Meeting Minutes

Location: Microsoft Teams at 10:00AM - 12:00PM
Date: 26.2.2021

Agenda

1. Notes and comments on previous MoM: 5th Feb 2021 MoM
2. FSC Partners’ achievement in Jan 2021. Core figures and highlights
3. First Round Crop and Livestock Assessment preliminary updates (AgriTEX-FAO)
4. COVID-19 Perception: approach and findings (AAH)
5. Open contributions from Partners about any significant programmes’ modifications due to COVID-19 (All participants)
6. Updates from Partners
7. AoB

Participants


Discussion

1. Notes and comments on the previous MoM: 5th Feb 2021 MoM
   No feedback on the previous minutes of the meeting held on 5th February 2021. Minutes approved without any further comments and amendments.

2. FSC Partners’ achievement in Jan 2021. Core figures and highlights

   Presentation for January covering overall achievements, and the 2021 draft HRP.

   Food assistance: 1.5 million beneficiaries
   Total people reached under key activities of in-kind food distribution, CBT in Urban areas and CBT in Rural areas. While the total number of people reached for food assistance is 1.5 million
as the overall figure for partner achievements, HRP forms only a small fraction of this number at 55,000 with the rest the beneficiaries falling under the lean season assistance.

Agriculture and livelihoods: 114,000 beneficiaries.
Key activities reported under agriculture and livelihoods for the month of January are Training, extension and advisory services, Drought-tolerant seeds distribution, Inputs / materials for household kitchen gardens, Agriculture/livestock inputs, Small livestock and other inputs, Rehabilitation of critical assets and lastly provision of stock feed and forage seeds.

Q: In term of the January reporting, are we referring to the HRP defines as HRP 2020 or the draft that is yet to be released for 2021?
A: The HRP 2020 response plan was until December 2020 and has now ended. The current report is based on the HRP 2021 which is awaiting approval. We are also aware that some activities are still under projects started in 2020 but the monthly report is the one that counts.

Q: One of the issues we are trying to assess is for IPC analysis was driven by assumptions and one such assumptions used during the IPC analysis in October 2020 was the level of humanitarian assistance that would be delivered during the projection period October – December 2020, and January to March 2021. The key assumption was the assistance included was already funded or likely to be funded from government and humanitarian partners. At a recent technical working group held by FNC and IPC, it was discussed the linkages between IPC and ZimVac. There was a question about the case of a big enough discrepancy between the level of assistance that was assumed and what has been provided. Based on the assumption that was used, do we yet have clarity of what has been delivered vs what was accounted for during the IPC analysis?

A: For the non-government component (humanitarian component), the LSA forms that part of assistance that is already being provided. We do not have data from governmental component. As FSC we are only able to report the non-government side. We have triggered a process to work on the government side and are yet to get any meaningful feedback and without that additional information, we cannot speak about the discrepancy.

Q: Is it possible to overlay the current assistance map with the current needs? It is great to see where people are mostly reached but would also be meaningful to see if these are the same areas where the needs were equally higher. This would provide a better visualization of the data.
A: Regarding the needs, we need to recognise that the IPC is the same as the needs i.e., Humanitarian Needs Overview. However, on the response map, we do have the response beyond the needs identified. This question is the same as the gap analysis and from the results we have, we are still working out how to properly represent this information and an outright overlay will not be accurate as the response we have now combines both HRP and lean season assistance.

The second map, agriculture and livelihoods is a sub-set of the assistance and the assumption is that these are the same population receiving food assistance packages.

3. First Round Crop and Livestock Assessment preliminary updates (AgriTEX-FAO)

The crop and livestock assessments are food security early warning tools used in the country and providing an indication of the expected crop and livestock production. It is also used to possibly forecast the food security situation focusing on the agricultural production.
Data collection has moved from traditional paper questionnaires to digital mobile based on Open Data Kit (ODK) system.

The assessments are critical for policy and decision makers in terms of prioritizing needy areas and districts in terms of food assistance planning.

**Key highlights of the report include:**

- The 2020/21 agricultural season was characterized by a good start of the rainfall season which was well distributed in both space and time. The season started during the third dekad of November, whilst most of the districts received their effective rains in the dekad of December 2020.
- The Government of Zimbabwe supported the agriculture season through the following input schemes; Climate Proof Presidential Input Support Scheme (Pfumvudza) including tick grease, Cotton Input Scheme and Special Maize Programme for Import Substitution (Command Agriculture).
- Most of the households (over 90%) were supported by the available government inputs programs and being the Pfumvudza/Presidential inputs scheme and the Command Agriculture program.
- There was a limited availability of top-dressing fertilizer on the market since the beginning of season which led to high prices compared to previous seasons.

Presentation to be uploaded to the website:
[crops and livestock status](#)

### 4. COVID-19 Perception: approach and findings (Action Against Hunger)

ACF Works with two local partners, Nutrition Action Zimbabwe (NAZ) and Africa Ahead in food security livelihoods (NAZ) and health (Africa Ahead) in Mwenezi and Chiredzi and Bulawayo

Community Perception Tracker (CPT) is a mobile tool to enable staff capture, analyse and understand the perception of communities during disease outbreaks. The process is a systematic approach to data collection that enables rapid analysis and captures trends. Please note that this is only relevant as an accompaniment to an existing program.

**Main findings:**

- There is acceptance of existence of Covid-19 especially with those personally affected or having had a family member affected.
- Strong belief in natural remedies
- Concern over efficacy and safety of vaccines
- There is a big concern over livelihoods lost and the longer the lockdown goes on, the longer the people are affected.
• Lockdown measures have been approved by the community to be working in reducing the spread of the virus.

Main concerns:

• Exclusion with regards to livelihoods, elderly and those with disability or chronic illness who have reduced access and mobility
• Misinformation causing distrust especially with vaccines
• Healthcare workers have little to no training on COVID-19 and Infection Prevention Control (IPC) in addition to extremely limited PPEs
• Increased reliance in traditional medicine with no official clear communication from Ministry of Health and Child Care
• Curiosity of why COVID-19 prevention measures still needs to be followed if the vaccines were effective and why people should for example wear masks fuelling distrust
• COVID-19 prevention measures always being ignored by older generation in terms of traditions especially around funerals and other activities that the older hold dear.

Comments: FSL Cluster might need to ask ACF to come back to the cluster and present new information and findings as they become available. Can also have a monthly schedule as soon as there are updates.

Q: Zimbabwe Association of Visually handicapped was looking out for whether the CPT as a tool does take care of people with disability and was impressed to hear that there is a component that covers PWD. Noted that in their finding there was exclusion of persons with disability, under the recommendations, how to we make programming to include people with disabilities with regards to Covid-19 interventions?

A: This is a question for everyone. ACF and AA takes inclusion seriously and have communication methods to make sure that all those groups targeted have access to the same information throughout all medium of communication, be it radio, WhatsApp, public address etc. At a broader level, there is still work to be done on how to take the information and make it available to all broader groups. There is still a gap on how that can be escalated to the next steps in general programming as related to Covid-19.

Full presentation available at the following link:
Community perception and rumour tracker

5. Open contributions from Partners about any significant programmes’ modifications due to COVID-19 (All participants)

Open discussions
WHH experience (Farai):

Covid-19 impacts is that it has taken away or reduced the contact between field staff and the beneficiaries mainly because we aren’t able now to meet in person and interact with beneficiaries. It is not easy to deal with issues that affect our beneficiaries and that isn’t possible due to restrictions. Have had to design new ways to interact with the beneficiaries.
As a result, programming has slowed down because some activities that require stakeholder interactions are delayed due to lack of immediate response. For instance, if you want to speak with counterparts, you will have to call, and in most cases, for example, the District Administrator are not in the office unlike before when one could just drive to the office and meet them up.

As such, some projects will not be able to reach their targets or objective as they may have been delayed, slowed down or stopped. In some cases, the staff involved also have their fears, as staff must work in a positive and conducive environment in the field, thereby slowing down the pace of implementation.

**Practical Action (PA) experience (Maria Goss):**

It has been difficult to get the work done, there are targets that are very practical e.g., setting up nutrition gardens, solar irrigations, etc which needs to be done with the community. There is a need to engage with the stakeholders and the community where there is a need to have a buy-in and to understand why it is important for instance the degraded land needs to be addressed and what initiatives can work. Even if there is the capacity, the community will have to lead and build on the initiatives. From that perspective, it has been hard to get activities done especially on new projects due to covid-19. For already existing projects, it was easier to continue as there was already momentum, for example podcasting where equipment was already provided.

Each time PA must sit down with donors and stakeholders to work around what can be done and to what extent, but still face the challenge of internet connectivity especially when working with the marginalised communities to get everyone engaged.

From the government side, there are only skeleton staff manning and the extension officers in the field are overwhelmed.

Q: With the podcasting, how has the uptake been like?
A: Podcasting is just on approach due to ratio of extension officer which is quite higher to farmers. For instance, in Manicaland, there is just one extension officer managing four wards and that gives an indication of how many HHs they must work with. To work around that, PA gives recorded podcasts to the lead farmers and continually upgrade them with new information. This is not an online approach as that would reduce access to the information due to lack of Internet. Farmers come together in smaller groups and information is shared among those small groups. PA also use radio to communicate around post-harvest management. The podcast is community owned and PA continues to update the information.

Q: Have you come across farmers with disability either as farmers or beneficiaries of your services, and in terms of podcasting how has been the update of that medium in accessing information?
A: Will give example of some of scenario of people living with disability and how PA has been working with them.
PA combines agriculture with renewable energy sources and makes water more accessible. Have two community cases:

1) Visually impaired beneficiary: with an elderly man in late 50s who is visually impaired. In PA work, there is a need for sustainability and requires a co-payment of 2-10% of installation of solar infrastructure. From experience, if the community do not buy-in, after some time the infrastructure doesn’t get used and it breaks down. PA brought in the gender advisor and social welfare to talk to the community about inclusion and how to work with them. The whole group of the community assigned one of the youth members to work with the specific beneficiary so that whatever is done in other areas is also done on his piece of land. They also help him understand...
the language, and whenever they plan activities, the communities help make decision on how to best work with him. It has become kind of a family to include him on what is happening.

2) The second case is a lady with medical condition: Community members work with her and if she misses any meetings or training, community members bring her up to speed with what was missed. PA also does vulnerability analysis when choosing beneficiaries to include persons with disability.

6. Updates from Partners

Updates from partners

PA: National Agriculture policy framework dialogue meeting two weeks ago and will be sending out further communications. Reports and invitation will be sent to make partners aware that consultants are going to make presentations on each of the six pillars.

FAO: Reflecting upon the interventions by Practical Action, it has given us to reflect on important issues like nutrition, health, and roles that nature plays in ecosystem.

7. AOB

AOBs