In order to measure the impact of food assistance the CHS uses the CSI as the key indicator for the effect of food assistance on its beneficiaries. The Coping Strategies Index (CSI) measures the frequency and severity of actions taken by households in response to the presence or threat of a food shortage. A comparative analysis is also provided between the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households when assessing the impact of food assistance. A lower score of the CSI implies reduced stress on the household and hence a household will be having a better food security situation.

The mean CSI for beneficiaries is significantly ($p < 0.001$) lower than that for non-beneficiaries. The October 2007 survey shows a decrease in the CSI for the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households when compared to March 2007. The comparison of the CSI from October 2006 to October 2007 shows that the CSI has largely remained static. The fact that the beneficiary household’s food security situation is better than the non-beneficiary households indicates the positive impact of food assistance programmes in alleviating food insecurity.

By programme activity, VGF beneficiaries have the highest CSI score at 24. The OVC beneficiary households had the lowest CSI at 11. The most common strategies households are engaging in include limiting portion sizes (73%), reducing the number of meals eaten per day (73%), eating less preferred foods (57%), doing casual labor for food (53%), adults eating less (51%) and borrowing food (50%) among other mechanisms.

The food consumption score not only allows comparisons of dietary quality and diversity between beneficiary and non-beneficiary populations but also is used to establish a threshold of dietary quality against which to compare these populations. Research has shown that dietary diversity and food frequency are good proxy measures of household food security.

### Dietary Adequacy

The **food consumption score** not only allows comparisons of dietary quality and diversity between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households but also is used to establish a threshold of dietary quality against which to compare these populations. Research has shown that dietary diversity and food frequency are good proxy measures of household food security.

The **chart** shows that the percentage of **beneficiary** households with poor consumption has decreased since March 2007 to almost none while the percentage of non-beneficiary households with poor consumption has increased. This indicates the positive impact of food assistance on household food consumption despite worsening conditions. The best consumption was found amongst the HBC and OVC beneficiary households while 60% of MVP households had poor or borderline consumption.

### Consumption classifications

Using a 7-day recall period, information was collected on the variety and frequency of different foods and food groups to calculate a weighted food consumption score. Weights were based on the nutritional density of the foods.

Households were then classified as having either ‘poor’, ‘borderline’ or ‘adequate’ consumption based on the analysis of the data.

Households with ‘borderline’ consumption consume the equivalent of cereals and vegetables on a daily basis plus pulses and oils about 4 times per week. Those with ‘poor’ consumption managed to eat the equivalent of only cereals and vegetables on a daily basis. This is considered a bare minimum and is a sign of extreme household food insecurity.
In order to better understand the relative importance of different livelihood sources the heads of households were asked to estimate the contribution of each source to the total household income. The graph on the right shows that the greatest contribution to total income for non-beneficiary households is from casual labour, accounting for 23% of total income. Other main sources include petty trade and vegetable sales. When compared to October 2006, the reliance on casual labour decreased from 42%, reflecting a change in access to work. The graph on the left shows that for beneficiary households, the greatest contribution to total income is also casual labour, followed by petty trade, food assistance and vegetable sales. Reliance on casual labour has also decreased from October 2006. For both groups, however, reliance on petty trade has increased greatly. When comparing the two groups, there are significant differences in share from skilled trade and, of course, food assistance.

### Contribution to Total Income

![Graph showing contribution to total income](image)

### Livelihood Sources and Expenditure

#### Main livelihood sources of households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Non-beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual labour</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty trade</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food assistance</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Vegetable sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables sales</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Remittances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Avian Influenza Issues

Poultry and sales of poultry products are important sources of income in some rural households in Zimbabwe. The October 2007 CHS again attempts to investigate the potential impact of an outbreak of avian influenza on these households.

- In Round 9, 60% each of beneficiary and non-beneficiary households reported owning at least one chicken. This was a decrease in comparison to 77% beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, who reported to be owning at least one chicken.
- More of the male headed households (65%) owned poultry and less female headed (59%) households owned poultry.
- For beneficiary households, those with adequate consumption are much more likely to own poultry.
- 16% of beneficiary households and only 10% of non-beneficiary households had consumed chicken or eggs in the week prior to the survey. This is similar to the findings from March 2007.

#### Expenditure information

For both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, casual labour was a main income activity for around 40% of households, followed by petty trade for over 30% of the non-beneficiaries and 27% of beneficiaries, as indicated in the table on the left. Food assistance was a main source of livelihood for 27% of beneficiaries, down from 72% in March 2007 and 38% in October 2006. Compared to March 2007 reliance on petty trade increased for both groups.

- Significantly more (p < 0.05) non-beneficiary households are likely to name only one livelihood source (47%) as compared to beneficiary households (38%) who can count food aid as a source of livelihood. The percentage of households with only one source has increased from March 2007.
- 21% of OVC and 19% of HBC beneficiaries rely on remittances as compared to around 7-10% of other programme beneficiaries.
- HBC beneficiaries were most likely to name food assistance as a main livelihood source.
- More than 40% of the MVP and VGF beneficiaries relied on casual labour.
- VGF beneficiaries were the least likely to rely on vegetable production as a livelihood.
- VGF beneficiary households were the most likely to name only one source of livelihood (40%), followed by MVP beneficiary households (30%).

Information is collected on:

- Household demographics
- Household livelihood strategies
- Coping strategies
- Food aid outcomes
- Food consumption & sources of food consumed
- Vulnerable Groups
  - Orphaned children
  - Chronically ill
  - Female headed households
  - Elderly headed households
  - Asset poor
  - Disabled
- Targeting observations
- Household wealth and income
- Detailed household expenditure
- Agricultural production
In this round, vulnerability was assessed by considering the number of vulnerable characteristics (out of 12) had by each household.

- The variables used were asset poverty, female or elderly head, chronically ill member, hosting orphans, disabled member, recent death of a member, 80% or more dependents, poor housing quality, poor access to safe drinking water and sanitation, and having no livestock.
- Households were described as having either low (0-1 characteristics), moderate (2-5) or high (6+) vulnerability.
- More beneficiary households had high vulnerability (26%) as compared to non-beneficiary households (20%).
- The chart below compares the mean coping strategies index (CSI) and food consumption score (FCS) by vulnerability level and beneficiary status. For beneficiaries it is important to see that the food consumption score is higher for all vulnerability groups than the non-beneficiaries. Levels of coping increase with increased vulnerability for the non-beneficiaries. This trend is not apparent in beneficiaries.
- By programme activity, more VGF beneficiary households (29%) had high vulnerability compared to MVP (25%), HBC (22%) or OVC (21%) beneficiaries.
- By sub-office, more beneficiary households in Mashonaland (34%) and Bulawayo (30%) Sub-offices had high vulnerability when compared to Mutare (20%) and Masvingo (14%) Sub-offices.
- The Bulawayo sub-office area had the highest percentage of non-beneficiaries with high vulnerability (27%).

### Targeting Efficiency

**WFP Zimbabwe and partners target households who are considered vulnerable based on social-economic and socio-demographic criteria** that vary according to programme activity. Characterization of sampled households according to vulnerability, indicated an improvement in the targeting of beneficiaries across WFP programmes particularly in the Home Based Care programme.

- Targeting and implementation of programme interventions in Mutare and Masvingo Sub-offices can be further improved, particularly under the VGF programme were the CHS data shows an inclusion of 10% of households in the low vulnerability category. Further verifications exercises should be conducted to improve targeting under this programme activity.
- Exclusions of more than 20% of highly vulnerable non-beneficiaries were however noted in Mashonaland and Bulawayo Sub-office regions.
- Under the MVP programme, 5% of the beneficiary households were in the low vulnerability category. HBC and OVC programmes have maintained targeting efficiency by recording zero households in low vulnerability compared to 3% recorded March 07 (R8).
Transfer preference findings were consistent with those from the March 2007 round. Nearly 75% preferred food only while close to a quarter of the interviewed households, preferred both food and cash with only a few (2%) preferred cash only.

The main reasons food only was preferred were: satisfied HH food shortages (76%), the market supply of food is unpredictable (59%), food prices are high (47%), food prices are unpredictable (38%) and difficulty in access the markets (33%). The main reasons both food and cash were preferred include: best meets seasonal needs (88%), ability to cope is improved (68%) and ‘other’ reasons (43%).

By programmes, the chart below compared October 2007 to March 2007. HBC (31%) and VGF (30%) beneficiaries are the most likely to prefer both food and cash assistance. For almost all programme types there has been an increase in preference for both cash and food with the exception of the MVP beneficiaries who had an increased interest in food only assistance when compared to March 2007.

Sources of Food Consumed by Households

Identifying the major sources of food and monitoring these over time is critical to understanding the principal factors affecting food security of households. As illustrated in the chart below:

- **Non-beneficiary** households accessed most of their food through purchase and some production; those with poor consumption also relying significantly more on casual labour and less on food assistance ($p < 0.001$) to access food. Compared to March 2007, a greater share of consumption is coming from purchase and much less from hunting/gathering and production.
- **Beneficiary households also** relied mostly on food assistance with some production and purchase to access their food. However those with poor consumption rely more on production and purchase and less on food assistance. For all households, access hunting/gathering has decreased while reliance on purchase has increased compared to March 2007.

**Education of Children**

- For beneficiaries, 84% of eligible boys and 83% of girls are attending school compared to 73% (B&G) in March 2007, 78% (B) and 76% (G) in October 2006 and 81% (B) and 81% (G) in March 2006.
- When comparing by beneficiary status, non-beneficiary children are slightly less likely to be enrolled (76%).
- However, by programme activity, more than 90% of children from OVC beneficiary households are enrolled and attending as compared to around 80% for the other programme beneficiaries.
- Male orphans are not less likely to be enrolled and attending school. However, female orphans, and especially double orphans, are more likely to have dropped out of school.
- By age, for both orphans and non-orphans, enrollment drops dramatically starting after the age of 11 years.
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