

Meeting Minutes

Date: 2nd July 2021

Location: Microsoft Teams at 11:00-13:00

Meeting Recording: [link](#)

Agenda

1. Notes and comments on previous MoM
2. FSLC Partners achievements for May 2021
3. World Bank Zimbabwe Economic Update Report presentation with focus on poverty/food security (World Bank)
4. Updates from Partners
5. AoB

Participants (68 attendees)

ACF, Assemblies of God Projects, CAFOD, Caritas Masvingo, Caritas Zimbabwe, Christian Blind Mission, CIMMYT, DCA, EU, FACT Zimbabwe, FAO, GOAL, ICRISAT, IRC, Mercy Corps, Oxfam, Practical Action, Trocaire, UN OCHA, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, WHH, WHO, World Bank, World Vision, ZCC, Zimbabwe Council of Churches (ZCC), Zimbabwe Red Cross Society

Discussion

1. Notes and comments on the previous Minutes of Meeting

No feedback on the previous minutes of the meeting held on 18th June 2021. Minutes approved without any further changes.

2. FSLC Partners achievements for May 2021

During the month of May 2021, FSL Cluster partners reported to have reached 305,125 people with either in-kind food distribution, cash or vouchers modality in both rural and urban areas. Among them, 279,756 received cash-based support in both rural and urban areas while the remaining 25,369 beneficiaries received in-kind food assistance.

Concurrently, a total of 47,000 beneficiaries were supported with agriculture and livelihood assistance. This includes 28,000 receiving horticulture seeds and other inputs / materials for household kitchen gardens (and related trainings, cooking demonstrations, etc.) 12,700 beneficiaries received training on and inputs for agro-ecology interventions such as soil

conservation practices, soil reclamation techniques and restoration of degraded landscapes. 2, 500 beneficiaries benefited from training, extension and advisory services to extension officers and farmers focusing on good agriculture practices with emphasis on climate-smart agriculture. May (static) dashboard is available at the [link](#)

Additionally, the cluster has published a dynamic map for partner presence with all the datasets from January to May 2021. Contributors of the data also include government Social Welfare assistance.

Dynamic dashboard is available at the [link](#)

3. World Bank Zimbabwe Economic Update Report presentation with focus on poverty/food security (World Bank)

Key findings summary:

- The pandemic worsened economic challenges necessitating implementation of critical reforms
- The economy is expected to rebound in 2021 but poverty levels will remain elevated
- Coverage of social assistance programs remains limited

Q: Why did the urban population lose / get impacted more?

A: This is due to a number of factors, if you look at the post covid-situation, the nature of the pandemic resulted in shutting down most business; mostly affected are informal workers in urban areas, and less in the rural areas. Before the pandemic there was a rapid inflation of between 17% and 19% that affected food prices mostly in urban households than the rural.

Q: Where can one access the updated poverty reports/PICES reports?

A: The briefs from the first two rounds of Rapid-PICES can be accessed through the ZimSTAT website here: <https://www.zimstat.co.zw/covid-19/>

Q: When you define food security in terms of moderately, or severely food insecure, what criteria or approach do you use in this survey?

A: We look at each household using a probability scale and say this household has a high chance of being food insecure. Any household above that threshold would be food insecure.

Q: In your last slide, the statement says that around 20% of rural population received food assistance in March. One of the jobs/roles of food security cluster is to collect on a monthly basis data about food assistance but from food aid deliverers. According to our records, in the month of March we have around 836,000 HH which translate to more than 20% of rural HHs receiving food assistance. So clearly, these are two different approaches, the cluster asks the aid deliverers, and your methodology asks beneficiaries. There might be a little discrepancy with this, and what would be your comment?

Food Security Cluster Zimbabwe

WFP/FAO Harare

<https://fscluster.org/zimbabwe> | info.zimbabwe@FSCluster.org

A: The rapid PICES has 9 rounds and within those rounds, we have a sample of 1,800 HHs derived from mini PICES carried out between April and May 2019. This sample has some people who are receiving aid. The sample may have not captured a lot of people who are receiving food aid, but this also gives us a picture of what is happening to those receiving aid. There would be some sampling errors around that may explain this variation. The dip in round two survey could be due to the timing of the survey as food aid was received outside that window. The role rapid PICES is to conduct these periodic surveys so that we can infer what the food needs are as well as the support required/flowing.

Q: Are these PICES datasets panels in the sense that you go and interview the same HHs at every round you do the survey?

A: Follow the same households (1,800 HHs) taken from the mini PICES 2019 and follow and interview repeatedly in all the 9 rounds.

- 1) What are the sample sizes per round? We carry interviews via telephone and response does differ. On average we were getting 1,400 to 1,700 over a period. We try to maintain the sample sizes so that we do not have much attrition during the 9 rounds. In order to avoid much attrition, we provide the HHs with airtimes to be able to call back in case the call drops and as an incentive to keep the number.
- 2) Are the surveys statistically representative at the district level?
Not representative at the district level. What is representative is the PICES which has 32,000, HHs. The rapid which is a subset of mini PICES is representative nationally for rural and urban areas. It is representative for national and province but not at the district level.
- 3) How can we get the data? When the data is anonymised, you can get the data from ZimSTAT (now allowed to provide anonymised data)
- 4) How can one access the survey instruments? For example, I am interested to see to what extent these surveys have a full agricultural module? (No response recorded)

Comments: What we see from government spending confirms the PICES results. Key social assistance in 2020 were not fully implemented.

Q: What was considered for the minimum basket and how does that compare to the ZimVAC definition of a minimum basket? What would be interesting is to see to what extent we can compare the findings of ZimVAC study and PICES (considering that some of the indicators might not be the same etc). How does that compare or is this related to food basket in any way?

A: The way food/poverty is calculated in PICES is based empirically on people's own consumption diet with stipulation of minimum calorie (around 2,200 kilo calorie). You look at people's food consumption or food expenditure and convert to kilo calories and see if the expenditure is meeting the minimum total expenditure needed to obtain that much calories. Implicitly in this presentation there are already two different methods to assess food poverty line. One is to assess food poverty rate and the other one is food security based on 8-point phase question scale that uses FAO methodology and then there is the ZimVAC methodology that is widely used. It is important to understand how these different methods capture different

phenomenon of food security and have an understanding whether they talk to each other and how. For this to happen, access to micro-data is very important – this has been raised in another forum. All data needs to be looked at in unison to understand how these different methods work.

Q: Would be good if the different stakeholders would work together and put a comparative table explaining meaning of different projections. For instance, the latest ZimVAC indicates a food poverty line of 73% and if you try to compare that with the PICES analysis which projects 45% equivalent to 7.5 million, it does not really coincide and does not seem harmonised.

A: All in agreement the food security using the FAO methodology is also showing high severity, moderate to high vulnerability.

Q: Regarding what is being presented as a bumper harvest is only causing a slight improvement of food security and does not seem to be presented well in PICES.

A: The third round of rapid PICES was done between December 2020 and March 2021. This round overlaps quite a bit with the lean season and that is why the drop of food insecurity is not as high as would be expected given the bumper harvest.

Presentation available at the [link](#)

4. Updates from Partners

CBM: launched a new project on Thursday 1st July 2021 which puts persons with disability at the centre of humanitarian disaster preparedness and humanitarian action. During the project, CBM will be running trainings on inclusion of persons with disability in humanitarian activities. All humanitarian actors both government and non-government are invited for the trainings. All those interested in participating in the training as invited to send an expression of interest via email to Mr Gondai Dekeza at gondai.dekeza@cbm.org

5. AOB

Nothing reported

END