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IOM is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As an intergovernmental organization, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to: assist in meeting the operational challenges of migration; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration; and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.
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Executive Summary

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) implements the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) programme in more than 50 countries around the world with the objective of tracking and monitoring displacement and population mobility. DTM’s tools gather information on various levels and of various kinds, including information on where displacements occur, why they occur, the length of displacement, the migration patterns and the conditions of internally displaced individuals both on site and in transit. This information is shared with relevant stakeholders, including governments and humanitarian partners to enhance understanding of movements of population and of affected peoples’ needs.

The present report aims to provide an overview of displacement and migration trends before 2016 up to October 2018, while also assessing the needs of the affected population in Tsholotsho district in Zimbabwe. Assessments were conducted in four wards most affected by floods namely Wards 5, 6, 15 and 19. Analysis of sector-wide needs were also conducted via these household-level surveys, focusing on shelter and non-food items (NFIs), water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), food and nutrition, health, education, livelihoods and protection. Lastly this report includes analysis on the migration patterns focusing on the period before 2016 up to October 2018, and also evaluates the push factors of migration.

---

Key Highlights

Assessments were carried in Wards 5, 6, 15 and 19 in Tsholotsho district to capture information on displacement and migration.

- The displaced population is estimated at 476 IDP households or 2,343 IDP individuals.
- 100% of displaced households live within the host community.
- 0.4% of the target population is displaced due to community clashes.
- 99.6% of the target population is displaced due to flooding.
- The largest IDP population (374 households) is living within the host community in Ward 6.
- The migrant population is estimated at 707 individuals.

Figure 1. DTM coverage in Zimbabwe

Figure 2. Tsholotsho DTM highlights
Background

Zimbabwe is prone to rapid and slow onset disasters of both natural and man-made origins that have repeatedly caused several devastating effects and triggered population displacement. Over the last decade, natural disasters caused by cyclones and El-Nino, as well as socioeconomic and political factors have all contributed towards migratory movements in the country. In some areas, this has jeopardized hard-won development gains particularly in the southern region which covers the Matebeleland North and Matebeleland South provinces of Zimbabwe. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) and its partners in collaboration with the Government of Zimbabwe has been implementing a collaborative initiative that is primarily aimed at monitoring and advocating for the rights of vulnerable and at-risk populations which include, but are not limited to, internally displaced persons (IDPs), host communities, women, girls, men and boys. One of the key activities under the project “Scaling-up coordinated protection, promotion and enforcement of human rights for citizens and other vulnerable groups including internally displaced persons in Zimbabwe” is to pilot the establishment of Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) in selected sites in Zimbabwe. IOM’s DTM programme in Zimbabwe is funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA).

Limitations

Data collected for this first round should be understood as estimations only and are based on a sample covering four (4) wards out of the twenty-two (22) wards in the Tsholotsho District. For Ward 6, the study relied on official displacement statistics only. However, it should be noted that site verification for Ward 6 was conducted to gather information on migration, sectoral gaps and needs. In Wards 5, 15 and 19, data was collected at household level with family heads responding to questions and providing the necessary information on displacement and migration. The study represents only part of the total displacement and migration flows in Tsholotsho District, and thus uncovered wards and periods are not represented. Data on vulnerabilities and sectoral needs are based on direct observation and information gathered from key informants (NGOs, District Civil Protection Committee, traditional leaders and councilors) and should be understood as mainly indicative. The household-level surveys were also targeted at household representatives who are adults and thus, minority age groups such as children were not captured by the surveys.

---

3 Civic Forum on Human Development (CFHD) and Emthonjeni Women’s Forum (EWF)
Methodology

A total of 12 field-based enumerators were trained to conduct assessments in four IDP and migrant sending wards, namely Wards 5, 6, 15 and 19. Out of the 22 wards in the district, these four wards (Wards 5, 6, 15 and 19) were selected based on their susceptibility to floods and due to the high rate of migrant mobility from these wards. Mixed methods were used to collect data, including key informant interviews with representatives from the local administration and members of the targeted community; and surveys with heads of households.

The DTM assessments were carried-out in two phases. The first phase was an assessment conducted with key informants at district level. The type of information collected at this level focuses on IDPs and includes displaced population estimates (households and individuals), date of arrival, location of origin, reason(s) for displacement and type of displacement location. The assessment also recorded contact information of key informants and organizations assisting IDPs in the district. The main purpose of this assessment is to provide a list of wards where IDPs are present. This list is then used as a reference to continue the assessment at ward level.

The second phase involved surveys targeted at heads of households. The type of information collected at this level includes displaced population estimates (households and individuals), time of arrival, location of origin, reasons of displacement, type of displacement locations and multisectoral needs. This assessment was conducted by interviewing randomly selected households in each of the targeted wards. The results of this assessment were used to verify the information collected at district level.

The second phase was carried out in all wards that had been identified as having IDP populations in the district list. For Ward 6, estimates on displacement (374 HH) were provided by the Government of Zimbabwe. However, site verification was further conducted to gather additional information related to displacement as well as migration. In Wards 5, 15 and 19, the DTM team carried out assessments targeting displaced households from which, information on migration was also captured. Surveyed households who provided explanations of their displacement situation were also asked to provide the migration status of their household members, for instance, notifying if there are members of their household who have migrated abroad for work.

Notably, these household-level surveys were only targeted at adults. As only one representative from each household is surveyed, minority age groups such as children are excluded from the household-level surveys.

Based on the official statistics, Tsholotsho District’s population is estimated at 24,151 households, whereby the household-level surveys covered a sample of 355 households at 99 per cent confidence level, with a 5 per cent margin of error.

---

Profile of Household Representatives

In Figure 3, an overview of the age and sex breakdown of household representatives was obtained based on a sample of 355 households. This sample represents 75 per cent of the IDP and migration population in the four wards (Wards 5, 6, 15 and 19) of Tsholotsho District. 63 per cent of the respondents were female-headed households, whilst 37 per cent were male-headed households. The migration patterns in the region indicates that men are more mobile as they search for better economic prospects in neighbouring countries, while women tend to remain behind to look after families. The dominant age bracket among the sampled household respondents was 36-59 years-old.
Internally Displaced Population

Figure 1. Overview of Internal Displacement in Tsholotsho District

Displacement Key Findings:

- Floods during the 2016/2017 rainy season was the main reason for internal displacement in Wards 5, 6, 15 and 19.
- Assessments on internal displacement show that an estimated total of 476 IDP households or 2,268 individuals have relocated to live in permanent structures with host communities in Tsholotsho District.
- Assessment findings indicate that Ward 6 was most affected by internal displacement with 374 IDP households (79%), followed by Ward 5 with 65 IDP households (14%), Ward 15 with 26 households (5%) and Ward 19 with 11 households (2%).
Reasons for Displacement and Period of Displacement

Assessment on displacement period and the push factors indicate that most of the displacement in the affected areas in Tsholotsho were due to floods caused by cyclone Dineo during the 2016/17 rainy season. Majority of households stated 2017 as their year of displacement with less than one per cent of the displacement occurring before 2016. No displacement estimates were recorded for the year 2016.

Displacement Locations

Figure 5 shows the number of displaced households and individuals in four of the assessed wards. Assessment results indicate that the displaced households are living with host communities and have settled in permanent locations, occupying houses constructed by the government and houses built using their own resources.

Notably, Ward 6 was the most affected by floods with a total of 374 displaced households or 1,870 IDPs, which represents 75 per cent of the IDP caseload identified throughout the assessed wards. This

---

is followed by Ward 5 with 65 displaced households or 316 IDPs (14%), Ward 15 with 26 displaced households or 115 IDPs (5%) and lastly, Ward 19 with 11 displaced households or 42 IDPs (2%).

MIGRANT POPULATION

Figure 6. Migrant population by household and ward

Figure 6 indicates that a total of 707 migrants were reported from 303 households which claim to have migrants in their households. Assessment findings shows that 85 per cent of the households reported to have an average of 2 migrants from their households living outside Zimbabwe while 15 per cent of the households reported not having household members outside the country.

Migration status analysis by location shows that 34 per cent (242 individuals) of the migrants were from Ward 5 while 23 per cent (159 individuals) were from Ward 15, followed by 22 per cent (156 individuals) from Ward 19 and 21 per cent (150 individuals) from Ward 6.
Migration Destination

Figure 7. Destination country of migrants

As shown in Figure 7 above, the majority of migrants relocated to South Africa, with the rest of the migrants moving to other countries. Historically, migration from this district to South Africa dates back to the pre-independence period up to the present day. However, the driver for this migration pattern remains the same, and that is moving for better economic prospects.
Migration Reasons

![Migration Reasons diagram]

Migration push factors assessed on Figure 8 shows that 84 per cent of respondents migrated from the district to neighbouring countries for economic reasons in search of better livelihoods while 16 per cent migrated for other reasons (education, family reunification, temporary trade, etc.).

Migration Period

![Migration Period diagram]

Figure 9 shows analysis of migration trends for Tsholotsho District. An estimated total of 707 individuals migrated from the district during the period before 2016 up to 2018. 73 per cent of migration took place before 2016 while 17 per cent of migration occurred in 2016. Another 5 per cent of migration occurred in 2017 and 6 per cent of migration occurred in 2018. Migration push factors related to this period of migration include economic hardships, floods and recurring drought in the district.
Response efforts in the district reveal a multi-sectoral approach between the government and development partners, with services ranging from agriculture technical assistance, food assistance, shelter provision and provision of non-food items to the affected community. Agencies operating in the district include government departments under the Civil Protection Unit, the Organization of Rural Associations for Progress (ORAP), World Vision, the Zimbabwe National Army, Plan International, UNICEF, Roman Catholic Church, SDA Church and USAID and the International Organization for Migration (IOM).

Multisectoral Gaps

Households from Wards 5, 6 and 15 that were affected by the 2016/17 floods are still struggling to meet their basic food and nutritional needs. Most of the crops (60%) that were planted in the 2016/17 season were destroyed by waterlogging. The assessment also found that there is limited space for meaningful agriculture activities in the new locations where IDPs sought refuge, thus forcing affected
households to move back to their old locations, placing them at risk of potential future flooding. Food insecurity in the area is high due to a combination of flooding and drought. This is evidenced by the number of households who are confirmed to be relying on remittances and food aid from the government and other aid partners. These findings also coincide with the Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee (ZimVac) Report 2017 which identified Tsholotsho as the worst affected district from floods, leaving 859 people homeless. The district was also reported having the highest maize grain prices, which are above USD 0.50/kg.

The main economic activity in Tsholotsho is farming especially herding. The soil in the district is generally bad for cultivation, with the exception of the black clay soil along Gwayi River near Sipepa in Ward 5. This explains why residents from Sipepa in Ward 5 (a drought prone area) have resisted calls to be permanently relocated to the new settlements of Sawudweni and Tshino in the same district. The report also found that government restrictions on agriculture activities such as livestock production in the new settlements is forcing displaced families to move back to their old locations which are flood prone areas. The assessment noted that diaspora remittances are contributing immensely to the livelihood support of displaced households in the area. Households with family members abroad receive remittances from them to cover basic family expenses such as food, school fees and agricultural support. Labour constraints were observed among female-headed households interviewed, as most men move to neighbouring countries in search of jobs, leaving their wives to look after the families and perform agricultural activities.

The assessment noted that the establishment of new settlements at Sawudweni and Tshino in Ward 6 and Canaan in Ward 15 did not translate into an increase in education facilities but witnessed an increase in student enrolment. For instance, during the 2016/17 floods, enrolment at Tshino primary school increased from 500 to 900 pupils. The establishment of new resettlement areas have resulted in an increase of student enrolment, which is beyond the capacity of the schools to accommodate. This is one of the sources of conflict between the IDPs and host families. The lack of resources to support schools with infrastructural rehabilitation (especially those affected by floods) has resulted in overcrowding in nearby schools.

---

6 https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/WFP-0000019918.pdf
Houses with pit latrines and access to clean water were constructed in Tshino and Sawudweni in Ward 6. The assessment found that there is a need to conduct WASH awareness raising initiatives targeted at the beneficiaries of the new settlements, with a focus on peri-urban set-ups for people who previously lived in rural areas. The government through the support of the District Development Fund initially targeted\(^7\) to drill around 12 boreholes with the aim of increasing access to water in the new settlements, including at schools and clinics. Sentiments shared by the respondents show that access to water is a challenge in the district as both humans and livestock sharing the same water source from the few boreholes in the area. The study also noted that in the old and new settlements, there is a lack of proper solid waste disposal mechanisms, which can lead to health risks since the houses are located close to each other and homesteads have no pit latrines.

From the findings, it was observed that Tsholotsho District, much like most districts in Zimbabwe, has no system of documenting residents that are migrating to other countries. The district has been relying on the statistics produced by Zimbabwe National Statistics Agency (ZIMSTATS) for migration data. At household level, the assessment found that migrants from the Tsholotsho District, and particularly from Ward 19 lack proper travel documentation, such as passports, birth certificates and national IDs. This has been exacerbated by the high costs needed to acquire proper travel documentation as well as the long waiting period for processing passports. During the DTM exercise, some of the respondents were not comfortable in sharing information on their relatives or friends who migrated to South Africa and Botswana due to fear that the exercise might be documenting irregular migrants from the district. Information collected through key informant interviews with government representatives show that migrants from the district prefer to use transport operators “Malaichas” as a cheaper way to facilitate migration to the country of destination. However, it was noted that with this mode of transportation, there is high chance of human smuggling which could later lead to human trafficking.

Non-food items in the form of tents, mosquito nets, clothing and foot wear were provided to the victims of the 2016/2017 flooding. Government departments such as the Civil Protection Unit, Public Service, Public Works and Red Cross supported the construction of houses in Ward 6. At the time of the assessment, a total of 374 standard houses (Figure 12) had been constructed by the Government of Zimbabwe to accommodate the affected households. However, it is important to note that the new settlement resembles a peri-urban set up, whereby livestock or crop production are also not allowed by the government. The ban on agricultural activities in the new location has resulted in the affected household resisting relocation and preferring to move back to their old locations, while reserving the new homes for emergencies. Assessments in the old location found that some mud houses had collapsed during the rainy season due to moisture, leaving families in need of shelter support.