

# Meeting Minutes

**Date:** 19<sup>th</sup> November 2021

**Location:** Online via Microsoft Teams at 11:00–13:00

**Meeting Presentation:** [link](#)

## Agenda

1. Notes and comments on previous MoM
2. FSLC Partners achievements in October 2021
3. Focus Theme: Gender in food security programming - introduction
4. Food Insecurity outlook until May 2022 (FEWSNET)
5. Urban Vulnerability: WFP observations
6. Partners' Corner
7. AoB

**Participants** 56 registered, 58 attendees, 33 organisations represented

## List of organisations:

ACF, Africa AHEAD, Amalima Loko, CAFOD, CARE International, Cesvi, Christian Aid, COSV, CRS, DanChurchAid, Evangelical Fellowship of Zimbabwe (EFZ), FAO, FEWS NET, FNC, FSLC, HarvestPlus, help from Germany, ICRISAT, Kickstart International, LEAD, LGDA, MeDRA NAZ Oxfam, Plan International, Red Cross, Save the Children, Tearfund, USAID, WFP, World Vision, Zimbabwe Council of Churches, Zimbabwe Red Cross, ZRBF/UNDP.

## Discussion

### **1. Notes and comments on the previous Minutes of Meeting**

No feedback on the previous minutes of the meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2021. Minutes approved without any further changes.

### **2. FSLC Partners achievements in September 2021**

During the month of October 2021, FSL Cluster partners reported having reached 344,848 people with either in-kind food distribution, cash, or vouchers modality in both rural and urban areas.

Among them, 314,034 received cash-based support in urban areas, 30,726 in rural areas while the remaining 86 beneficiaries received in-kind food assistance in the camps.

October continues to confirm the status of the assistance reported in the last two months, with cash assistance taking over 95% of the share of food assistance, and a reducing in-kind assistance. Food in-kind also shows a growing trend within its low absolute figures, whereas with the least reported in October. Under the current circumstances, only 5 agencies have reported being active in food assistance (only 1 national NGO) in the month of October, while the contribution to the HRP remains low. Only 23 districts have been reached.

Agriculture and livelihood assistance reported a total of 169,000 beneficiaries in October. This includes 7,690 people benefiting from the provision of crop and small livestock inputs, 59,265 extension officers and farmers received training, extension, and advisory services focusing on good agriculture practices with an emphasis on climate-smart agriculture, on and inputs for agro-ecology interventions such as soil conservation practices, soil reclamation techniques, and restoration of degraded landscapes.

Lastly 102,930, beneficiaries received assistance in the rehabilitation of critical assets for animal survival and agriculture (dip tanks and animal drinking troughs) through other modalities (e.g., contracting a company). Overall support to small holder farmers continues to increase in October, confirming the trend initiated in July.

[October dashboard](#)

[Partner presence dynamic map](#)

Question:

CESVI: Can you clarify which kind of activities we are supposed to report, or are we going to tell other people to report? May have missed this part, but not entirely clear on which kind of activities are going in the dashboard.

Response: The current reporting tool, the 5W matrix template for 2021 is inspired by the current humanitarian response plan set of activities. In the reporting, partners not only report about HRP, but we do embrace a wider range of reporting, including 100% of the humanitarian food security related. We do focus on the food assistance, food and cash assistance and the agriculture and labour support.

LSA Planning: Partners reminded to update the LSA projects matrix and share with the cluster

### 3. Focus Theme: Gender in food security programming - introduction

Introductions and initial ideas on gender within the food security sector and creation of a platform to come together and share experience of the different approaches, methodologies that we are actually using, and the lessons we are getting.

Key question is whether it is possible to build resilience either at the household level or community level without also addressing systemically the issues of gender inequality. and to which the answer is definitely a big no. What we have seen is that in terms of program design, gender sometimes comes as an afterthought.

This initiative is aimed at coming up with a series of sessions towards the building of what we can call gender theory of change in resilience. If it is programming for resilience, what are the gender issues to consider? How do we program to build resilience within a program and address the gender issues so that we build both adaptive capacity within this community?

First step is to set up a small committee that will steer the work and direct the trajectories of this work, in addition to Makanza, Maggie (FAOSFS) [Maggie.Makanza@fao.org](mailto:Maggie.Makanza@fao.org) who has been already involved, the following names were put forward at the meeting:

Siphiwe	Mpofu	Africa AHEAD	Gender Focal Person	<a href="mailto:spiwe@africaahead.com">spiwe@africaahead.com</a>
Charity	Hawadi	Care International	M and E Assistant	<a href="mailto:charity.hawadi@care.org">charity.hawadi@care.org</a>
Marika	GUDERIAN	WFP	Gender focal point	<a href="mailto:marika.guderian@wfp.org">marika.guderian@wfp.org</a>

#### Questions/Responses/Comments

The challenge to the gender specialists, is that when the group is being designed, they need to make sure that they stay awake. They keep their eyes open because gender is a condensed space because there are so many groups that are vulnerable. You will find that the youth will say there's no theoretical change for the youth and the disabled will also say the same. So, I think what we need is our gender focuses on the various organizations to be quite proactive and raise those issues at the design stage.

#### 4. Food Insecurity outlook until May 2022 (FEWSNET)

[FEWSNET presentation link:](#)

##### FEWS NET Zimbabwe Food Security Outlook Oct 2021 to May 2022

Regarding the IPC categories that are presented, it is important to clarify the fact that in Zimbabwe we did not have an IPC in 2021 which would be inclusive of stakeholder consultation. What has been shown here is the food insecurity outlook based on FEWSNET and associated partners.

##### Questions/Response/Comments

CESVI: Just wondering, the presentation was focusing on maize and despite that, we now have this forecast saying that we're going to have normal to above normal rainfall so far, we have not really seen this above normal rain. As much as we are hoping for a good rainy season, we are also aware that maize isn't doing well. It would be interesting to know if we have a consolidated data on cereals because this could also affect the assessment of food security and food insecurity and the needs of food distribution in some areas because some farmers are actually doing small grains and able to at least have domestic needs covered.

Response: Unfortunately, I continuously referred to maize as the only important crop, but we also take into consideration the importance of all the other food crops, including the small grains. We also have data that we use in terms of analysis that brings together all the grains, the staple that is maize, the small grains. That data we get from the Ministry of Agriculture after the second-round crop and livestock assessment, which is one of our data sources for analysis.

FNC: Concern is your current assessment and projection to May 2022, which is showing mostly areas for stress and crisis, that more than 20% and above of the population in those areas is either in stress or in crisis. You indicated that you used crop and livestock assessment as one of your source documents and most of the districts that you put in stress or crisis, they've actually got surplus cereal production, more than 12 months' supply of grain according to the crop and livestock assessment. Therefore, was really wondering what really drove those areas and also just checking in terms of the food security status of the whole country, where we have less than 30% of the whole country not being able to meet their food requirements.

FEWSNET: Crop and livestock assessment results is one of the sources we use for our analysis. But we also have data sources from our own internal assessments and the assumptions that we also use for our analysis. It is factual, but it also tends to generalize information for the whole district. Our analysis was more done through the livelihood zone level, where we would specifically look at a livelihood zone and employ a number of assumptions already mentioned. We also gather information from enumerators we have in various districts. Then we combine all that to make an informed analysis. So, it is a fact that these districts would have overall a cereal supply that would

even last even for twelve months, but within the same district, there are livelihood zones, or areas that will be facing some huge gaps, considering that the bulk of this maze, especially in some of the districts that have commercial farms, would be destined for the Grain Marketing Board and so forth. Therefore, the group of interests that we analyse, the poor and the very poor, would actually be constrained in their specific livelihood zones.

In some way, there is no one to one relationship between food security status of people living in an area and level of production in an area. What informs our analysis is the production which when analysed at livelihood level, does not show any correlation, so it is an interaction of more than one factor.

FNC: Not disputing anything but what is actually saying is not translating into the analysis that was just presented. Even if we have the commercial areas which are mostly in agro-ecological regions 2 and 3 and where we have bulk of those A1 farmers that are contributing to the higher maize production, that is still not translating on the map whichever way we present it, be it livelihood. There are areas categorised as A1 prime that produce the bulk of the grain of the country, those areas according to the map presented are actually presented as in crisis. It then defeats actually what you have categorized and presented because like in A1 prime and other livelihood zones where we have commercial farmers. We actually have those people producing for the country, and its actually farmers that have been allocated A1 holding and there is no area that's showing minimum. The concern is therefore the uniform colour whereas we know some areas have a surplus even if we are using the livelihood zones approach.

FEWSNET: Like mentioned, comparing the maps in the presentation we also have some minimal that is, in the maize plus producing areas, which are prime production areas that we are mentioning. In February-May, we also have some minimal phase one classifications in the same areas as in October-January, but some maybe a transition to phase two. So, in all these areas, phase one classification is actually present. But considering the analysis, we also see there's a number of phase two and phase three classifications that have come in the Southern part, the Midlands parts, the classification is clearer when you refer to the maps in the presentation (see FEWSNET presentation for the map comparison).

## **5. Urban Vulnerability: WFP observations**

The purpose today is to give an overview of ways that WFP is trying to observe the urban situation in specific domains.

- As you all may be aware the ZIMVAC is planning to hold another urban assessment in December. The last one was held in December of 2020 and showed a deterioration in the food security situation across urban districts from 2019, and a lot of that had to do also

with the impacts of Covid-19 measures, particularly on informal employment opportunities in urban areas which are really critical for the livelihood. WFP is also implementing two types of urban programs; one is a cash assistance program and the other one is an urban resilience program which we have just piloted and are now going to expand across all 23 districts where we currently have the cash program in place.

- Linked to this, is the WFP remote monitoring platform, the Hunger Map Live (<https://hungermap.wfp.org/>). The platform aims to collect information through mobile surveys. Originally, the survey was to just track food security and other kind of trends, also to do with market access and effects of Covid-19 on access to health facilities, et cetera for the country. For that survey, the data is being collected continuously and aim to collect 150 responses per province. So not very thorough but gives us just an indication on trends, et cetera.
- The data is collected through a third-party service provider, GeoPoll, who has worked on a variety of monetary surveys across the world. WFP decided to try out the same platform to do monitoring in a handful of domains where WFP with its partners, has an active urban program. So, for now we've just piloted to nine domains, and this includes Epworth and Goromonzi, so I will go ahead and just show what that looks like.
- We are also trying to make all these information public, accessible through the hunger Map Live website. There is a weekly automatically generated reports, which are shared with the Food Security Cluster for further dissemination to the partners. And this includes kind of a countrywide snapshot, but as well as a snapshot for each of these urban domains.
- The survey doesn't cover all urban domains in the country but is trying to fill a gap in information that we can have in between these annual large scale ZimVAC assessments, because again, something that I think we have certainly faced at WFP, but also other organizations, is the question that there was a deterioration in a situation across urban domains in the country.
- Now, a year later with continued Covid-19 lockdowns, continuing macroeconomic challenges, most of which were covered by FEWSNET in their presentation. There is an assumption that the situation in urban areas may have even further deteriorated, and that's something that will certainly be informed by the National ZimVAC assessments. In-between these assessments, the idea is that we would like to be able to somehow monitor the situation, and it could be through this platform. It could be through a variety of other ways. This is something that we just wanted to explore: the quality of data that we could

also get through our remote monitoring surveys that we also then can hopefully be compared with data collected face to face through the ZimVAC.

## **6. Updates from Partners**

FAO on locust issue: FAO through a regional program is monitoring the local situation with the support of the government. FAO is hoping to give a short presentation and an update at the next cluster meeting and should be able to provide some insight both into how the system works and also if there are any outbreaks. But currently there's nothing major to report, both in Zimbabwe and also in the region.

Red Cross: Recently got refunding for food security wash in Chiredzi 3 wards targeting 600 HHs or 3000 people. The modality that we'll be using is vouchers, and the project will start first distribution in December and the program is for three months.

## **7. AOB**

Nothing reported

END