Tropical Cyclone Idai Response
Return Assessment Reintegration and Recovery
Manicaland – Round 2

Introduction

Tropical Cyclone Idai made landfall in Zimbabwe on 15 March 2019 and the country experienced floods and sustained heavy rains which left a trail of destruction including shelter, lives and livelihoods mostly in Manicaland and Masvingo provinces. From 24 to 30 April 2020, IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) team in coordination with the Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ) conducted Return Assessments in 64 villages across Buhera, Chimanimani and Chipinge Districts of Manicaland province. The following report is an analysis of the current situation of the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in the affected villages. The survey gathered information regarding shelter arrangements, livelihood conditions and ways of promoting the safe, dignified and sustainable return and reintegration of those who had been displaced by the cyclone. This report provides an overview of the key results and highlight elements of the data that should be considered for subsequent programming and intervention.

Challenges

Assessment of some areas in province was hampered by poor mobile connectivity in certain villages due to poor telecommunications coverage. The definition of the term returnee was not properly articulated by the enumerators as evidenced by the number of returnees reported in some districts with most of the IDPs having returned to their original homes.

Key Findings

The survey covered 64 villages which reported presence of returnees during the village assessment. Across the three districts, 57 villages reported that all the returnees were able to return to their places of origin as illustrated in the chart below.

![Chart 1: Proportion of returnee families who were able to return to their own homes by village.](chart1.png)

- For Chipinge district 53 villages reported that everyone (100%) was able to return, three villages reported that most (75%) families were able to return and two villages reported that about half (50%) of the families were able to return.
- In Chimanimani district, two of the three assessed villages reported that everyone managed to return to their original homes, while one village reported that (25%) of the displaced families were able to return to their original homes.
- In Buhera two villages reported that everyone (100%) was able to return to their original homes, while one village reported that most (75%) of the returnees were able to return to their original homes.

The majority of the IDPs have returned to their original homes as reported by 61 villages across the three assessed districts as illustrated in Table 2 and Chart 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelter type</th>
<th>Number of families</th>
<th>No of villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Homes</td>
<td>2,616</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Shelter type breakdown of the returnees across the three districts
The majority of the returnee families returned to their original homes in April and May 2019 as reported by 22 villages each. (See Chart 3 below)

The three main factors influencing the returnees intentions in their original homes were reported as:

- In Buhera, three villages reported that housing availability and reuniting with relatives and friends influenced their return, followed by availability of service delivery was highlighted by two villages and availability of job opportunities/livelihood activities as highlighted by one village.

- In Chimanimani, three villages reported that 25 per cent of the returnee families had access to income generating or livelihood opportunities while in Buhera two villages reported that 25 per cent of the returnee families had access to income generating or livelihood opportunities and one village reported that half of the returnee families had access.

- In Chipinge, 30 villages reported 50 per cent, while 11 villages reported none, 10 villages reported most (75%), six villages reported 25 per cent and one village reported that all returnee families had access to income generating and livelihood opportunities.

All the assessed 64 villages reported that the majority of the families have returned to their original homes permanently.