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1 SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This study on the socio-economic status of women and children on Zimbabwe's commercial farming, mining and peri-urban areas was initiated and commissioned by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). This phase of the study focused on limited but specific cases which though less generalisable provided significant insight upon which a full-scale national vulnerability assessment can be based. The assessment sought to review recent studies and surveys on vulnerable groups, consult with relevant stakeholders to determine the extent and nature of vulnerability of women and children in the three areas and to identify further needs and requirements for further in-depth study for purposes of assistance and intervention.

The pilot study was initiated in the wake of a deteriorating economic situation and growing poverty levels - situations likely to impact more on women and children who are among the most vulnerable. The study commenced in February with literature review and fieldwork was undertaken in April at Mhangura Mine, Rhodesdale and Glen Somerset Farms in Wedza and Macheke/Murehwa districts respectively and Porta Farm in Norton.

This introductory chapter will layout the rationale for assessment, its objectives as well as the methodology used in gathering information. Limitations of the study will also be briefly discussed.

1.2 RATIONALE FOR THE PILOT STUDY

Zimbabwe is currently facing a multitude of political, social and economic challenges. The economy, which has slumped to the worst levels since independence, is characterised by an acute shortage of foreign currency and fuel, high rate of inflation, de-industrialisation and de-investment in crucial sectors of the economy. In 2000 the budget deficit was estimated at 23% of GDP, the economy declined by around 4,2%, agriculture declined by 3%, tourism by 4,5%, mining declined by 10,5% and manufacturing declined by 14% (Chamber of Commerce, 2000). The overall budget deficit was pegged at US$611million and by the third quarter of 2000 the debt had amounted to US$488 million (Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe).

All macro-economic indicators are reflecting negative trends resulting in deepening poverty where 75% of the population has been described as poor, 42% very poor, 62% living below the poverty datum line and 34% have a consumption below the Food Poverty Line (Central Statistical Office, 1995). The Zimbabwe National Chamber of Commerce estimates that around 200 000 workers have lost their jobs since beginning of 2000 and the figure is likely to rise to 400 000 if conditions do not improve in the formal sector. In the agricultural sector it is estimated that by August 2000 around 40 000 farm workers were not being paid their wages because of abandonment of farms by their owners or because of non-production (GAPWUZ). Around 115 000 and 50 000 workers were in the process of being retrenched around the same time in the Karoi and Guruve areas respectively. A study by ZINISA (July
2000) revealed that 81,5% of workers in the sample did not have any plans to vacate farms where they are or were formally employed because they have no alternative homes. In the mining sector the Chamber of Mines estimates that by December 2000 a total of 27 000 workers had lost their jobs leaving an estimated 45 000 children below the age of 15 in a vulnerable position.

The commercial farming and mining areas are no doubt among the areas most affected by the negative trends in the macro-economic indicators. Commercial farm workers and mine workers have traditionally been among the most poorly paid. The closure of mines and the land reform process is likely to affect their earnings that the workers used to sustain their livelihoods. In this situation it is women and children who are in a more vulnerable position because of their limited coping options. It is imperative therefore that a vulnerability assessment focusing on the nature of vulnerability be carried out firstly because these two sectors provide probably the largest body of people who suddenly find themselves with no income and with very limited coping options due to lack of adequate savings and limited access to land.

Secondly such an assessment is necessary because of lack of specific details on where the vulnerable groups are located, exact numbers and the extent and nature of the vulnerability. Currently stakeholder organisations and institutions working in these two sectors do not have adequate information on the situation on the ground and where such information exists it does not present a national picture. For example, the Farm Community Trust only operates in the Mashonaland region and does not have adequate information even in that region itself. With this lack of adequate information it thus becomes difficult to design intervention strategies to ameliorate the situation in these areas.

Thirdly the assessment is necessary to complement some of the studies that have been done by different organisations about the situation in these two areas. Although some of the studies done are quite recent they were done before the macro-economic situation had deteriorated to the current levels (e.g. ZINISA and UN Inter Agency Group studies) and are therefore less reflective of the current situation on the ground. Another current study by Save The Children (UK) is focusing primarily on Household Economies which is basically food consumption patterns and does not give in-depth assessment of specifically women and children's vulnerability in terms of health, education and water and sanitation. The study is also more qualitative and lacks specific figures on vulnerability variables, which makes the quantification of intervention measures difficult. Based on the above observations a vulnerability assessment focusing specifically on women and children was found to be necessary and the starting point being a pilot survey to get some insight into the actual situation on the ground. Based on this insight a more comprehensive assessment would be carried out to determine the location of the vulnerable groups, and the nature and state of that vulnerability.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE PILOT STUDY

The broad objectives of this pilot vulnerability assessment of women and children were, firstly, to collect primary and secondary information, through fieldwork, review of recent
studies and surveys on vulnerable groups and through consultations with different stakeholders, on the nature and extend of vulnerability of women and children on commercial farming, mining and peri-urban areas, their numbers and geographical location. Primary information was to be collected through the identification of three case study areas each representing a specific sector.

The second broad objective was to identify further needs and resource requirements of existing institutions in the NGO and government sectors and discuss practical modalities for further in-depth assessment of vulnerable groups in Zimbabwe.

The third broad objective was to identify coping mechanisms of the affected women and children and the possible areas of assistance to improve their livelihoods both in the short and long terms.

The specific objectives of the pilot assessment as specified in the terms of reference were

a. To determine the socio-economic conditions of households on occupied commercial farms, closed down mining centres and peri-urban areas.

b. To identify the location of a sample of children of workers who have stopped working due to disruptions on the farms and those retrenched in the mining centres and to assess the ability to protect the rights of these children.

c. To determine the degree of accessibility of these children and women to basic services and needs such as health, education, shelter, food, sanitation, water and security.

d. To establish current coping mechanisms that these women and children are embarking upon in order to survive.

e. To assess the role of government institutions, private and NGO sectors in the provision of basic needs to affected women and children.

f. To determine the needs of the women and children (including shelter) both in the short and long term.

g. To assess the magnitude of the problems faced in these settlements using desegregated data and indicators.

h. To find out any interventions or projects, NGOs working on commercial farms and mining communities have.

i. To recommend possible interventions based on the findings.

1.4 METHODOLOGY

The pilot vulnerability assessment utilised both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods to enable cross validation of data. One closed down mine, two commercial farms and one peri-urban area were purposefully sampled to represent the three targeted areas. Mhangura mine in Mashonaland West was purposively sampled because it is one of the biggest mines to close down recently due to viability problems affecting a population of 15,000 people. Rhodesdale and Glen Somerset Farms in Mashonaland East were sampled because they were designated and occupied and had the highest number of farm workers in Mashonaland East Province, a province among those with the highest concentration of farm labourers. It was also decided to sample Mashonaland East because most of the vulnerability assessments on commercial farms had focused mostly on Mashonaland
Central and West Provinces. Porta Farm was purposefully sampled because of its proximity to Harare and that it has been subjected to a lot of monitoring studies and therefore the results of this assessment would be used to determine whether there have been population movements since the last study. The limited sample was also a result of the limited budget and the narrow scope of this study which was meant to be the basis upon which a much wider and representative assessment would predicated. Data was collected through the following methods:

1.4.1 Documentary Review
Recent literature and studies on vulnerability in the three target sectors was reviewed so as to get background information on who the vulnerable groups are, their location, the nature of vulnerability as well as their coping mechanisms. Literature reviewed included academic studies, Consultancy reports, monthly reports from stakeholder organisations and institutions like Farm Community Trust, Inter-Country People’s Aid, Save the Children (UK), General Agricultural, Plantation Workers Union of Zimbabwe, UN agencies and relevant government departments.

1.4.2 Focus Group Discussions
Three focus group discussions were held with women and children at each of the targeted research sites. Two of the group discussions were held with women whilst the other one was reserved for children of school going age who were mature enough to hold intelligent discussions. Each group, depending on the total number of people who had gathered for the research, had between 5 and 20 participants randomly selected. At Mhangura Mine a total of 58 participants, at Rhodesdale Farm 15 Participants, Glen Somerset 16 Participants and at Porta Farm 56 participants took part in the group discussions.

1.4.3 Semi-Structured Questionnaires
Semi-structured questionnaires were administered to individual women and youths in the target areas. The respondents were randomly selected from amongst those that had not participated in group discussions. Careful consideration was however made to ensure that youths were also included in the sample so that they could also articulate their own problems. The aim was to administer as many questionnaires as was possible within the given time frame. At Mhangura mine a total of 56 valid questionnaires were administered, Rhodesdale 13, Glen Somerset 18 and Porta Farm 64.

1.4.4 Key Informant Interviews
Interviews with key informants were held with mine authorities, health and education officials, government officials, NGO representatives, local leadership and other relevant people. Around 20 key informants were interviewed during the assessment.
1.4.5 Anthropometric measurements

Anthropometric measurements were done on children five years and below to determine their nutritional status. A total of 120 children had their anthropometric measurements taken at Mhangura, 20 at Rhodesdale Farm, only 5 at Glen Somerset Farm (scale brokedown) and 96 at Porta Farm. Evaluation of nutritional status is based on the rationale that in a well nourished population, there is statistically predictable distribution of children of a given age with respect to height and weight and weight and age. Use of a standard reference population facilitates the analysis of nutritional status of children and one of the most commonly used reference populations and the one used in this report is the NCHS (US National Centre for Health Statistics Standards) recommended for use by the World Health Organisation.

There are three standard indices of physical growth that describe the nutritional status of children:

- Height for age
- Weight for height
- Weight for age

Weight for age is the index that was utilised in this report. This index is a composite index of weight for height and height for age and does not distinguish between acute undernutrition (wasting) and chronic under nutrition (stunting). It is however a good overall indicator of a population’s nutritional health.

1.4.6 Observations

The research team used an observation checklist to note down the physical condition of children under five, conditions of shelter structures, water and sanitation sources and conditions of health and educational facilities.

Data was analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for the semi-structured questionnaire, EPI-Info for anthropometric measurements and qualitative analysis for the other qualitative data.

1.5 LIMITATIONS

This study was not meant to be a comprehensive and representative study but a pilot study whose results will be the basis upon which a more comprehensive representative study will be based. As such the results of this pilot study should not be viewed as nationally representative because the sample was limited and the time frame made it not feasible to draw out a representative sample. The case studies in this report however provide a comprehensive insight of the situation on the ground in terms of vulnerability on the researched sites and might provide some information on what is taking place nationally. The information might prove valuable to those organisations and individuals intending to embark on a comprehensive vulnerability assessment.

Another constraint during the research was the unwillingness by some key informants to release information because of their fear of the volatile political situation. For example some
of the farms were reluctant to divulge details about their former employees arguing that the farms have been designated and thus have no control over what is happening now. Despite the above limitations it is the firm conviction of the researchers that the results of this pilot research are valid enough and can be a basis upon which further in-depth studies and contingency plans can be predicated.

At Porta Farm where a lot of studies have been done by various NGOs (e.g. World Vision, Save the Children, Inter-country People’s Aid) the settlers were a bit resistant to being interviewed because they felt they have been asked similar questions too many times. Despite these complaints the respondents were however eventually co-operative.
1.6 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section discusses, in brief, the research findings and draws up recommendations based on the findings.

1.6.1 Findings-Mining (Mhangura)

The mining sector has been hard hit by the prevailing socio-economic situation. Closures of mines like Mhangura Mine, BHP in Norton (though due to geological problems), Kamativi and other marginal producers and the scaling down of operations by others has left thousands of workers without jobs. For example 5 410 mineworkers have lost their jobs in the Harare region alone and this represents 37% of all mineworkers. This has affected an estimated 21 640 dependants, including 9 000 children estimated to be below the age of 15 (Chamber of Mines, 2001).

The following were the major findings at Mhangura mine:

a) At its peak the mine employed between 2 500 and 3 000 workers. At its closure in November 2000 the mine retrenched the remaining 1 200 workers and affected a total population of around 15 000 people who relied directly or indirectly on the mine for their livelihoods.

b) Of the 56 households interviewed only 5 of the households heads were in some form of formal employment (3 as permanent workers and 2 as contract workers) at non-mine establishments. The rest (91%) were not formally employed.

c) The average household size is 6. The 0-15 years age group comprise 56.6% of the total sampled population.

d) The majority of the former workers in the sample are Zimbabwean 78.6%, Malawians 14.3% and Zambians 7.2%. Almost all the respondents said they have no alternative homes and have no where to go should they be asked to vacate the mine houses.

e) 10.7% of children in the sampled households had dropped out of school mainly because of lack of school fees.

f) The majority of the households (57%) have no alternative sources of income and rely on borrowing, 10% rely on remittances from working children and friends, 7% rely on informal trading and another 7% are engaged in the sale of vegetables. Those who had received packages were involved in usury as a way of generating income. Child prostitution, drug peddling and poaching were mentioned as some of the survival strategies being embarked upon by some of the community members.

The former employees have no access to arable land on which they can carryout meaningful subsistence agriculture. Those with any land have small patches that they use as vegetable gardens.

h) 82.1% of the households reported food shortages in the past 12 months, which was more severe after the closure of the mine in November 2001.

i) At the time of the research the households no longer had access to chlorinated water, the water supply was erratic, the toilets were hardly cleaned, sewage was overflowing, garbage was uncollected and grass was uncut, services which used to be provided by the mine. A lot of worms, flies and mosquitoes could be seen roaming in the toilets. A health crisis is looming.
j) Mine workers and their dependants used to be afforded free medical treatment by the mine but after they were given their retrenchment packages they were supposed to pay for health services at the hospital which has since been taken over by the Lutheran church. 53% of the respondents pointed out that members of their households had fallen sick but did not seek medical treatment because they could not afford drugs.

k) 50% of children below the age of two had had diarrhoea in the two weeks preceding the survey. 2.5% of children 5 years and below were severely under-nourished and 5.8% were moderately undernourished. These percentages are higher than the national average.

l) The majority of women (95.6%) knew about family planning and the most known methods by those who knew were the pill (100%), condom (80.9%), injectable (52.3%) and the loop (42.8%).

m) Main needs in terms of priority were food (100%), education (92.8%) and health (85.7%) in the immediate term. In the long term the majority (82.1%) wanted to be allocated land and the second priority was income-generating projects (67.85%).

1.6.2 Commercial Farming Areas-Rhodesdale and Glen Somerset

Two commercial farms in Mashonaland East were included in the sample. The following is a summary of specific findings on the farms.

a) In Wedza out of 1 230 families resettled only 9 were farm workers, in Marondera out of 2 996 only 4 were farm workers, in Murehwa 53 out of 1 572 were farm workers and in Seke only 6 farmworkers out of 1 088 families were resettled. At Glen Somerset farm out of 52 farmworker families only 3 were resettled and at Rhodesdale out of 30 farm worker families none have been resettled.

b) At the two farms 41.9% of the workers are Zimbabwean, 9.7% are Mozambican, 38.7% are Malawian and 9.7% are Zambian. All the respondents said they have no alternative places to go to should they be displaced from the farms where they are currently staying. The average length of stay at the two farms is 21 years.

c) The 0-5 years age group constitutes 21.4% of the total population. The average household size is 5.

d) Of the 30 workers at Rhodesdale only 9 are still employed and all the 36 workers at Glen Somerset are unemployed.

e) There are 5 full orphans at Rhodesdale aged between 2 and 9 years and 2 maternal, 1 paternal and two full orphans at Glen Somerset.

f) A total of six children of school going age were not going to school at the two farms and lack of finance was cited as the main reason why they were not going to school.

g) Only 6.5% of the households had access to arable land and the rest only have small patches on which they grow their vegetables.

h) 48.4% admitted that they have suffered food shortage in the last twelve months and that there are days they have spend without having a meal. 35.5% are meeting their food requirements by working in neighbouring communal areas and farms, 32.3% are buying their food while 16.1% are relying on remittances from children and relatives.

i) On both farms the workers no longer have reliable piped water supply and in the event of water cuts the workers had to fetch water from unprotected sources some 2.5km away.

j) The two farms were serviced by mobile health clinics but they are now asked to buy drugs, which they said they could hardly afford. 45% had members of their families ill but
did not seek treatment. The main reason cited for not seeking treatment was inability to afford to buy drugs (70.1%). 37.5% of the children were delivered at home, another 37.5% were delivered at a clinic and 25% were delivered by traditional midwives. All the children were immunised and had health cards.

k) 12% of children under 5 years were severely undernourished and 24% were moderately undernourished bringing the total number of undernourished children to 36%. This is far much higher than the national average of 14% in 1999.

l) All the women knew at least one family planning method with the most common being the pill, condom and injectable.

m) All the respondents had heard about HIV/AIDS and that it was caused by having unprotected sex and having multiple partners.

n) The priority needs mentioned by all the farm workers are food and health (in the immediate term) and consideration in the resettlement exercise in the long term.

1.6.3 Peri-urban areas-Porta Farm

According an IPA/UNICEF study (1999) Porta Farm has a total population of approximately 3 547 persons (803 households). The following were specific findings at Porta Farm:

a) The local development committee noted that on average five families are coming to settle at the informal settlements every month. A total of 61 families have settled at the farm since December 2000.

b) The majority of respondents (62.5%) are Zimbabwean, 12.5% are Mozambican and 25% are Malawians.

c) The 0-5 years age group constitutes the largest percentage (39.9%) and the average household size is 5.

d) 23.4% of the household heads were employed permanent workers, 62.5% were unemployed, 10.9% were self employed and 3.1% were still in school.

e) 25% of the households were caring for orphans who lost a male parent, 10.9% who had lost a mother and 12.5% who lost both parents. Some of the orphans are looking after old and frail grand parents and have pulled out of school as a result.

f) 56 children of primary school going age and 73 children of secondary school going age are not going to school and the main reasons cited for non-attendance were need to work to look after families (50.4%), lack of school fees (31%) and dropping out of own will (18.6%).

g) 51.6% of the respondents had no source of income, 24.4% relied on wages/salary, and 10.9% relied on informal trading.

h) Out of 64 households interviewed only one household had access to land and the rest had very small patches of land which they used to grow vegetables. 87.5% of the respondents had experienced food shortages in the twelve months preceding the research and the same households reported that there are days that they have gone without having a meal.

i) All the households have access to communal tapes from which they draw water for domestic consumption. 67.2% of the households had their own individual latrines, which also double up as bathrooms. Majority of houses are made up of plastics, pole and dagga and thatch with earth hardened floors.
j) Porta farm is serviced by a mobile health clinic and 62.5% said the clinic does not have enough drugs. 75% of the households reported that their members have fallen ill and failed to seek medical treatment because they could no afford medical fees.
k) 46.4% of the households with children under two years had their children delivered at home by traditional midwives or relatives. All the respondents said their children had been immunised and 85.7% of the children had child growth monitoring cards. 89.3% of the children had diarrhoea two weeks preceding the research.
l) 5.2% of the children under five were severely undernourished and 11.5% were moderately undernourished bringing the total number of undernourished children to 16.7%.
m) All women knew at least one family planning method. 20.5% knew about the injectable, 34.1% knew about the pill and another 34.1% knew about the condom and 11.4 knew about the loop. All the respondents had heard about HIV/AIDS.
n) The main needs of the community were child supplementary feeding, shelter consideration in the resettlement Programme and setting up of income generating projects.

1.6.4 Recommendations

a) Information gaps, which make responses to emergencies and disasters difficult, were identified in this study. Although this study and other studies have managed to gather empirical evidence the results are less generalisable as the studies were mainly confined to specific case studies. Rapid vulnerability assessments must be commenced as soon as possible so as to get a national picture of what is happening on the ground. Results of this study indicate that the food security situation on the farms and mine might reach catastrophic levels in the not too distant future.
b) There is need to identify the adaptive and coping mechanisms of the people in these areas so that those that are viable can be encouraged through training and funding e.g. vending at Porta Farm and mushroom collection at Rhodesdale Farm.
c) Urgent intervention measures have to be taken at Mhangura mine to create a hygienic environment through community involvement to avoid the outbreak of communicable diseases like cholera and others like malaria especially during the coming rainy season.
d) There is need to begin child supplementary feeding programmes in these areas because the levels of undernutrition in these areas is higher than the national averages.
e) NGOs and UN agencies have to closely co-ordinate on disaster preparedness so as to have a systematic response to emergency situations. What is currently happening is that different organisations are carrying out their own independent assumptions resulting in duplication of researches. An inter-organisational disaster preparedness team needs to have an inventory on what each stakeholder organisation is doing.
f) The number of people who have flocked to peri-urban areas is not known and it is imperative that other peri-urban areas in other towns be assessed because it seems there is a gradual movement to these areas.
g) Mobilisation of resources has to start immediately as there is evidence that already some families are in a stressful situation and would need humanitarian intervention.
h) The current land redistribution exercise has to take into account farm and mine workers as well as those in peri-urban areas.
i) Lobbying of government to bring its attention to the plight of these vulnerable groups has to be a continuous process so that they do not escape the attention of government.

j) There is need to put in place a monitoring system to enable quick identification and response to emergency situations of vulnerable groups.
1.7 INVENTORY OF THE WORKS OF NGOs, GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND UN AGENCIES ON VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT AND EMERGENCY PLANNING

This section gives an outline of what other organisations are doing in terms of vulnerability assessment and emergency planning. This information is necessary for co-ordination purposes.

a) FAO/WFP (26 April-9 May) Zimbabwe crop and food supply assessment in drought and flood areas. Field assessment focused on Masvingo (Mwenezi and Chivi) and Manicaland (Chipinge and Makoni) provinces. The assessment concluded that there is high nutritional vulnerability in areas affected by the dry spell and floods and recommended that there is a very high urgent need to provide food aid to affected households.

b) FAO/WFP (1 June 2000) Crop and food supply assessment in Zimbabwe. The report concluded that emerging food insecurity problems in the country are primarily due to diminishing purchasing power. The urban poor and many households in food deficit southern and eastern areas of the country are particularly vulnerable to food shortages and would need to be targeted for food assistance.

c) International Organisation for Migration The organisation has partnered with the Ministry of Labour to carry out an assessment of the socio-economic condition of farm workers on all designated farms. The study intends to cover 10% of all workers on the designated farms. Results expected in July.

d) ZINISA (Save the children-UK, Farm Community Trust, Inter-Country People's Aid, World Vision). This network of NGOs has formed an emergency preparedness subgroup and have engaged a communications officer and a disaster preparedness officer. The group is also training its members on emergency preparedness and is compiling information in order to come up with an emergency preparedness plan.

e) Save the children –UK (March 2001) Household Economy Assessment in Mutorashanga Informal Mining Communities. This is part of SAVE's on going emergency food security project funded by DFID. The project also supports capacity building for emergency preparedness.

f) UN Inter-Agency Disaster Management Team in Zimbabwe (October 2000). Zimbabwe's vulnerable population groups assessment

g) Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe The Impact of land reform on commercial farmers' livelihoods (March 2001)

h) Save the children (UK) Floods in Muzarabani (March 2000) emergency responses and community perceptions.

i) OXFAM (GB) (June 2000) Currently carrying a vulnerability assessment and capacity analysis for emergency responses throughout the country.

j) OXFAM (America) (June 2000) Currently carrying a vulnerability assessment in Zimbabwe.
2 SECTION TWO: OVERVIEW OF VULNERABILITY IN ZIMBABWE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is a synthesis of findings of recent vulnerability studies and surveys done on commercial farming, mining and peri-urban areas. This literature review process seeks to analyse as much secondary information as possible describing, characterising and quantifying vulnerable groups and the nature of vulnerability in the three areas and identify information gaps which make intervention difficult and therefore needed to be filled by a UNICEF vulnerability assessment focusing primarily on women and children.

Recent studies, surveys and reports done by organisations such as Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe, Save the Children (UK), Inter-country People's Aid, UNDP, GAPWUZ, CPU and DFID were reviewed. Contact was also made with relevant officials of these organisations to get updated information that might as yet not been compiled into reports.

The discussion will first focus on the general review findings and then look at the three target areas individually.

2.2 ZIMBABWE' MACRO ECONOMIC POLICIES SINCE INDEPENDENCE

Since independence in 1980 the Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ) has formulated and implemented a total of five National Economic Development Plans namely the Transitional National Development Plan (1982-1985), First Five Year National Development Plan (1986-1990), Second Five Year National Development Plan (1991-1995), Zimbabwe Programme for Economic and Social Transformation-ZIMPREST (1996-2000) and the current Zimbabwe Millennium Economic Recovery Programme (2000-2001). The first two development plans after independence were predicated on socialist principles where the government embarked on massive social sector development and the attempt to control the productive sector. The third development plan saw the government abandoning its socialist orientation and embracing market driven reform programmes code named the Economic Structural Adjustment Programme. The last two plans mainly focus on addressing macro economic instabilities resulting from ESAP.

The attainment of independence by Zimbabwe in 1980 brought to an end a bitter liberation struggle and crippling sanctions that had negatively affected the country’s economy. By 1980, after peace and stability had been attained, the economy experienced a real growth rate of more than 11%, a 27% increase in export earnings and an increase in government expenditure of more than 17%. By 1981 the manufacturing and agricultural sectors accounted for more than 26% and 18% of GDP respectively. The major objective of the First Transitional National Development Plan was to continue improving the performance of the economy to enable the financing of the expanding social services sector. The plan targeted a 3% per annum growth in formal employment where 108 200 jobs would be created and an economic growth rate of 8% per annum.

After the first Development Plan, Land Reform and Resettlement cornerstones of this programme fell far short of resettling 162 000 families as had been envisaged. Only one fifth
of the target had been achieved. GDP grew by 4.0% per annum and unemployment remained unacceptably high. There were however major strides in social infrastructure development. The economy was characterised by a heavy reliance on export of raw materials and a high degree of technological dependency on the outside world. Agriculture and mining accounted for over two-thirds of total exports and debt service ratio was 28% of total exports of goods and services. GDP grew by 11.0%, 1981 by 13.0%, 1982 by -2.0% and 1983 by -3.0% before recovering in 1984. There was also a decline of -1.2% in the productive sectors while the social services sector recorded a growth of 2.9%. Inflation, which was pegged at 15.0% at the beginning of the transitional plan, rose to 17% by 1985. Exports in real terms declined significantly between 1982 and 1983. Although there was an improvement in 1984 the increase was not enough to enable the country to meet its export requirements. Balance of payment overall deficit grew to $150 million by 1983 and the recovery in 1985 produced a surplus of $259 million. The first National Development Plan (1986-1990) was launched against this economic background.

The second national development plan's major objectives were to transform and control the economy and to carry out land reform and ensure efficient utilisation of that land. GDP was targeted to grow at an annual rate of 5.1%, agricultural output by 5.0% per year, above the projected population growth rate of 2.76% per annum. The plan also projected that employment will increase at an annual rate of 2.2%. The budget deficit was to be reduced from $808 million for 1985/86 to $630 million by 1990/91 and reduce budget deficit as a proportion of GDP from 10.3% to 6.2% over the same period.

Between 1980 and 1990 GDP annual growth rate averaged 3.2%, between 1985 and 1990 it averaged 3.0% compared to the projected 4.3%. The growth rate of the productive sectors i.e. agriculture, mining and manufacturing averaged only 3.1% from 1980 to 1990. This slow in the growth rates was mainly due to low levels of investments and shortages of foreign exchange. Between 1980 and 1990, 209 000 new jobs were created in the non-agricultural sector, and 46% of these jobs were in the public sector (public administration, health and education). Between 1979 and 1989 inflation averaged 11.4% and by the end of 1990 it was running at 17%, the main cause being the budget deficit. Public debt was 70% of GDP at the end of 1990. The economic reform Programme was launched against this background to correct the fundamentals that were causing instability.

The major objectives of the economic reform Programme were to improve the living conditions of the poor and reduction of poverty by increasing per capita GDP from $1508 in 1990 to $1673 by 1995(at 1990 prices, to achieve an average economic growth rate of 4.6% per annum, reduce inflation from 25% in 1990 to 9% by 1995, create 108 500 new formal jobs and 50 000 informal jobs over the same period and to achieve a GDP average growth rate of 4.6%. The contribution of the manufacturing, agricultural, distribution and hotels, education and mining sectors was targeted at 27%, 12%, 12%, 9% and 7% respectively. Zimbabwe achieved a high growth rate of 8.5% in 1996. Agriculture grew by 19.4%, tourism by 6.8% and manufacturing by 4.8%. From 1997 economic growth rate declined to 0.5% by 1999 and domestic savings declined from 18.2% of GDP in 1996 to 11% of GDP in 1999. Inflation rose from 22.6% in 1995 to 58.3% in 1999 resulting in an increase in food prices of
1000%. Parastatal loses amounted to Z$11 billion in 1998. The macro economic situation during this period pushed the government to launch the Millennium Economic Recovery Programme whose major objectives are to consolidate fiscal adjustment policies, resolve foreign currency crisis, accelerate and complete public enterprises reforms, lower interest rates, build investor confidence and protect vulnerable groups. The Programme seeks to contain budget deficit to 3.8% of GDP and to reduce domestic debt from 31% of GDP in 2000 to 7% over 18 months. The success of these measures is however too early to access.

In 2000 the budget deficit was estimated at 23% of GDP, the economy declined by about 4.2%, agriculture declined by 3%, tourism by 4.5%, manufacturing 10.5% and mining 14%. The inflation rate is currently estimated at 55% and is expected to balloon to around 70%. The persistently high budget deficit has remained a major source of concern in overall macroeconomics management. In 2000 the overall budget deficit was pegged at US$611 million and by the third quarter of 2000 external debt had mounted to US$488 million. The current land resettlement program and the political situation have dampened investor confidence, which has destabilised the macroeconomics environment. The vulnerability of disadvantaged groups has thus been seriously affected. The shortage of foreign currency has precipitated the current fuel crisis, drug stock-outs, food insecurity and limited access to basic needs and services like water and sanitation, health and education.

2.3 GENERAL OVERVIEW OF REVIEW FINDINGS ON VULNERABILITY

The vulnerability of people in commercial farming, mining and peri-urban areas has been highlighted by various studies and assessments done by different organisations and individual researchers (Bonnard, 2000; Inter-Country People's Aid, 1999; UNDP, 1999; ZINISA, 2000; FCTZ, 1999). These studies revealed that the socio-economic status of people in these areas was characterised by low incomes, food insecurity and limited access to basic services and needs like health, education, shelter and water and sanitation. Women and children in these areas are particularly vulnerable because of their limited resources and coping mechanisms.

The Government of Zimbabwe has embarked on a Land and Agrarian Reform Programme which is aimed at "...restructuring of access to land...enhancing agricultural activity, leading to industrial and economic empowerment and growth (Government Policy document, February 2001). By 1997 the government had acquired 3 498 444 hectares of land and resettled 7 1000 families. The government noted that the majority of settler families experienced real increases in incomes, which exceeded those of their counterparts in communal areas. It is estimated that Phase 1 of the Resettlement Programme achieved an ex-post economic internal rate of return (EIRR) of 21%, well above the 14% expected at its planning (Overseas Development Agency Report, 1998).

The second phase of the land reform programme was launched in September 1998 with the objective of acquiring 841 farms covering 2.1 million hectares. Between October 1998 and June 2000 168 263,808 hectares of land were acquired on which 4697 families were settled.
The Fast Track Resettlement phase one was officially launched on 15 July 2000 to speed up the pace of land acquisition and resettlement. A total of 51,543 families were resettled under the fast track phase one between July 2000 and 9 February 2001 on 2 million hectares. This brings the total of resettled families to date to 127,240 on 5.8 million hectares. The target service level for the villagized Model A1 include a borehole per village of 20-25 families, a clinic for 500 families, a dip tank for 1,400 herd of cattle, a primary school classroom and teacher's house for every 20 families and a decent housing unit per household through the Rural Housing Programme Loan Fund. All the above agricultural reform measures are meant to reduce poverty and reduce the vulnerability of previously disadvantaged groups. This phase is expected to run from June 2000 to December 2001.

The second phase of the fast track programme was planned to run from 2000-2004. During this phase payment of compensation for improvements to land for each farm will be phased over five years, Land Use Planning and demarcation shall be done, settler emplacement, provision of Level 1 infrastructure like access roads, dip tanks and boreholes and provision of Level II infrastructure like clinics, schools, telephone lines and electricity lines will also commence.

There is a strong possibility that the current impasse over the land resettlement programme, the massive closures of mines and other industries and the subsequent retrenchment of workers and the prevailing political atmosphere has changed the nature of vulnerability in these three areas. This implies therefore that if that is the case there is need to reformulate intervention strategies, which are predicated on vulnerability assessments, which capture the factors currently on the ground. Organisations like FCTZ, CFU, UNDP and GAPWUZ have admitted that intervention in these three areas has become difficult because not much is known about the current situation on the ground in terms of the nature of vulnerability, numbers and location of population groups in vulnerable situations and therefore needing assistance. This dearth of information has resulted in different organisations giving inconsistent figures on for example the number of farm workers who have been retrenched or displaced as a result of the current fast track land resettlement programme.

The de-industrialisation currently taking place has resulted in massive job loses. The Zimbabwe National Chamber of Commerce estimates that if the current negative trends in the economy continues around 600,000 workers will have lost their jobs by the end of 2001 in the formal sector. The Commercial Farmers’ Union estimates that the value of agricultural output is going to decline by $19.4 billion within the next three years if the situation does not improve. Given that the Zimbabwe economy is agro- based the decline in the agricultural sector will have a ripple effect across the whole economy which will result in massive job loses thereby exposing a large section of the population to stressful situations. A United Nations Inter-Agency Vulnerability Report (August 2000) identified the following population groups as the most vulnerable:
Table 1. Vulnerable groups and causes of vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-group</th>
<th>Causes of Vulnerability</th>
<th>Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Commercial Farm Workers                                                | • Land reform programme  
• Abandonment of farm or retrenchment  
• Political violence                                                  | • Displacement  
• Inability to meet basic needs like food, health and education due to loss of income |
| 2. Retrenchedes & underemployed (e.g. closure of mines & factories)       | • Retrenchment  
• Underemployment                                                                                           | • Same as above                                                       |
| Cyclone Elaine Victims                                                    | • Cyclone Elaine induced flooding & damage                                                                  | • Food insecurity  
• Increase in communicable diseases, damage to infrastructure, reduced access to health, education and agricultural markets |
| Poor households in urban, peri-urban and communal areas.                  | • Poor incomes due to unemployment and poor agricultural activity due to a rise in input costs               | • Limited access to health, education, adequate nutrition  
• Increase in nutrition deficiency diseases and communicable diseases |

A January 2001 nutrition surveillance report by UNICEF indicated that there are reported food access problems in Beitbridge, Zaka, Binga, Chiredzi, Chirimanzu and Chipinge. The same report also forecasted food shortage problems in the districts of Matebeleland South Province where area under maize has been reduced by 87%. The main reasons for the looming food shortage were given as the late start of the season, unaffordable tillage costs coupled with lack of drought power and expensive input costs. The removal of subsidies on fertiliser and agro-chemicals has seen prices shooting up by over 300% over the past five years. In urban areas households are consuming less or cheap cuts of meat, less chicken, fruits and eggs because of low incomes (Chitiga, 1999) and by now the situation has most probably deteriorated further. Rapid household food security assessments were recommended by this report so that intervention measures could be formulated on time.

All the above-identified vulnerable groups will have difficulties accessing health services where they have to pay fees and buy drugs. The UNDP 1999 Human Development report indicated that on average 8.8% of Zimbabwe's population have no access to health care but this figure is most likely to have increased given the current economic situation. Drug stockouts are being experienced frequently at the Government Medical Stores and this has made it difficult to control the main health problems in the country namely HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, cholera, dysentery, diarrhoea diseases and acute respiratory infections. As at May 2000 the Government Medical Stores had run out of essential drugs like Chloroquin phosphate tablets, quinine sulphate, isoniazid and pyridoxine hcl (VixB6) and some paediatric hospitals in Harare had no basic items like insulin and gloves. The situation makes it difficult for the vulnerable groups, who cannot afford private medical
schemes. The following table, adapted from the UN Inter-Agency vulnerability assessment, summarises the health problems of vulnerable groups:

Table 2: Vulnerable Groups and their Health Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VULNERABLE GROUPS</th>
<th>POTENTIAL HEALTH PROBLEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Farm Workers</td>
<td>• Overcrowding and settling in areas without sanitary facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Food insecurity-malnutrition related diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Health service centres dysfunctional, too far or too expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Drugs not available or too expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retrenched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Orphans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peri-urban dwellers</td>
<td>• Increase in population due to people migrating to these areas resulting in overcrowding and an increase in communicable diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Food insecurity-malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Orphans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Women and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural communities</td>
<td>• Limited access to health facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shortage of drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unaffordable health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in communicable diseases and TB, HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Damaged infrastructure making health delivery difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 75% poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cyclone Elaine victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Drought stricken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban dwellers</td>
<td>• shortage of essential drugs in hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• inability to purchase health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• communicable diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• food insecurity-malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 39% households poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• underemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• retrenched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• informal sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

United Nations Inter Agency August 2000

In terms of education, the vulnerable groups are finding it increasingly difficult to meet their children's educational expenses. Between 1990 and 1994 public expenditure on primary and secondary education declined by more than 30% and a transition from Grade Seven to Form One had fallen to 70% of all those who completed Grade seven during the same period. According to FCTZ there are on average 33 children attending primary school and 7 attending secondary school per farm and this means that if more than 3000 farms are acquired more than 100 000 primary and more than 21 000 secondary students will be affected in one way or the other if the parents are not resettled on the farms where they were employed.

Given the above situation it is imperative that UNICEF carry out an independent assessment to determine the nature and extent of vulnerability of children and women in these areas as
they are the ones likely to be most affected by the situation. The pilot survey is the first step in that direction.

2.4 COMMERCIAL FARMING AREAS

At independence, Zimbabwe witnessed a phenomenal growth in the provision of social services such as health, education and the raising of minimum wages to a previously disadvantaged African population. The commercial farm workers benefited very little from the social programmes set up after independence (FCTZ, 1999). Farm workers were characteristically poorly paid, ill treated and lacking access to land and other basic services like health and education.

There are between 320,000 and 450,000 farm workers living on Zimbabwe’s commercial farms and this includes both permanent and seasonal workers. Commercial farm workers and their families, who constitute nearly 20% of the country’s population, have limited access to land rights. The present and future of farm workers is therefore inextricably bound up with how the land question is resolved.

The vulnerable position of the farm workers is made unique in that between 70 and 80% of the farm workers do not maintain communal homes (FCTZ, 1999). Furthermore, many farm workers have limited access to land rights because of their foreign ancestry (ZINISA, 2000). Women and orphaned children are likely to be affected more because consideration for resettlement is likely to be determined by one’s adult status and patriarchal considerations. Female headed and child headed households are likely to be left out if no special consideration is made.

A July 2000 study by ZINISA revealed that 81.5% of farm workers in the sample do not have plans to vacate the farms where they are employed because they have no other homes except the farms. Given the above background it is important to establish what has happened to women and children on commercial farms where resettlement has taken place. Information on the situation on the ground in commercial farms is very scanty and major organisations dealing with commercial farm workers are not certain of the nature and magnitude of vulnerability in these farms. FCTZ, which is one of the major sources of information on farm worker communities, admitted that they do not have a full picture of the vulnerability situation on the ground. Information is becoming more and more difficult to gather because of the sensitive nature of the land question. The organisation has had at times to rely on newspapers for information and such information has to be carefully handled because newspapers can be biased according to their political orientation.

FCTZ has however managed to do some field visits to farms in the Mashonaland region after the commencement of the fast track resettlement programme. For other provinces the organisation has mainly relied on newspaper reports. In Marondera District at Myembi farm, out of 30 farm worker families only 2 families were resettled, in Chikomba no farm workers were resettled, in Seke only 8.5% of the farm workers were resettled, Mutoko 10.2% and Murehwa 8.6%. By September 2000 only 4.1% of farm workers had been resettled and at Kuti farm in Mashonaland West only 7 out of 23 permanent workers were resettled. The
following table shows the number of farms where resettlement has taken place by district and the number of farm workers who have been resettled:
Farms where resettlement has taken place and no. of farm workers settled
NB. Period 1980-1997 71000 families were resettled, 1997-1998 559 families were resettled but there is no information on the number of farm workers who either were resettles or left out

Table 3: Farm workers not resettled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROVINCE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>FARM</th>
<th>TOTAL RESETTLED FAMILIES</th>
<th>FW RESETTLED</th>
<th>FW NOT RESETTLED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>Marondera</td>
<td>Myembi</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28 (153)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>Marondera</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>25 (79)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/08/2000</td>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>Chikomba</td>
<td>Phillipsdale</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/08/2000</td>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>Chikomba</td>
<td>Nyamazaan</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/02/2000</td>
<td>Mash east</td>
<td>Chikomba</td>
<td>Bester's Rust</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/02/2000</td>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>Marondera</td>
<td>Lot 1 of Antelope</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1 of Inkosi</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landsloot</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rietkop</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2000</td>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>Seke</td>
<td>AD of Gowerlands</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1 of Plumbstead</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duendrin</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chikumbike</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/08/2000</td>
<td>Mash East</td>
<td>Murehwa</td>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8/2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Castle den Pines</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Castle den extension</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/08/2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corfe</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Par</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1 of Endsleigh</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9/2000</td>
<td>Mash Central</td>
<td>Bindura</td>
<td>Retreat</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guruve</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mazowe</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt Darwin</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chikoma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mtzaraban i</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drumada</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viewfield</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rustington</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/8/2000</td>
<td>Mash West</td>
<td>Makonde</td>
<td>Kuti</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above information clearly shows that the information is compiled in a haphazard way and does not give a clearer picture of the situation of farm workers. In some cases the number of farm worker resettled is not given, in others the total number at each farm is missing whilst in other cases the dates of resettlement and total number of people resettled is also missing. What is however clear from the above figures, though not complete, is the fact that in the majority of cases farm workers were left out in the resettlement exercise and in cases where they were resettled a very small percentage was considered.

The position of the farm workers is made unique and vulnerable by the fact that between 70 and 80% of the farm workers do not maintain communal homes and approximately 45% have limited access to land because of their foreign ancestry (ZINISA, 2000). The majority of farm workers in reality have on were to go as they have very limited traditional links in communal areas which makes it difficult for them to have access to land under the current provisions where people wishing to be registered for resettlement have to go through their traditional leaders, Rural District Councils or through political structures like Village Development Committees. Farm workers do not fall under any traditional authority and VIDCO structures are almost non-existent in commercial farming areas.

The all farms census by FCTZ (1997) and another by Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (1998) of workers on 804 initially designated farms indicated that around 55 000 workers would be affected and taking into account that each farm worker has an average of between 5 and 6 dependants (CSO), a total of between 275 000 and 330 000 people would be affected. If the government acquires more than 3000 farms as is officially the intention, the ALB/CFU and GAPWUZ estimates that 150 000 workers will be affected and together with their dependants between 750 000 and 1 million people will be affected.

If the assumption that between 70 and 80% of the farm workers do not maintain communal homes, and therefore do not have alternative settlement areas, at least between 190 000 and 220 000 people will need alternative settlement areas. Faced with all these risks and threats to their livelihoods farm workers are least capable to cope with these threats because of low incomes, lack of access to land rights and a very small asset base. Coping mechanisms are likely to be limited to basic survival tactics like squatting, begging, gold panning and poaching, prostitution and migration to peri-urban areas. The lack of viable coping mechanisms means that this group needs co-ordinated assistance to ameliorate their predicament.

Among the vulnerable farm workers are vulnerable sub-groups like farm orphans and the elderly. The Zimbabwe Government estimates that there are between 600 000 and 1 million children currently orphaned and the figure is expected to rise by 60 000 annually. Farm workers are among the most vulnerable sub-groups of the country.
workers are multi-ethnic in composition and the families are often isolated from their traditional extended network which ordinarily involve relationships of obligation and responsibility towards family members (FOST, 2000). The absence of such traditional links sometimes leaves orphaned children in a particularly vulnerable position.

The FEWS all farms census (1999) gives an average of 1.4 orphans per farm and a total of 5946 orphans on commercial farms. This figure is obviously very low because the definition of orphan is restricted to children who have lost both parents (full orphan). The WHO definition of an orphan is a child who has lost one parent. FOST has identified an average of 2 orphans per farm and this implies that there will be more than 6000 orphans who will be affected if more than 3000 farms are resettled. Farm orphans are particularly in a vulnerable position because of the “absence of extended traceable families, dislocation from familial (totem) groups, marginalisation from society and coming from multi-ethnic backgrounds increases their vulnerability” (FOST, 1998:18) as summarised by the following table:

### Table 4: Farm orphans and causes of vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF VULNERABILITY</th>
<th>PRINCIPLE CAUSES</th>
<th>EFFECTS ON LIVELIHOODS</th>
<th>COPING MECHANISMS</th>
<th>NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of parental care</td>
<td>Orphanhood-weak community network, no traceable lineage</td>
<td>• Food insecurity</td>
<td>• Child labour</td>
<td>• Food and clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited access to health and education</td>
<td>• Begging</td>
<td>• Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Abuse by foster parents and communities</td>
<td>• Squatting</td>
<td>• Water and sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>• Migration to peri-urban areas as street kids</td>
<td>• Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Displacement</td>
<td>Resettlement-allocation of land likely to depend on one’s adult status</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>• Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General insecurity</td>
<td>Political violence</td>
<td>• Displacement</td>
<td>• Fleeing to perceived safe areas</td>
<td>• Treatment for injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Same as above</td>
<td></td>
<td>• counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• material support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: United Nations Inter Agency Vulnerability Assessment Report, August 2000**

As shown above farm orphans have very limited coping mechanisms. Another vulnerable sub-group within the commercial farming communities consists of **no-working elderly or retirees** living on the farms. This group is just as vulnerable as farm orphans because they are physically exhausted and are no longer productive on the farms. This group usually survived by the goodwill of the farmer but cases have been reported where elderly people have been dumped by farmers on roadsides because they are no longer productive. The on going resettlement programme is likely to exclude this group because they are no longer economically active and some are visually impaired and if no intervention measures are taken such retirees are likely to become destitute.

The FEWS all farms census estimates that there are on average 3.7 (male and female) no-working elderly persons per farm. This means therefore that if more than 3000 farms are
acquired for resettlement there will be around 14 000 elderly people who would need shelter, food, blankets, medicine and clothing. Some of these elderly people have the burden of looking after AIDS orphans.

Another vulnerable sub-group within the commercial farming areas consists of children living on the farms. The FEWS all farms census estimates that on average there are 78 children per farm between the ages of 0-16 years. If the resettlement programme affects more than 3000 farms it means more than 234 000 children will be affected. The following table shows the estimated number of different age groups of children on 3000 farms:

Table 5: Children Living on Farms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>AVERAGE PER FARM</th>
<th>ESTIMATED NO. ON 3000 FARMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-16 years</td>
<td>78,5</td>
<td>234 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-6 years</td>
<td>30,7</td>
<td>90 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 years</td>
<td>30,1</td>
<td>90 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-16 years</td>
<td>17,7</td>
<td>51 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Averages from FEWS All Farms Census, 1999

The nature of vulnerability of children on commercial farms is summarised by the following table:

Table 6: Children living on commercial farms (0-16 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF VULNERABILITY</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL CAUSES</th>
<th>EFFECTS ON LIVELIHOODS</th>
<th>COPING MECHANISMS</th>
<th>NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
<td>Parents displaced/retrenched and lose income (99% of households rely on wage labour for income)</td>
<td>• Malnutrition especially under five’s • Malnutrition deficiency diseases • stunting and wasting • Forced marriages</td>
<td>• Reduce food intake • Child labour • Child prostitution</td>
<td>Supplementary feeding especially for the under fives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education inaccessibility</td>
<td>• Displacement /retrenchments of parents disrupts education • Parents cannot afford due to lost income</td>
<td>Increase in number of children not going to school</td>
<td>• dropout of school • repeating grades at primary level</td>
<td>School structures • teachers • Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>• Displacement</td>
<td>• Upsurge in</td>
<td>• Children</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
inaccessibility - can settle in areas with limited or no health facilities
  • Parents can not afford health care

diseases
  • Increase in deaths

send to traditional/fait h healers for treatment
  • Not seeking treatment
  • delaying seeking treatment

facilities
  • Medicines
  • Medical personnel

The exact total numbers of children, their location and needs have not been established by any study. Studies done so far are limited to specific provinces or case studies and are thus less generalisable.

The CFU estimated in June 2000 that at least 10 000 farm workers had been displaced as a result of the fast track programme. The FCTZ report however noted that despite these figures of workers not resettled there is no evidence of displacement and farm workers grouped outside the farms. Where resettlement has taken place farm workers have remained on the farms but they have themselves not been resettled. In cases where farmers have abandoned their farms the workers have also remained on the farms. A few have migrated to neighbouring farms but they still stay on the deserted farm. No study has yet been done to determine how these unresettled farm workers who are out of wage employment are coping. The condition of women and children in particular needs to be established.

The pilot assessment done by UNICEF seeks to address these knowledge gaps specifically focusing on child nutrition, health, food security and education at household level. The CFU is in the process of analysing data on the socio-economic impact of the land reform programme.

As noted earlier on the data available is scanty and mostly concerns farms in the Mashonaland region. The nature and magnitude of the vulnerability, numbers of people in stressful situations and their locations need to be established if intervention measures are to be effectively implemented.