	4%	1.2%	1.6%	8%
	% HHs in arrears for school fees	40%	29%	19%	15%	32%
Tenure Insecurity	% HHs lodger without agreement	53%	22%	14%	11%	33%
	% HHs who do not legally own land	62%	17%	12%	9%	51%

4.1.2. What can we conclude from the above vulnerability matrix?

Urban households have a relatively high dependency on cash for purchases of essential goods and services;

- Employment insecurity is a contributing factor to poverty and vulnerability. Household reliance on informal employment is quite large. This feature increases the odds of a household falling into severe poverty and raises household vulnerability particularly among the very poor group.
- About 40 percent of the households own non-movable assets (land and house) and out of these, 45 percent are in the very poor category.
- Household who do not own any asset, are estimated at 8 percent of total urban population. These households are most likely to fall into severe poverty and vulnerability.
- Selling assets and goods under an adverse economic environment can be used as an indicator of household vulnerability. Less than 10 percent of households have been

selling assets in the last three months. From this percentage more than 50 percent are the very poor.

- The overcrowding variable (number of persons per room) does not seem to capture fully the perceived overcrowding problem that exists in high-density areas. Nevertheless, data is pointing to the fact that the overcrowding problem small as it may seem is severe amongst the very poor households.
- The access to safe water does not seem to be a big problem in urban areas of Zimbabwe, however, the few (3 percent) households without access to safe water are mainly those in the very poor who stay in the high-density areas, squatter camps and peri-urban areas.
- It is noticeable that the vulnerability of the households for the very poor is also reinforced by them having arrears in paying school fees.
- Tenure insecurity (on housing and land) is relatively high in Zimbabwe urban areas. About half of urban households have access to land that is not legally allocated. About one third of urban households are lodgers without agreement. Among these households, the majority (more than 50 percent) is from the very poor socio-economic group.
- The tenure insecurity diminishes the probability of both land and housing (as important productive assets) being used to cushion household against severe poverty by renting, subletting and have access to credit to raise income. Tenure insecurity increases vulnerability of the poor.

In summary, it can be concluded that 51 percent of household that fall under very poor socio-economic category, as defined by their level of income, also exhibit strong characteristics that allow clustering them as very poor and vulnerable. The 20 percent falling under poor category also show signs of increasing vulnerability, and some are likely to fall under severe poverty.

4.2. Household Food Security

4.2.1. Food Sources and Availability - Where do households acquire their Cereals

The greatest maize deficits were experienced in the Matabeleland provinces followed by Midlands and Manicaland provinces because secondary data indicate that cereal production of these provinces were lowest in that order as follows, Matebeleland South 6,500 MT, Matebeleland North 43,500 MT, Midlands 53,900 MT and Manicaland 106,100 MT. Masvingo province displayed an unusually high production this season because of a rather good season in the province. Although these are rural production figures there exists very strong rural/urban linkages, as a result a bad season in rural agriculture affects the urban population. Distribution of grain by the GMB is expected to be biased in favour of areas with bigger deficits.


Table 4.2 shows that the major source of grain was from the parallel market in all provinces. GMB was the second major supplier in Matebeleland South, Matebeland North, Masvingo Provinces. Sixteen percent and 17 percent of communities indicated that there were buying cereal from shops in Harare and Mashonaland West Provinces respectively. Some households reported getting their grain from NGOs and churches.

Table 4.2: Source of cereal focus group perceptions -percent

Province	Shops	Own Production	GMB	Black/Parallel market	Other
Bulawayo	8.1	0	7	81.4	3.5
Harare	15.8	0.5	1	82.1	0.5
Manicaland	1.1	6.7	4.5	66.3	21.3
Mash central	0	0	6.1	93.9	0
Mash East	14	4	4	76.0	2
Mash West	17.1	0	11.4	68.6	2.9
Masvingo	0	0	41.7*	55.6	2.8
Mat North	2	2	35.3*	58.8	2
Mat South	0	0	23.5*	70.6	5.9
Midlands	0	0	3.8	88.5	7.7

4.2.1.1. Relative Contribution of Different Sources of Cereal

From fig 4.2 it can be seen that the major source of cereal for the urban dwellers were purchases. Food aid was the second major source in Matebeland South, Bulawayo and Manicaland Provinces. Rural production was the second major source in Masvingo, Mashonaland West, Mashonaland East and Mashonaland Central Provinces. This shows a strong rural urban linkage in these provinces. Urban production was the second major source for Harare only. Special programs for children in primary schools, lactating mothers and chronically ill were available in all provinces. Masvingo had the highest level of cereal (18%) coming from special programs followed by Matebeleland South (11%). Mashonaland Central Province had the least level of cereal coming from special programs.



4.2.1.2.Sources of Maize meal

Communities revealed that the major source of maize meal was from the parallel market followed by shops for Harare, Manicaland, Mashonaland West, Masvingo, Matebeleland South and Midlands Provinces. The other provinces such as Bulawayo, Mashonaland Central and Matebeland North, their major source of maize meal were shops followed by parallel market.

4.2.1.3. Source of Maize grain excluding food aid

Major source of maize grain for all provinces were purchases.(Figure 4.3). Rural production was the second major source for Manicaland, Mashonaland central, Mashonaland East and

Masvingo. Urban production played a very important role in Harare and Mashonaland West being the second major source of maize. Other sources were quite significant in Matebeland North and Midlands and these included maize from relatives and friends excluding food aid.

4.2.1.4. Contribution of Food Aid

The survey indicates that over 95 percent of the households do not receive general food aid, child supplementary feeding and special food aid to orphans.(Appendix I) .Six percent of the very poor households indicated that they received food aid and 3 percent for the poor and middle class. Approximately 1 percent of the better off also received food aid. The fact the better off received food aid whole family rations shows some loopholes in the targeting system.

Approximately 5 percent of female headed households received food aid compared to 4 percent for the male headed households. Elderly headed households had the highest percentage of households that received food aid(7 percent), followed by the 20 to 29 years age group(5 percent).(Appendix I) . The widowed had the highest number of households that received food aid(7 percent) compared to 6 percent for the divorced and less than 4 percent for the married, single and those cohabiting. Approximately 7.5 percent of households with orphans received food aid compared to 3.2 percent for households without orphans. Sixty one percent of the food insecure households received general food aid compared to 39 percent for the food secure. Squatter camps had the highest percentage of households that received food aid(13 percent), followed by mines and peri-urban areas(8 percent for each) see Appendix I. Almost 4 percent of households in the low density areas indicated that they received food aid. These may be the domestic workers or gardeners who reside in these areas.

These results shows that the elderly headed households who may be widowed and keeping orphans are the ones mostly targeted by food aid givers.

Table 4.3 shows that food aid was being provided in all provinces. Focus group perceptions indicate that Matebeleland South had the highest number of communities that indicated that they had received food aid in the suburb (64.7 percent) followed by Harare (36.2 percent), Manicaland Province (22.9 percent), Bulawayo (21.8 percent), Mashonaland West (20 percent) and Masvingo Province 18.4 percent. In other provinces, number of communities receiving food aid was less than 15 percent. In all provinces, NGOs and to some extent churches were playing a major role in supplying food aid (Table 4.3). Manicaland (68.2 percent) had the highest number of communities that indicated receiving Government supplies of food aid. There was no food aid from government for Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland East, Masvingo and Matebeland South Provinces.

Figure 4.3: Maize source excluding food aid by province




Table 4.3: Source of food aid Community Perception -Percent

Province	Food AID Provided Yes	UN	GVT	NGO	Church	Other Organizations
Bulawayo	21.8	15.8	10.5	36.8	57.9	15.8
Harare	36.2	0	18.7	85.3	20.0	4.0
Manicaland	22.9	0	68.2	63.6	4.5	4.5
Mash central	12.1	0	0	100	0	0
Mash East	14.5	12.5	0	0	12.5	50
Mash West	20.0	0	42.9	57.1	14.3	14.3
Masvingo	18.4	28.6	0	71.4	14.3	0
Mat North	9.8	0	20.0	60.0	0	20
Mat South	64.7	0	0	63.6	45.5	0
Midlands	14.6	0	16.7	66.7	16.7	16.7

4.2.2. Food Availability

Food purchases depend on availability on the market, price of commodity and household income level. Table 4.4 shows that urban dwellers in most provinces indicated that maize grain was rarely available except Bulawayo and Harare. In Harare (36.2%) indicated that maize grain was occasionally available, 28.0% readily available and 34.8% rarely available. In Bulawayo 42.5% indicated that maize grain was readily available, 39.1% occasionally available and 18.4% rarely available.

Table 4.4: Cereal availability, community perceptions.

Province	Readily available		Occasionally available		Rarely available	
	Cereal	Maize	Cereal	Maize	Cereal	Maize
Bulawayo	20.7%	42.5%	42.5%	39.1%	35.6%	18.4%
Harare	42.5%	28.0%	30.9%	36.2%	25.6%	34.8%
Manicaland	14.6%	11.5%	14.6%	18.8%	67.7%	65.6%
Mash central	12.1%	9.1%	60.6%	18.2%	27.3%	72.7%
Mash East	21.8%	10.9%	50.9%	34.5%	27.3%	54.5%
Mash West	28.6%	0%	22.9%	31.4%	48.6%	68.6%
Masvingo	21.1%	10.5%	50.0%	15.8%	28.9%	73.7%
Mat North	3.9%	3.9%	64.7%	31.4%	31.4%	60.8%
Mat South	23.5%	17.6%	11.8%	17.6%	64.7%	64.7%
Midlands	19.5%	14.6%	19.5%	41.5%	56.1%	43.9%

Communities revealed that wheat flour was rarely available in all provinces (Table 4.4). The majority of urban dwellers purchased wheat flour from the parallel market at exorbitant prices.

Table 4.5 shows that the very poor had the least mean cereal per capita per month (10.06 kg) followed by the middle (13.42kg). The mean values for the poor and better off were 13.87kg and 14.70 respectively.

Table 4.5: Quantities of cereal in kgs available per household by income group.

EXPENDITURE GROUP		CEREALS RECEIVED FROM FOOD AID PER CAPITA	CEREALS RECEIVED FROM SPECIAL PROGRAM MES PER CAPITA	CEREALS PURCHASED & THEN CONSUMED PER CAPITA	URBAN CEREALS PER CAPITA	RURAL CEREALS PER CAPITA	OTHER SOURCE OF CEREALS PER CAPITA	TOTAL CEREALS PER CAPITA
VERY POOR	N	138	90	2357	370	285	495	2527
	Mean	3.27	2.20	9.07	2.99	3.82	2.46	10.06
	Median	1.33	1.28	8.00	1.11	1.67	1.55	8.61
	Sum	451.13	198.20	21371.13	1107.57	1089.57	1216.23	25433.83
POOR	N	25	24	978	130	147	219	1017
	Mean	4.71	3.79	11.99	2.84	7.09	3.48	13.87
	Median	2.38	1.33	9.67	1.39	2.78	2.08	10.33
	Sum	117.66	90.99	11724.32	368.97	1042.16	761.52	14105.62
MIDDLE	N	19	9	704	84	114	150	722
	Mean	4.93	1.59	11.32	3.84	6.03	4.01	13.42
	Median	4.17	1.39	10.00	1.10	2.85	2.19	10.66
	Sum	93.65	14.28	7966.43	322.46	687.67	601.83	9686.32
BETTER	N	6	3	712	62	111	164	726
	Mean	1.07	1.41	12.02	7.17	7.48	5.05	14.70
	Median	.42	1.67	10.00	2.08	3.13	3.33	11.33
	Sum	6.42	4.23	8560.77	444.69	829.98	827.87	10673.95
Total	N	188	126	4751	646	657	1028	4992
	Mean	3.56	2.44	10.44	3.47	5.55	3.31	12.00
	Median	1.67	1.33	8.67	1.25	2.22	1.89	10.00
	Sum	668.86	307.69	49622.65	2243.69	3649.39	3407.46	59899.73

Table 4.6: Quantities of sweet potatoes in kgs available per household by income group.

EXPENDITURE GROUP		URBAN SWEET POTATOES/YAMS PER CAPITA	RURAL SWEET POTATOES/YAMS PER CAPITA	PURCHASED SWEET POTATOES/YAMS PER CAPITA	OTHER SOURCES OF SWEET POTATOES/YAMS PER CAPITA	TOTAL SWEET POTATOES/YAMS PER CAPITA
VERY POOR	N	8	56	247	28	323
	Mean	1.01	5.17	4.42	.75	4.37
	Median	.60	1.02	.75	.61	.83
	Sum	8.09	289.35	1092.58	20.99	1410.80
POOR	N	4	16	120	7	145
	Mean	.24	3.36	2.72	.52	2.65
	Median	.14	1.76	1.10	.28	1.20
	Sum	.96	53.80	326.03	3.63	384.42
MIDDLE	N	1	19	81	11	105
	Mean	3.33	1.54	2.15	.71	2.04
	Median	3.33	1.04	1.00	.63	1.11
	Sum	3.33	29.24	173.81	7.81	214.19
BETTER	N	2	25	78	26	122
	Mean	7.22	3.36	23.73	1.45	16.29
	Median	7.22	1.39	2.32	.83	1.67
	Sum	14.44	84.03	1851.02	37.77	1987.26
Total	N	15	116	526	72	695
	Mean	1.79	3.93	6.55	.97	5.75
	Median	.63	1.25	1.00	.67	1.00
	Sum	26.83	456.41	3443.43	70.20	3996.65

Table 4.6 shows that the median per capita was highest among the better off (1.67) followed by the very poor (2.65).

4.2.3. Contribution of Rural and Urban Agriculture to Food Security

4.2.3.2.3. Rural Urban Linkages

To assess urban –rural linkages the study looked at households living in urban areas that were involved in rural agriculture in 2003 and households rural-urban transactions as captured by the survey. The results are presented in Table 4.7.

The magnitude and type of transactions captured by the survey may underestimate the on-going rural –urban transactions. This may be due to restrictions of maize flow from rural to urban areas or high costs of inputs and successive droughts.

Percentage of households doing rural agriculture [%]	19.1
Percentage of households doing any rural-urban transaction [%]	13.2
Average quantity of maize harvested in rural for urban own consumption [kg]	307.8
Average quantity of millet/sorghum harvested in rural for urban own consumption [kg]	507.7
Average quantity of sweet potatoes/yams harvested in rural for urban own consumption [kg]	209.2

About 20 percent of urban households have been farming in rural areas. Rural production of basic staple food (maize and sweet potatoes) being consumed by urban dwellers is estimated at 6 and 11 percent respectively.

A look at urban agriculture reveals that about a quarter of urban households have access to land for cultivation within urban areas in 2002/2003 agricultural season. Among those about 60 percent are from the very poor socio economic group. Most households have access to an area planted less than an acre. Almost half of the households with access to land, their land was not legally allocated.

4.3. Household Food Access

4.3.1. Effects of Markets on Food Security - Maize Prices

Livelihoods were greatly affected by the source of grain, which was the parallel market and the prices were exorbitant. The average prices for maize grain at different sources are shown in table 4.8 by province. Parallel market prices for maize grain were higher compared to retail shops.

Table 4.8: Maize meal and prices by province from Focus Group Interviews

Province	Maize GMB 50kg bag	Maize GMB 20kg	Maize 50kg Parallel Market	Maize Parallel Retail 20 kg	Maize Meal Retail shops 20kg	Maize Meal parallel 10kg	Bread Retail Market
Bulawayo	4063.24	2054.32	19648.03	8412.50	8655.94	10428.00	1391.38
Manicaland	14757.69	8490.00	18335.71	6139.53	10972.22	7464.29	981.96
Mash Central	14785.71	5187.50	14951.61	5156.25	11530.00	15333.33	1368.75
Mash East	14369.23		16537.04	6924.53	11860.87	8287.50	1051.43
Mash West	12212.11	3505.71	16351.85	5606.06	11809.52	9766.67	1051.43
Mat North	2767.08	1196.67	17922.73	7824.49	13058.82	12793.75	2157.45
Mat South	3267.00	4500.00	24818.18	8892.86	13554.54	9000.00	1413.33
Midlands	12161.11	6299.23	17921.88	7305.56	12133.33	13277.78	1689.74
Masvingo	6795.42	3534.61	14684.78	5750.00	9933.33	6555.56	1597.22
Harare	15130.71	3893.53	18958.03	8706.90	14140.75	13240.74	1482.07
Total	9684.68	4507.08	18211.74	7508.74	12005.03	11629.23	1410.91


4.4. Household Consumption Patterns



4.4.1. Monthly Consumption Patterns

The very poor were mostly consuming carbohydrates (80.3%), followed by vegetables (16.3%) and very little protein rich foods and oils (Figure 4.4).


The poor also exhibit the same pattern shown above except that the protein rich slice of the pie has slightly enlarged (Fig 4.5).

The better off were also consuming a lot of carbohydrates (87%). The slice for vegetables is smaller (6.7%) compared to other income groups and slices for proteins and oils is larger (Figure 4.6).





Further analysis of the diets indicated that the very poor were obtaining most of their calories from maize (57%), followed by potatoes (8%). The share for protein rich foods is insignificant. The poor access 56% of their total calories from maize. Bread, sugar, oils have the same percent contribution (8%). The middle class obtain 48% of their total calories from maize followed by bread and oils (10%). The better off obtain 37% of their total calories from maize followed by rice (17%). Bread has the highest share in the better off group (11%), even protein rich foods (7%). The 87% share for the carbohydrates for the better off is made of maize, bread, potatoes, sugar and rice (Figure 4.7).



Food composition across the socio-economic groups was analyzed and the results indicate that carbohydrates consumption increases with the wealth status. The very poor eat the least amount (10.5 kgs/capita/month), followed by the poor (15.4 kgs/capita/month), then the middle income (19.3 kgs) and the better off (26.1 kgs). Similarly consumption of protein, fats and oils, vegetables and tubers also increases with the wealth status of the household (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9: Available mean monthly food quantities per capita by income group

Income group	Carbohydrate (kgs/capita)	Protein rich Foods (kgs/capita)	Fat and Oils (kgs/capita)	Vegetables (kgs/capita)
Very Poor	10.50	0.27	0.27	2.25
Poor	15.42	1.16	0.48	2.75
Middle	19.33	2.00	0.70	2.96
Better off	26.14	3.50	0.93	3.00
Total	13.75	0.75	0.45	2.50

4.4.2. Consumption Frequency

From the frequency Table 4.10 it seems that urban dwellers were consuming mostly maize meal, sugar, vegetables, coffee/ tea and cooking oil. The cooking oil is being consumed almost every day, but Figure 4.7 shows that the quantities per capita were very little especially for the very poor and poor.

Table 4.10: Number of times item was eaten over the last 7 days, entire Population

Food item	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Maize meal	1.4	3.1	1.3	2.1	2.4	3.7	2.9	83.1
Sorghum and Millet	67.4	12.5	8.5	5.0	1.9	1.0	0.5	3.1
Bread	41.7	10.8	8.7	8.0	3.4	1.9	1.1	24.4
Potatoes	73.2	9.1	5.9	4.5	1.9	0.7	0.5	4.1
Sugar	12.6	5.2	4.1	4.7	2.1	1.7	1.1	68.5
Pulses	66.8	15.3	8.6	4.1	1.6	0.6	0.2	2.8
Vegetables	3.3	3.0	1.6	2.5	2.2	2.0	1.9	83.5
Tea/coffee	15.8	5.2	4.6	5.0	2.4	1.9	1.0	64.1
Fruits	63.9	8.3	6.6	6.2	2.8	1.4	0.5	10.1
Roots,edible insects	88.8	4.6	2.3	1.6	0.7	0.3	0.1	1.7
Meat	30.3	13.8	13.0	11.6	7.5	3.8	1.6	18.3
Eggs	71.9	10.4	6.3	4.4	2.0	0.8	0.3	3.9
Fish	67.0	14.8	8.2	4.4	2.0	0.7	0.3	2.6
Cooking oil	12.5	3.6	2.1	2.6	2.4	2.0	1.3	73.6
Milk products	51.0	8.2	6.4	5.6	2.5	1.5	0.6	24.3

4.4.3. Consumption Frequency by Socio- Economic Group

About 43 percent of the urban population eat 3 meals per day, whilst 57 percent were having 2 or less meals per day. Of those having 2 or less meals, 62 percent were from the very poor, 18 percent poor, 10.5 percent middle and 9.5 of better off socio economic groups (Table 4.11).

Table 4.11: Number of meals eaten per day by socio economic group

Income group	0	1	2	3	4	Total
Very poor	0.9%	13.4%	54.9%	30.5%	0.2%	2489
Poor	0.6%	7.8%	43.2%	48.2%	0.2%	998
Middle	0.1%	7.3%	33.7%	58.6%	0.3%	713
Better off	0.3%	5.6%	31.3%	62.7%	0.1%	713
Total	0.7%	10.3%	46.0%	42.8%	0.2%	4913

4.5. Household Income Patterns and Food Access

4.5.1. Introduction

During the ZIMVAC September 2003 urban food security assessment, information was gathered on households' major income generating activities. Respondents were asked to indicate their formal and informal activities. Number of people in either formal or informal employment per household was also captured and salaries earned. Other income sources such as agricultural

produce sales, Government public works, subletting assets etc were explored. Income shares per capita per household were computed for different sources of income.

4.5.2. Income Sources at National Level.

At national level, 55 percent of households ranked formal employment as their major source of income and 36 percent ranked informal employment. Four percent ranked both formal and informal as their major source and 3 percent ranked remittances. Two percent ranked other activities as their major sources of income. The differences were statistically significant ($p=0.05$).

4.5.3. Source of income by Province

Sources of income in all provinces were diversified. In general the major income sources were from formal employment, informal employment, agricultural produce sales and gold panning in most provinces (Fig 4.8).

4.5.3.1. Bulawayo Province


In Bulawayo, formal employment was the major source of income (27%) followed by livestock sale and informal employment contributing 18% each for the urban dwellers. Other activities contributed 12 percent to total household income per capita. Respondents were not asked to disclose their other sources therefore these are not known. The contribution of remittances, subletting, vegetable and asset sales to total household income per capita were very little (Figure 4.8).

4.5.3.2. Matebeleland North Province

In Matebeleland North urban areas, informal employment was the major income source (63 %) followed by formal (12 percent) for the urban dwellers. Cereal and cash crop sales contributed 11 percent of total household income per capita. The contribution of asset sales, remittances, public works, livestock sales and other sources combined was only 14 percent (Fig 4.8)

4.5.3.3. Midlands Province.

Fig 4.8 shows that the major income generating activity for urban dwellers in the Midlands province was informal employment contributing 26 percent of the total household income per capita followed by formal employment (19 percent). Livestock sales, gold panning, remittances



and other sources contributed 16 percent, 11 percent, 9 percent, 10 percent respectively. Cereal and cash crop, asset sale, subletting, vegetable sales contributed very little (9 percent).

4.5.3.4. Matebeleland South Province

The major source of income for urban dwellers in Matebeleland South was formal employment contributing 25 percent of the total household income per capita followed by informal (24 percent). Remittances and groceries, livestock sales, and other activities contributed 14 percent, 9 percent and 13 percent respectively. Subletting, cereal and cash crop sales, gold panning, asset sale and vegetable sales combined contributed 15 percent of total household income per capita (Figure 4.8).

4.5.3.5. Manicaland Province

Overall, formal employment contributed the largest share to total household income per capita (20 percent) followed by remittances and groceries (19 percent). Cereal and cash crop sales, other sources, informal employment, gold panning and livestock sales contributed 16 percent, 12 percent, 11 percent, 9 percent, 7 percent respectively (Figure 4.8). The contribution of vegetable selling, subletting and asset selling was very little (6 percent).

4.5.3.6. Mashonaland central Province

Fig 4.8 shows that livestock sale was the major source of income for the urban dwellers in Mashonaland Central contributing 23 percent of total household income per capita. Formal employment and cereal and cash crop contributed 20 percent each. Informal employment contributed 16 percent.

4.5.3.7. Masvingo Province

In Masvingo urban areas, livestock sales contributed the largest share to total household income per capita (21%), followed by formal employment (19 percent). Subletting contributed 18 percent and Masvingo had the highest share of income coming from subletting among provinces. Remittances, informal employment, cereal and cash crop sales contributed 16 percent, 9 percent and 8 percent respectively. Vegetable and asset sales and other sources combined contributed only 9 percent (Figure 4.8).

4.5.3.8. Mashonaland West Province

Cash crop sale was the major source of income for Mashonaland West urban dwellers contributing 33 percent to total household income per capita followed by livestock sales, formal employment and remittances contributing 12 percent each (Figure 4.8). Informal employment, gold panning, and other activities contributed 11 percent, 8 percent, 9 percent respectively. Subletting, asset sale, and vegetable vending contributed very little to total household income per capita (3 percent).

4.5.3.9. Harare Province

The major source of income for the Harare urban dwellers was cereal and cash crop sales contributing 21 percent of total household income per capita followed by formal employment (15 percent) and informal employment (13 percent). Livestock sales, remittances in, gold panning and other activities contributed 12 percent, 11 percent, 12 percent, 10 percent respectively. vegetables, assets sales and subletting combined contributed very little (6 percent).

4.5.3.10. Mashonaland East Province


The major source of income was gold panning contributing 37 percent of total household income per capita followed by formal employment (14 percent). Cereal and cash crop sales contributed 13 percent followed by informal employment (10 percent). Remittances and Livestock sales contributed 9 percent and 8 percent respectively (Figure 4.8). The contribution of asset and vegetable sales, subletting and other sources was very little (9 percent).

4.5.4. Income source by income group

Sources of income for the different social groups were investigated and are shown in Figure 4.9. Sources of income were very diversified in all income groups.

4.5.4.1. Very Poor

The major source of income for the very poor was livestock sales (19 percent) followed by formal employment (16 percent). Informal employment 15 percent, cereal and cash crop sales 13 percent, remittances and groceries 10 percent, gold panning 9 percent, and other sources contributed 6 percent. Vegetable and asset selling, subletting, public works combined contributed only 12 percent (Figure 4.9). Vegetable selling had the largest share in the very poor group compared to other income groups.



Communities ranked fruit and vegetables sales as the major livelihood activities for the very poor followed by other activities (Table 4.12). This shows that the activity is very popular among the very poor, but does not contribute much to total household income per capita per month. Petty trade was ranked third in the very poor and poor groups.

Occupations mentioned during the focus group discussions for the very poor include domestic workers, gardeners, general hands, industrial workers, hair dressers, traders in the black market, builders, paper collectors, flower and bottle collectors, prostitutes, shop assistants, etc.

4.5.4.2. Poor

The major source of income for the poor was cereal and cash crop sales (21 percent) followed by livestock sales (20 percent). Formal and informal employment 14 percent and 13 percent respectively, other sales (10 percent) and remittances contributed 6 percent (Figure 4.9). Subletting, vegetables and asset selling and public works combined contributed 16 percent.

In group discussions, fruit and vegetables selling was ranked as the major livelihood activities for the poor followed by formal employment. The income per capita share for vegetable selling was very small for the poor. This shows that though the activity is very popular among the poor, its contribution to total household income per capita per month is minimal.

Activities engaged by the poor include domestic workers, gardeners, general hands, industrial workers, hair dressers, black marketers, builders, paper, flower and bottle collectors, prostitutes, shop assistants, etc. There is little variation in the activities of the poor and very poor.

4.5.4.3. Middle

The major income source was cereal and cash crop sales (20 percent) followed by formal employment (15 percent). Informal employment (14 percent), livestock sales (14 percent), other activities (12 percent), remittances (10 percent), and gold panning contributed 8 percent (Figure 4.9). Selling of asset, subletting and vegetable vending contributed very little (7 percent). There was no public works for the middle income earners.

From focus group discussions, communities ranked formal employment as the major source for the middle class followed by cross boarder trading (Table 4.12).

The other activities for the middle classes include foreign currency dealings and black marketing.

4.5.4.4. Better off

The major source of income for the better off was informal employment contributing 29 percent of total income per capita followed by formal employment (15 percent). Cereal and cash crop (14 percent), remittances and groceries (11 percent), other activities (8 percent), gold panning (9 percent) and livestock sales (7 percent). Asset and vegetable selling, subletting combined contributed very little (7 percent). There was no contribution from public works for the better off.

From the focus group interviews, communities revealed that the better off in their communities survive mostly by professional services such as teachers running private lessons in their suburbs, doctors opening own surgeries, lawyers opening own practicing firms etc. followed by formal employment (Table 4.12). Cross boarder trading was ranked third.


The better off were people in business, commuter operators, builders, foreign currency dealers, traders in the black market, landlords, money lenders and those with relatives abroad.

Table 4.12: Community perceptions of livelihood activities

Group Activity	Very poor		Poor		Middle		Better off	
	% yes	rank	% yes	rank	% yes	rank	% yes	rank
Formal employment	10.8	4	32.4	2	67.4	1	50.9	2
Professional service	.6		1.8		12.1	5	56.7	1
Tuck shop	5.8	8	15.2	7	17.3	4	7.9	6
Agric	6.1	7	5.8	9	3.8		5.8	8
Gold panning	1.2		3.6		5.8	10	7.1	7
Cross border trade	1.2		3.8		25.9	2	39.5	3
Fruits/veges vending	44.1	1	39.7	1	9.7	8	3.3	
Clothes vending	10.8	4	21.1	6	10.3	7	2.0	
Hardware vending	1.8		8.6	8	8.3	9	4.4	9
Petty trade	34.7	3	23.0	3	5.2		1.1	
Home industry	8.6	6	22.7	5	21.4	3	11.7	4
Relatives UK	0.2		0.8		6.7			
Other	47.7	2	23.0	3	11.2	6	28.2	4

4.5.5. Source of income by gender

Female headed households obtained 27 percent of their total income from cereal and cash crop sales followed by formal employment (17 percent). Livestock sales (16 percent), remittances and groceries (13 percent), informal employment (13 percent) and other activities contributed 6 percent (Figure 4.10). Male headed households obtained 21 percent of their total income from informal employment followed by formal employment (15 percent), livestock sales (12 percent), remittances (8 percent) and gold panning contributed 7 percent.



4.5.6. Sources of Income by Employment Type

4.5.6.1. Informal employment.

At national level, 59 percent of households had at least one member in informal employment. Approximately 64 percent had at least one member engaged in informal employment for the very poor, 57 percent for the poor, 53 percent for the middle income and 50 percent for the better off. The mean number of members engaged in informal activities per household is 1.19, with a standard error mean of ± 0.00913.

4.5.6.2. Formal employment

At national level, 57% of the households indicated that there was at least one member of the family in formal employment. Approximately 49 percent had at least one member engaged in informal employment for the very poor, 61 percent for the poor, 67 percent for the middle income and 67 percent for better off. Formal employment improved the status of the household.


The mean number employed in the formal sector was 1.24, with a standard error mean of 0.00989. There is very little variation in the mean number of members engaged in formal or informal activities per household. In all four income groups, the number of people engaged either in formal or informal employment is approximately one.

4.5.7. Effect of incomes on food security

When food security was related to income groups that were determined using expenditure as a proxy for income the following results were obtained:

From Figure 4.11 it can be seen that the prevalence of food insecurity was highest in the very poor group (81percent) with an average expenditure per capita of Z\$17,979.50, followed by the poor (57 percent) with an average expenditure per capita of Z\$41,957. The middle had a prevalence of 43 percent and their median income per capita per month was Z\$65,700. The better off had a prevalence of 29 percent and income per capita per month of Z\$120,111.10. There is a very strong negative correlation between income level and food insecurity ($r=-1.00$, $p=0.01$). Food insecurity decreases as income per capita increases.

Figure 4.11: Relationship between income and food security.



4.6. Household Expenditure Patterns

4.6.1. Expenditure patterns by socio economic group

As expected the very poor and poor segments of the urban population spend relatively large proportions of their expenditure on food than the non-poor groups. However, the non-food expenditure share takes a slightly higher proportion within the total household expenditure. This is due to high costs for non-food essentials such as transport (public or private), housing, water and sanitation, education and health care services (Figure 4.12 and Table 4.13).

Data suggests that poor income groups spend more on relatively cheaper food commodities than the non-poor do. Among poor households, cereals take a large (more than 20 percent) proportion of household expenditure, and maize share account for more than half of the cereal expenditure. Vegetables and oil, account for about 12 percentage of total expenditure among this group (Figure 4.13 and Table 4.13).

Transport, accommodation (including water, electricity and telephone) and hygienic products are the largest non-food expenditure shares across poor and non-poor households. They account for more than one third of total expenditure (Figure 4.14 and Table 4.13).

Figure 4.12: Household food and non-food expenditure shares by income




Figure 4.13: Household food expenditure shares composition by income




Figure 4.14: Household non-food expenditure shares composition by income




Table 4.13: Household expenditure shares composition by income socio-economic groups

Expenditure shares Legend	Poor		Non-Poor		Total expenditure share
	Very Poor	Poor	Middle	Better off	
Food	48.18	43.93	41.93	33.36	44.20
Maize	14.97	6.66	4.66	2.73	10.05
Cereals excl maize	5.79	10.13	10.87	8.75	7.82
Grains	0.09	0.12	0.17	0.09	0.11
Tubers	1.01	1.37	1.36	1.20	1.16
Beans	0.82	0.71	0.62	0.42	0.71
Animal Products	5.66	9.27	10.58	9.61	7.67
Sugar	4.17	2.94	1.99	1.15	3.17
Fruits	0.29	0.50	0.55	0.55	0.41
Oil	5.74	4.56	4.30	3.10	4.82
Vegetables	6.52	4.57	3.69	2.61	5.16
Mazoe	0.64	1.40	1.71	1.54	1.08
Other food	2.48	1.67	1.43	1.61	2.04
Non-food	53.16	56.46	58.27	66.75	56.51
Accomodation	4.62	3.51	3.11	3.27	3.98
Telephone electricity and water	4.78	4.17	3.84	4.31	4.45
Transport	6.93	9.66	10.37	14.34	9.04
Health	2.26	3.07	2.98	4.18	2.80
Education	3.75	4.37	4.32	5.83	4.26
Funerals	2.29	2.98	3.20	3.92	2.79
Agric Imputs	0.51	0.50	0.48	0.58	0.51
Remittance out	2.50	3.99	5.32	5.76	3.68
Other services	4.66	7.97	10.79	14.54	7.63
Hygienic prod	14.58	11.02	9.19	6.58	11.93
Firewood	1.34	0.78	0.54	0.19	0.95
Parafin	0.31	0.22	0.19	0.12	0.25
Other non-food	4.63	4.22	3.94	3.14	4.24
Total Expenditure	101.34	100.39	100.20	100.11	100.71


4.6.2. Expenditure patterns across provinces and head of household gender, elderly and non-elderly and marital status

An analysis across provinces, show that expenditure share is relatively similar. Non- food expenditure shares are all above 50 percent and range from 54 to 67 percent. Matabeleland South is the province exhibiting a slightly different expenditure shares composition. The province has the lowest (33 percent) proportion of total food expenditure share.

Staple food (cereals including maize) has the predominant share amongst food expenditures, accounting for almost 20 percent of total expenditure in all provinces but Matabeleland South with only 11 percent. Vegetables and oil follow with about 10 percent of total share, except Matabeleland have lowest share, 6 percent.


Among non-food expenditures, accommodation share combined with water, electricity and telephone) varies from 7 to 10 percent, followed by hygienic products, transport, health and education expenditure shares. Matabeleland South has higher transport expenditure share that accounts for 11 percent of total expenditure. On average transport expenditure share is about 7 percent, and all provinces exhibit values around the average except Matabeleland South. Other “strange” difference amongst Matabeleland South expenditure shares is the remittances out expenditure, which is 13 percent against less than 4 percent estimated for other provinces (Figure 4.15).

Figure 4.15: Household expenditure shares across provinces



Expenditure patterns among households headed by male or female, elderly or non-elderly and different marital status are relatively similar, only with minor differences. This should not be surprising given the higher proportion of poor households. Figure 4.16, illustrates the expenditure patterns by the different “special” groups.

Figure 4.16: Household expenditure shares by head of household gender, elderly and non-elderly and marital status



5. URBAN FOOD SECURITY, POVERTY VULNERABILITY AND LINKAGES

5.1. Urban institutions capacity

5.1.1. Constraints facing institutions

This chapter will discuss food security status of institutions and constraints faced by institutions in urban areas and their coping strategies. Table 5.1 shows the number and type of institutions that were interviewed during this assessment.

The sample size for centers for battered wives, pregnant girls, refuge camps, protection and street children are too small to make any meaningful conclusions (Table 5.1).

5.1.2. Institutional capacity.

At national level 98 percent of the institutions indicated that there were officially registered. Forty eight percent were government, 14 percent local authority, 11 percent church, 13 percent NGOs, 9 percent private and the remainder other institutions.

Thirty percent of the institutions were operating above their carrying capacity, 18 percent below carrying capacity and 53 percent were at their optimum level. Mainly boarding schools, hospitals and HIV and AIDS centers that were operating above their carrying capacity.

5.1.3. Requirements of Institutions

At national level 29 percent of institutions indicated that their requirements were met, for 54 percent requirements were met partially and 17 percent were not met at all. Figure 5.2 summarizes the proportion of institutions with requirements not being met at all. Institutions catering for the disabled followed by old people's homes were among the highest percentages of institutions that reported their requirements were not being met.

Table 5.1: Sample size by institution Type

Institution	Number in sample	Percent
Boarding school	71	28
Hospital	69	27
Child caring	41	16
Adult caring	11	4
Disabled caring	19	7
Old people's home	21	8
HIV and AIDS	13	5
Center for battered wives	1	0.4
Pregnant girls	1	0.4
Street children	7	3
Refugee camp	1	0.4
Protection	1	0.4
Total	256	100

Figure 5.1: Proportion of institutions by optimum status





Figure 5.2: Proportion of institutions not meeting requirements



5.1.4. Reasons for the institution not being able to provide services.

Table 5.2 show that the major reason for institutions not being able to meet their requirements were financial constraints followed by material constraints for all institutions except for hospitals. The second reason for hospitals was staff shortages.

Table 5.2: Institutional constraints

Institution	Finance Yes	Material Yes	Staff Yes
Boarding school	100%	54.8%	7.7%
Hospitals	89.6%	63.0%	69.2%
Child caring	84.4%	40.6%	10.3%
Adult caring	100%	37.5%	
Old people's home	93.8%	13.3%	2.6%
Caring for disabled	100	56.3	7.7
HIV and AIDS	80%	60.0%	2.6%
Overall	92.7%	49.4%	100%


5.1.5. Source of Funding for Institutions

Table 5.3 summarizes the source of funding for institutions. At national level, the source was mostly government followed by international donors. Churches were mostly targeting child and adult caring institutions, old people's homes and street children.

Table 5.3: Source of financial support

Institution	GVT	National donors	Local authority	Church	International Donors
Boarding school	53.5	5.6	8.6	5.6	2.9
Hospital	59.4	11.6	23.2	4.3	17.4
Child caring	56.1	56.1	14.6	51.2	53.7
Adult caring	63.6	54.5		45.5	70.0
Old people's home	31.6	52.6	5.6	57.9	33.3
Caring for disabled	76.2	47.6	19.0	28.6	57.1
HIV AND AIDS	23.1	30.8	8.3	15.4	83.3
Street children	42.9	42.9	28.6	71.4	71.4
Overall	54.7	27.2	14.4	22.8	30.6

Figure 5.3: Proportion of budget funded by institute.



5.1.6. Why are posts vacant?

The major reason why posts were vacant was financial constraints, followed by lack of expertise and staff (Table 5.4)

5.1.7. Food security in institutions

Table 5.5 below shows that the major source of food for institutions was purchases. Very few boarding schools and hospitals got food from donations and own production. The sample size for drop in centers, pregnant girls and street children was very small to make any meaningful conclusions.

Table 5.4: Reasons for posts being vacant.

Institution	Finance Yes	Material Yes	Staff Yes	Lack of expertise
Boarding school	43	5	8	22
Hospitals	39	9	41	37
Child caring	42		11	5
Adult caring	75		50	25
Old people's home	60	20	10	
Caring for disabled	53	7	7	13
HIV and AIDS	76			
Street children	67		17	22
Overall	46	7	22	22

5.1.7.1. How many meals are eaten per day?

If three meals per day is taken as the norm, then 65 percent of institutions reported that they were having three meals per day (Table 5.6). Fifteen percent of institutions were having four or more meals per day and these include all the institutions studied except institutions for street children. One percent of institutions reported that their number of meals eaten per day had increased and these were child caring and old people's homes. Thirty three percent reported that the number of meals had decreased. Sixty six percent of institutions indicated that the number of meals remained the same. Sixty four percent of institutions have their meals planned by a dietician.

Some institutions had mechanisms in place to monitor food consumption by beneficiaries at times of meals and the mechanisms include checking for absenteeism at meal times (37 percent) monitor quantities being consumed (61 percent) or checking the meal composition (24 percent). Approximately 2.5 percent of institutions had no mechanisms in place and these include boarding schools, HIV and AIDS centers and child caring and hospitals.

5.1.7.2. Constraints in procuring food

At national level approximately 80 percent of institutions faced constraints in procuring food in the past year. The major problem being that food was not available (81%), lack of funds (62 percent), no donations (13 percent) and low production (4.8 percent).

5.1.8. Factors prevailing in the surrounding community that encourage people to seek assistance/services from this institution.

Economic hardships were reported as the major factors that encourage people to seek for services at institutions (44 percent of the community reported economic hardships), followed by health bills and illness (23 percent), death in families (21 percent), drought (11 percent), school fees arrears (6 percent), spouse violence (5 percent) and political violence (3 percent).

Table 5.5: Source of institution food

Institute	N	Purchases	Own production	Donations
Boarding school	70	70.0	25.7	4.3
Hospitals	68	80.9	13.2	13.2
Child caring	41	85.4	51.2	58.5
Adult caring	11	90.9	45.5	72.7
Old people's home	19	68.4	36.8	63.2
Caring for disabled	21	76.2	66.7	66.7
HIV AND AIDS	12	46.2	8.3	61.5
Drop in center	1			
Pregnant girls	1			
Street children	7	85.7	71.4	85.7
Overall		76.2	32.3	33.9

Table 5.6: Number of meals eaten per day

Institution	one	two	Three	Four	More than four
Boarding school	3.8	7.5	60.4	17	11.3
Hospital	3.6	1.8	80.4	10.7	3.6
Child caring	10.3	7.7	61.5	7.7	12.8
Adult caring	11.1	10.0	90.0		
Old people's home	5.0	16.7	55.6	11.1	5.6
Disabled caring		15.0	45.0	5.0	30.0
HIV AND AIDS		50.0	33.3		16.7
Street children	14.3		85.7		
Overall	5.7	9.0	64.9	5.0	10.0

Table 5.7: Health facilities available for the institution

Suburb Type	Clinic	Doctor	Hospital	Faith healer
Low density	47.2	47.2	56.9	12.5
Medium density	60.9	13.0	39.1	4.3
High density	62.7	23.1	55.2	9.0
Peri urban	44.4	0	44.4	
Mine	40.0	60.0	20.0	
Overall	56.8	29.2	53.1	9.1

5.1.9. Health, Water and Sanitation for institutions.

Generally, most institutions have access to health services and very few consult faith healers. Fifty six percent of institutions had access to clinic facilities, 29 percent had access to doctors and 53 percent to hospitals (Table 5.7).

5.1.9.1. How often is refuse collected

At national level 17% of the institution indicated that their refuse was not collected at all. Fifty percent it was collected once, 25 percent twice a week, 9 percent once a month.

5.1.9.2. How reliable is the source of water?

Fifty percent of the institutions reported that water sources were very reliable, 29 percent reliable, 21 percent unreliable. Thirty five percent of hospitals and 17 percent of boarding schools had unreliable sources of water. Approximately 79 percent of the institutions have access to private tap water, 9 percent communal taps and 12 percent boreholes.

Table 5.8: Source of water for the institution.

Institution	Private taps	Communal tap	Borehole
Boarding school	68	10	22.5
Hospital	90	7	3.5
Child caring	65	12	23.1
Adult caring	100		
Old people's home	67	20	13
Disabled caring	92		8.3
HIV AND AIDS	89	11	
Street children	100		
Overall	79	9	12

5.1.9.3. Source of energy

Ninety six percent of institutions used electricity as their source of energy and 4 percent used firewood/coal. Fifty two percent of the institutions indicated that the source of energy is very reliable, thirty seven percent reliable, and 11 percent unreliable.

5.1.10. Institution perception of coping strategies?

Institutions were asked to rank their substitute of maize if its not available and from the analysis it can be deduced that rice was the first important substitute (ranked 1 by 99 percent of the institutions) followed by bread (ranked by 97 percent). Vegetables only and wild fruits were also highly ranked 96.6 percent and 98.9 percent respectively. Vegetables for institutions comprised of potatoes, salads etc whereas for the rural population was mostly leaf vegetables.

5.1.10.1. Institution Perceptions of Community Coping Mechanisms

At national level 82 percent of institutions reported that prostitution had increased in their suburbs in the last 12 months. There is little variation by suburb type or province except for peri-urban areas, which had only (50 percent) of institutions them reporting that prostitution was on the increase. Matebeleland North had the highest number of institutions that reported that prostitution was on the increase (100%) and Masvingo had the least number (60 percent). Ninety four percent of institutions reported that gold panning was on the increase. Theft was reported by 91 percent of institutions to be on the increase. Seventy two percent of institutions reported that early marriages were on the increase especially in high density, medium density

areas and mines. Eight seven percent reported that child abuse/child labour was on the increase in their suburbs. For all the activities that were looked at there were very little variations by province.

Migration was reported to be higher than normal by 44 percent of the institutions. Bulawayo and Manicaland Provinces have above 79 percent of institutions reporting that migration rates were higher than normal. It was mostly institutions in peri-urban areas that indicated that migration rates are higher than normal (62 percent) followed by mines (50 percent) and high density areas (49 percent). Its likely that people are migrating to peri-urban areas running away from high rentals, service charges, etc.

5.2. General Household Housing, Water and Sanitation conditions in urban areas by urban type, suburb and socio economic conditions.

5.2.1. Where are the worst conditions?

5.2.1.1. Accommodation

Worst living conditions were found in squatter camps where 28 percent of households lived in shacks followed by peri urban areas (8 percent lived in backyard shacks) and high density areas (4 percent). Compounds had the highest mean number of households who share a yard, with an average of 7.57 households per yard with a standard error mean of 3.02 followed by high density areas(3.28 , std error mean 0.0878).The least mean number of households sharing a yard was in the low density areas(1.98, std error mean 0.0929). The average number of rooms occupied was lowest for squatter camps, (1.79 rooms per household with a standard error mean of 0.22, followed by compounds (2.58 rooms per household with a standard error mean of 0.18) and peri urban areas (2.79 rooms per household with a standard error mean of 0.10). In low density areas the average number of rooms was 4.27 per household with a standard error mean of 0.093 and 3.01 rooms per household with a standard error mean of 0.0298 in high density areas.

5.2.1.2. Water Source

Forty six percent of people who lived in squatter camps accessed their water from unprotected wells and 15 percent from rivers and dams. In peri urban areas 4 percent accessed water from unprotected wells and in high density areas its 3 percent.

Worst conditions in terms of distance to water source were again in squatter camps where 41 percent access water from sources 500 to 1km and for 26 percent it was more than a km. In peri urban areas 8 percent accessed water from sources 500 to 1 km and 3 percent from sources more than a km. Only 13 percent of squatter camp dwellers obtained their water on premises.

5.2.1.3. Sanitation

Worst conditions in terms of toilet facilities found in squatter camps and peri urban areas. Only 9 percent of squatter camp dwellers had access to flush private toilets, 11 percent flush shared, 6 percent blair private, 3 percent pit communal, 71 percent other sources. The other sources included bucket system and bush toilets. It is mostly the poor and very poor who live in squatter camps. The study revealed that the mean number of people sharing a toilet was 18.61 with a standard error of 1.09 for the very poor, 15.68 people with a standard error mean of 1.57 for the poor, 9.36 for the middle income with a standard error mean of 0.83 and 8.38 for the better off with a standard error mean of 0.69. see appendix I.

5.3. Linkage food Security/Accommodation

Thirty eight percent of food insecure households owned houses and 33 percent were lodgers. Eight percent were tenants and thirteen percent were staying in tied/employment related houses. Of the households that were food insecure 4 percent lived in backyard shacks.

5.4. Health

5.4.1. Who are the most vulnerable to diseases and where are they staying?

There is little variation in the occurrence of malaria by suburb types. Mining areas had the highest percentages of households affected by malaria (42 percent), followed by the peri urban areas with 39 percent. Compounds came third (36 percent) and high density areas fourth (34 percent). The least percentages were found in low and medium density areas with 25 percent and 26 percent respectively.

The prevalence of diarrhea was highest in squatter camps with 40 percent of households affected. Squatter camps are expected to have high prevalence of diarrhea since people live in crowded conditions, using bucket system and bush toilets and drinking water from unprotected wells. In mines, 32 percent of households indicated that at least one member suffered from diarrhea. In high density areas 23 percent of households reported having diarrhea. In low density, medium density and peri urban areas the percentages of households affected by diarrhea were 16 percent, 18 and 19 percent respectively.


Prevalence of tuberculosis was highest in compounds with approximately (18 percent of households affected) followed by squatter camps (17 percent). Compounds and squatter camps were found to have high crowding levels with 7.57 households sharing a yard in compounds (see section 5.2.1.1). Over crowding conditions result in high prevalence of tuberculosis. Eight percent of households in high density areas were affected by tuberculosis. Only 4 percent of households in low density areas were affected by tuberculosis.

In all suburb types it is mostly the very poor and poor households that were affected by malaria, diarrhea, tuberculosis and other diseases. Squatter camps were the hardest hit.

There were more incidences of malaria (68 percent), diarrhea (68 percent), tuberculosis (70 percent), bilharzias (75 percent) and other diseases (66 percent) in the food insecure households compared to food secure households.(Appendix I). Seventy eight percent of reported cases of malaria, 77 percent cases of diarrhea, 81 percent cases of tuberculosis, 80 percent case bilharzias and 72 percent cases of other diseases came from the very poor and poor income groups combined.

5.4.2. Linkage Food security and Health

At national level, 50 percent of the households reported one member falling sick over the previous month (August 2003). The fact that almost 50 percent of studied household had at least one sick member in the last month is quite disturbing. Approximately 2 percent of the households lost



their head through death. Figure 5.4 indicated that percent food insecure is higher for households with at least one member sick compared to those without. Morbidity impacts negatively on the food status of a household. Whether its an under five, 5-14 or 15-60 year member who is ill makes no difference.

Figure 5.5 indicates that losing an adult (15-60 years) impacts negatively on the food status of the household. Generally at national level households that reported sicknesses were greater than those that reported deaths. This may show the greater access to health facilities in the urban population.

Households that indicated that the head was among the people who died had a higher proportion of food insecure households (69 percent) compared to those that did not lose the head of household (64 percent). Of the studied households, 2 percent lost the head of household through deaths.

5.5. Linkage Food security/orphans

5.5.1. Orphans Status in Households

Twenty nine percent of sampled households had orphans under 15 years of age. Twenty three percent had orphans under 15 years who came from other households. The mean number of orphans was highest among the very poor (Figure 5.6). Approximately 36 percent of the very poor households live with orphans compared to 25 percent for the poor, 20 percent for the middle and 15 percent for the better off.

Forty percent of female headed households had orphans compared to 21 percent of male headed households. Elderly headed households had the highest percentage of households living with orphans(50 percent) compared to other groups (less than 30 percent). Approximately 66 percent of the widowed households live with orphans compared to 32 percent for the divorced/separated, 20.7 percent for the married , 29 percent for the single and 26 percent for other. The percentage of households with orphans was seen to increase with household size. Households with 1-2 members had the least percentage of 5 followed by 3-6 members with a percentage of 24 and lastly the 7 or more group with 47 percent. It can be concluded that households headed by the elderly women are most likely to take in orphans.


5.5.2. Food Security Status of Orphans

Of the households with no orphans 64 percent of the households were food insecure and of those with orphans 77 percent were food insecure (Table 5.9).

Fig 5.5: Food security and mortality



Figure 5.6: Mean Number of orphans per Socio economic Group



5.5.3. Early marriages and orphans

Approximately 1.4 percent of households had children under 15 years getting married. Two percent of the very poor households had early marriages, 0.4 percent for the poor, 1.5 percent for the middle and 1.5 percent for the better off. Approximately 17 percent of child headed households had early marriages compared to 1.6 percent for the elderly headed households. Approximately 3.2 percent of households headed by the widowed had early marriages. Sixty eight percent of households with early marriages were food insecure.

Of the HH with early marriages approximately 68 percent had orphans. Table 5.10 below shows that households with orphans had a higher percentage of early marriages compared to those without. These results show that early marriages are among child and widowed headed households, households with orphans and most of these households maybe food insecure.

Table 5.9 Food security and presence of orphans			Table 5.10: Early marriages and presence of orphans		
	Food Status Composition		HH with early girl child married		
	Food Insecure % within DO YOU HAVE ORPHANS	Food Secure % within DO YOU HAVE ORPHANS	No early Marriage % within HH with orphans	Early Marriage %within HH with orphans	
No orphans	63.7	36.3	99.4	0.6	
orphans present	76.9	23.1	96.2	3.8	


5.6. Educational Issues.

5.6.1. Education general

The assessment identified paying of school fees as the second major shock among the very poor and poor households. Increases in costs of education compromise household food security .

The percentage of households with children in primary school was 72 percent for the very poor, 62 percent for the poor, 60 percent for the middle and 56 percent for the better off.

The mean number of primary school children is highest among the very poor (1.49 children with a standard error of 0.038), followed by the poor (1.06 with a standard error of 0.058), middle (1.03 with a standard error of 0.057), better off (0.91 with a standard error of 0.054). Figure 5.7 shows the percentage of households with at least one school going age child who is not in school.



5.6.2. Who is dropping out?

Approximately 8 percent of households indicated that a child dropped out of school. The mean number of school drop outs is highest within the very poor group (fig 5.8). Among the very poor and poor, 12 percent and 4 percent of households had school drop outs respectively.

Eleven percent of female headed households indicated that they had drop outs compared to 6 percent for the female headed households. The percentage of households with drop outs was highest among the elderly headed households (12.5 percent) and least among households with heads aged 20-29 years (6 percent).

The widowed and divorced had the highest percentage of households with drop outs compared to the other marital status groups.

As the household size increases so does the proportion of households with school drop outs. Household size of 1-2 members had a 0.7 percent drop outs, whilst a household size of 3-6 members had a 6.6 percent drop outs and a household with 7 or more members had a 11.2 percent drop outs.

Households without surviving head of house (26 percent) had school drop outs compared to 7 percent for those with surviving household head.

The mean number of boys and girls dropping out were 1.28 with standard error mean of 0.0492 and 1.26 with standard error mean of 0.0478 respectively. Figure 5.8 does not show the mean number of drop outs for the better off even though they indicated that they had children dropping out. This could be due to the fact that the actual numbers of boys or girls dropping out were not specified.

5.6.2.1. Reasons for dropping out

The major reason for dropping out of school for both girls and boys was that the household could not afford costs. Eight percent of the boys dropped out to give care to the sick. Approximately 6 percent of the girls dropped out for illness reasons. What is not clear is whether it is the girl child who was sick or a relative was sick and the girl dropped out to give care to the sick (Figure 5.9 (a) and (b))

Thirty percent of the educational institutions interviewed, reported that there were school drop outs from their schools. The highest percentage came from Matebeleland South Province (75 percent), followed by Mashonaland Central Province (50 percent). The least percentage came from Harare Province (25 percent), followed by the other provinces with (40 percent). Thirty percent of educational institutions indicated that they had capacity to enroll children in the suburb.




Figure 5.9a: Reasons for boys dropping out of school






Figure 5.9b: Reasons for girls dropping out of school



5.6.2.3. Households in school arrears

At national level 32 percent of households were in school arrears. Seventy five percent of the households that are food insecure are in school fees arrears compared to 65 percent of those not in arrears. For the households with at least one member sick, 34 percent were in school arrears compared to 28 percent for those with none. Households without surviving head of house (42 percent) were in school arrears compared to 32 percent for those with surviving household head. The percentages of households in school arrears were 40 percent for the very poor, 29 percent for the poor, 19 percent for the middle and 15 percent for the better off. Fig 5.10 is showing the percentages from different income groups for the households that are in school arrears. Seventy five percent of households in school arrears were food insecure. Thirty eight percent of female headed households were in school arrears compared to 29 percent for male headed households. Approximately forty two percent and 41 percent of widowed and divorced/separated households respectively were in school arrears compared to 29 per for married heads .


Figure 5.10: Households in school arrears by income group



5.6.3. Households that received educational assistance

At national level, 16 percent of households received educational assistance. The percentages of households that received educational assistance were 22 percent for the very poor, 12 percent for the poor, 8 percent for the middle and 6 percent for the better off. This is a cause for concern since we did not expect the better off to receive assistance. Fig 5.11 shows the percentages from different income groups for the households that received educational assistance.

Figure 5.11: Households that received educational assistance by income group.



5.6.3.1. Who is giving assistance

BEAM was found to be the major source of educational assistance and its mostly targeting the very poor and poor households (Table 5.11). As seen in the above table Beam and Non Governmental Organizations do not target the better of but the non rich. AIDS Action only target the very poor and poor. The better off are assisted by church, relatives and guardian funds.

Additional assistance is being given to school children in some suburbs as supplementary food mostly by NGOs and churches.

5.6.3.2. Awareness of BEAM and AIDS Action Committee Program

Overall about 74 percent of households were aware of beam. The percentages aware of beam were 69 percent for the very poor, 67 percent for the poor, 67 percent for the middle and 60 percent for the better off.

Beam is mostly targeting the very poor and poor (Figure 5.11).

Seventy three percent of households with orphans were aware of BEAM compared to 64.2 percent for households with no orphans. Approximately 48 percent of households with orphans were aware of AIDS Action Committee compared to 46 percent for households with no orphans.

Table 5.11: Targeting for the very poor and poor.

Organization	Very Poor	Poor	Middle	Better	Overall
Beam	60.6	40.0	25.0	0	53.2
NGO	14.2	12.7	12.5	0	13.4
Church	6.4	3.6	4.2	7.7	5.9
Friends/relatives	8.5	32.7	20.8	38.5	13.9
Aids Action	2.5	3.6	0	0	2.4
Guardian Funds	1.8	1.8	0	15.4	2.1
Other	6.0	5.5	37.5	38.5	9.1

Figure 5.12: Households BEAM awareness by income group.





Figure 5.13: Percent of Households aware of Aids action committee by income.



Forty seven percent of Households were aware of Aids action committee. The percentages of households aware of the Aids action committee were 44 percent for the very poor, 50 percent for the poor, 49 percent for the middle and 51 percent for the better off. Fig 5.13 shows the percentages from different income groups for the households that were aware of the AIDS action committee.

5.6.4. Linkages of food security and education
The percentage of households with school drop outs was higher among the food insecure households (84 percent) compared to the food secure (16 percent). The percentage of households that received educational

assistance was higher among the food insecure households (78 percent) compared to the food secure households(22 percent). The percentage of households in school arrears was higher among the food insecure households(75 percent) compared to the food secure households.

5.6.5. Other Linkages to Education

5.6.5.1. School drop outs and selling assets.

Approximately 13 percent of households that sold assets had school drop outs compared to 7 percent for households that did not sell assets.

5.6.5.2 Health and school drop outs

The proportion of primary school drop outs was high for households with at least one member sick (9 percent) compared to those without (7 percent).

The proportion of primary school drop outs for those households whose head had passed away was 26 percent, much higher than that for households which still had their household head (7 percent).

5.6.5.3. Health and school arrears

Of the households in arrears, 35 percent had at least one member sick compared to 28 percent for those with no sick members. 42 percent of households who were in arrears indicated that the head of household had passed away compared to 32 percent for those who did not lose the household head. In general households who had deaths in families 39 percent of them were in school arrears compared to those without (31 percent). Deaths and morbidities drain heavily on household resources, money is needed for funeral expenses and medical bills.

Majority of households in school arrears, households with school drop outs, and receiving educational assistance are food insecure and these are mostly from the very poor and poor groups.


5.7. Other Linkages

5.7.1. Asset ownership and food security.

Possession of assets especially liquid assets is positively correlated with food security. If a household has more diversified assets it means it can dispose some of the assets to buy food therefore lessening its vulnerability to food insecurity.

Of the households that were food insecure 61 percent do not own real estate (land and house).

Of the households that were food insecure, about 63 percent of them own durables. And 91 percent own basic assets. At national level approximately 10 percent of households were selling assets and these households that



sold assets were also found to be food insecure. Almost 90 percent of food insecure households were not selling assets even though most of them own basic assets. This result shows that selling of assets is not yet an important coping strategy. For households that sold assets, the main reason (42 percent) for selling was to buy food (Figure 5.14).

5.7.2. Unemployment and food security

When food security was related to employment status of household members whether formal or informal, 65 percent of households in some form of employment were food insecure compared to 66 percent for those not in either formal or informal. Employment status seem not to determine food security status as the difference is no statistically significant.

Sixty two percent of the poor households with no member either in formal or formal employment are food insecure. For the very poor the percentages of food insecurity for the employed and non employed are approximately (83 percent). There is no difference maybe due to the fact that whatever there were doing was not giving sufficient income to boost the food security status of the household.

5.7.3. Urban agriculture and food security

Table 5.12 shows that the incidence of food insecurity is highest in the very poor group, followed by the poor. Within the very poor and poor group, households with no access to land for cultivation had a slightly higher percentage of food insecure household compared to those who had access to land. Its likely that some of these non rich households even if they had inadequate inputs, production may not be high and again it depends on the size of the piece of land.

Food insecurity was found to be high in households that planted more than an acre compared to those that planted less than an acre except for the better off. What this implies is even if the land size is increased it does not necessarily mean that food security status will be boosted. Production depends on a lot of factors which maybe lacking in the other groups except the better off. Land with inadequate inputs may not solve the problem. The other factor is that in urban area agricultural produce maybe stolen whilst still in the fields or destroyed by municipality if the land is not legally allocated.

Table 5.12: Access to urban land and food status.

EXPENDITURE GROUP		COMPOSITION FOOD STATUS		Total Count
		food insecure	food secure	
		% within DID YOU HAVE ACCESS TO URBAN LAND FOR CULTIVATION IN 2002/3?	% within DID YOU HAVE ACCESS TO URBAN LAND FOR CULTIVATION IN 2002/3?	
VERY POOR	No	82.6%	17.4%	973
	Yes	82.2%	17.8%	741
	Total	82.4%	17.6%	1714
POOR	No	56.5%	43.5%	418
	Yes	57.2%	42.8%	236
	Total	56.7%	43.3%	654
MIDDLE	No	48.1%	51.9%	295
	Yes	42.6%	57.4%	148
	Total	46.3%	53.7%	443
BETTER	No	30.7%	69.3%	290
	Yes	31.3%	68.7%	134
	Total	30.9%	69.1%	424

Table 5.13: Remittances in and food status

EXPENDITURE GROUP		COMPOSITION FOOD STATUS		Total Count
		food insecure	food secure	
		% within DID THE HH RECEIVE OR EARN OTHER CEREALS RECEIVED FROM OTHER SOURCES?	% within DID THE HH RECEIVE OR EARN OTHER CEREALS RECEIVED FROM OTHER SOURCES?	
VERY POOR	No	83.0%	17.0%	1958
	Yes	83.2%	16.8%	125
	Total	83.0%	17.0%	2083
POOR	No	59.1%	40.9%	783
	Yes	46.7%	53.3%	46
	Total	58.5%	41.5%	828
MIDDLE	No	44.0%	56.0%	561
	Yes	42.9%	57.1%	35
	Total	44.0%	56.0%	596
BETTER	No	28.0%	72.0%	565
	Yes	11.1%	88.9%	18
	Total	27.4%	72.6%	583

5.7.4. Food security and social assistance or direct transfers.

The analysis looked at cereals from other sources and across all socio-economic groups, households obtained cereals from elsewhere. For the very poor and poor households who are food insecure majority received cereals from other sources compared to the middle and better off households. Unfortunately the survey instrument was not explicit about the names of the other sources, hence further analysis could not be done (Table 5.13).

5.7.5. Food security and rural cultivation

The analysis seem to indicate that rural cultivation had no bearing to food security as for the very poor and poor households, cultivating in rural areas did not enhance food security as both households that cultivated and did not were equally food insecure (Table 5.14). The results are not as expected and this could be explained by the fact that generally there was crop failure in 2003 in most rural areas.

Table 5.14: Rural cultivation and food security.

EXPENDITURE GROUP		COMPOSITION FOOD STATUS		Total
		food insecure	food secure	
		% within DID YOUR HH CULTIVATE CEREALS IN THE RURAL/RESETTLEMENT AREAS IN 2002/3?	% within DID YOUR HH CULTIVATE CEREALS IN THE RURAL/RESETTLEMENT AREAS IN 2002/3?	Count
VERY POOR	No	83.3%	16.7%	1053
	Yes	80.0%	20.0%	619
	Total	82.1%	17.9%	1672
POOR	No	57.1%	42.9%	427
	Yes	62.3%	37.7%	276
	Total	59.2%	40.8%	703
MIDDLE	No	49.0%	51.0%	298
	Yes	39.5%	60.5%	215
	Total	46.0%	55.0%	513
BETTER	No	34.6%	65.4%	280
	Yes	26.0%	74.0%	200
	Total	31.0%	69.0%	480

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Several recommendations arise from this analysis.

6.1. General Recommendations

The widespread poverty observed, requires a holistic approach to tackle it. This involves dealing with the fundamental macro-economic factors in the country so that the high shocks associated with inflation, cost of education and services could be reduced once there is stability in the economy and a positive economic growth and employment creation with all sectors growing.

6.2. Food Security

Most consumers obtained their cereals including maize from the parallel markets (both in urban and rural areas (in rural as revealed by the ZIM VAC April 2003 assessment)) despite the Government controls on the staple maize and wheat markets. This has not benefited the poor and very poor households. In face of this, there is need for;

- (i) Liberalizing the cereal marketing system so that high prices in the black parallel markets would eventually go as the market determines a competitive price which could boost cereal production;
- (ii) The Government through its Strategic Grain Reserve (SGR) should use the facility to stabilize prices in the market by releasing the grain in areas where prices have increased above the rest of the country;
- (iii) The poor and very poor households should be targeted for food aid programs, which could be as free food or through market targeted interventions specifically meant for the poor and where they live;
- (iv) NGOs and the Government should make a concerted effort to provide and encourage the production of pulses such as cowpeas, bambara nuts in the urban open spaces and in the rural areas to increase the protein content of the poor households' diet;
- (v) Increase the supply of cereals into the market by Government and NGOs.
- (vi) A way to formalize agricultural production in urban areas need to be pursued by Government and local authorities.

6.3. Social safety nets

Widespread subsidies on commodities and services could be expensive on the Government fiscus, hence the need to;

- (i) Develop a variety of safety nets aimed at the poor, the elderly, the female headed households, which have been found to be among the most vulnerable.
- (ii) The Government and NGOs to expand their programs beyond the programs such as BEAM and AIDS Action Committee, to include programs targeted to specific groups such as (a) through the Social fund, support of families who care for orphans through provision of allowances or food or paying their water/electricity or medical bills or giving tax concessions to those households with the special groups such as orphans. This move could enhance the extended family network, reducing the need for homes and institutions for the vulnerable with an option of home based care; (b) Support of households health requirements should be extended beyond just the HIV and

AIDS levy as food security has been seen to affect those with members who have been ill during the last three months.

- (iii) Improve the targeting for education assistance, as poor households have withdrawn children from school so as to buy food.
- (iv) Expansion of public works programs in urban areas

6.4. Health and HIV and AIDS

Whilst the NGOs and Government have made inroads in the area of HIV and AIDS reducing the infection rate from 34 percent to 25 percent, continued effort is required to provide HIV and AIDS services in suburbs where coverage is still low especially the high density, peri-urban and squatter camps areas.

6.5. Water and Sanitation

Accommodation, removal of refuse and provision of safe drinking water remains a challenge for local authorities and Government, given the increase in diseases such as diarrhea with the suburb type. There is need therefore to;

- (i) Improve the accommodation status for the poor to avoid overcrowding;
- (ii) Improve refuse collection in the high density and peri-urban areas;
- (iii) Improve the provision of clean and safe water for drinking for the poor;
- (iv) Improve drainage and toilet facilities for the poor so as to reduce the number of people sharing a toilet.