

PD-ABL-749

**SCOPE OF WORK FOR ZIMBABWE
AGRICULTURAL STUDY
JUNE, 1990**

PDC -0100-Z-00-9044-00
5801.103B

The Futures Group International
1050 17th Street NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036

SCOPE OF WORK
FOR
ZIMBABWE AGRICULTURAL STUDY
GENESYS 90-50.026
JUNE 1990

CONTENTS

SCOPE OF WORK	1
Rationale	3
Background	4
SCOPE OF WORK FOR PHASE I--LIMITED IMPACT ASSESSMENT DETERMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INCREASED MARKETED YIELDS OF COMMUNAL LANDS AND ACREAGE UNDER CULTIVATION	12
Purpose	12
Study Approach	13
Consultant Tasks	14
Consultant Considerations	15
SCOPE OF WORK FOR PHASE II--RANDOM HOUSEHOLD FIELD SURVEYS EXAMINING THE LINKS BETWEEN GENDER-ACCESSED RESOURCES AND INCREASED MARKETED YIELD OF MAIZE AND COTTON	17
Purpose	17
Study Approach	17
Consultant Tasks	21
Consultant Qualifications	22
Scope of Work Deliverables	24
ILLUSTRATIVE BUDGET	25
REFERENCES	32

SCOPE OF WORK

A two-phase examination of the links between women's and men's access to increased Government of Zimbabwe/Zimbabwe Agriculture Sector Assistance (GOZ/ZASA) Resources in communal land areas and the increased marketed yield of maize and cotton.

Phase I: Limited impact assessment to examine the relationship between increased marketed yields of communal lands and acreage under cultivation (15 days in the field; 3 days before and one week post field work).

Phase II: Household field surveys to examine the links between access to resources and increased marketed yield of maize and cotton on communal lands (46 days in the field; 2 days pre and 5 days post field work).

THE GENESYS PROJECT

April 1990

SCOPE OF WORK

According to official Government of Zimbabwe (GOZ) statistics, the marketed share of maize and cotton produced on smallholder/traditional farmlands increased dramatically between the harvest period before Independence (1980) and the harvest period of 1985-1986. The Grain Marketing Board (GMB), the sole buyer of maize outside of local consumer markets, reports that farmers in the lower economic level of this country increased their maize output delivered to markets by more than 600 percent in a 7-year period. Smallholder farmers comprise this economic strata and are registered on communal land, small-scale commercial farms, and resettled areas. Together they accounted for maize deliveries of 84,300 MT in the harvest season of 1977-1978. In the 1985-1986 season they delivered 524,840 MT of maize.

Similarly, the Cotton Marketing Board (CMB) describes an impressive increase of deliveries: 45,000 MT of seed cotton was sold to the CMB in the post-harvest season of 1977-1978--and 140,000 MNT in 1986. This is a 300 percent increase.

In 1986, small farm holders accounted for 40 percent and 50 percent respectively of total maize and cotton deliveries. (Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1988.)

Of the group making up the lower economic strata of farmers in the country, Communal Land farmers stand out as the most noteworthy subsector. One hundred seventy-four separate communal areas are home to 850,000 farming families, each cultivating on an average arable holding of 2.5 hectares of land. These farmers are at once the most deprived of resources and live in the most densely populated regions--and yet they are the most successful of the aggregated lower economic sector group. Unverified figures for 1988 estimate that communal land farmers alone provided 57 percent of GMB deliveries--and a probable 75 percent of the nation's maize crop as a whole. (Director of the East and Southern Africa Office of Development Innovations and Networks (IREN) in an article entitled, "Women and Agriculture in Zimbabwe," published by Ecoforum, Vol. 13, No. 2, October 1988.) This achievement is more remarkable when one considers that in 1985 the ratio between GOZ agriculture extension workers and farmers at the "grassroots level" was one for every 750 farm families. (CGIAR Study Paper #6.)

The President of Zimbabwe and other political leaders have spoken with pride of this remarkable achievement--and have cited female farmers as a major factor in this success. USAID/Zimbabwe can also take pride in these results. The centerpiece of USAID's agricultural program has been the Zimbabwe Agriculture Sector Assistance (ZASA) program which has provided \$55 million in cash and commodity resources to assist the smallholders in communal lands to become more productive. Eighty percent of the Zimbabwean population live in rural areas--the major proportion of this percentage is found on communal lands. It is estimated that over 75 percent of the rural population are women and children.

An attempt to replicate or further the remarkable success evidenced by the communal land farmers is hampered by the lack of disaggregated information identifying causal variables. It is not known, for example, whether the increased market share from communal lands is the result of an overall increase in arable communal land or indicative of increased productivity per land unit or a change in production practices. Are the cultivators of communal farm units accessing more resources in order to increase their yield? Has small farmer technical assistance been improved? Has there been responsive outreach to communal land farmers? Have women and men received equal access to extension services and resources? What are the labor implications of male presence/nonpresence on the farm land? What current gender considerations in agriculture support activities have been the most helpful in addressing differentiated needs? What resulting associated activities have been most effective in reaching the labor providers? What other gender considerations would increase activity impact if incorporated into ongoing agricultural support activities?

Rationale

The following scope of work has been developed with these questions in mind. It proposes a two-phase activity that will result in identifying those variables that have played a significant role in increasing marketed maize and cotton. The results of the first phase will establish whether there has been a significant change in unit yield within the communal lands or whether increased yield is, in the main, a result of an increase in acreage under production within communal lands since Independence or due to other variables (i.e. rainfall). It will show whether resource access at the user level contributed to this increased marketed share.

Phase II will take the results of Phase I and follow it through to provide an in-depth user profile at the communal farm level. Phase II will conduct a sample household survey of communal land farmers that will identify variables of various interventions. The purpose of this phase is to assess the extent to which GOZ-supported agricultural activities reached male and female farmers appropriate to their roles and responsibilities, and how this has/has not resulted in increases in productivity, income, and market participation. Data analysis of the survey sampling will demonstrate links, if any, between marketed maize and cotton and the use of agricultural resources made available by GOZ. It is expected that the results of the Phase II Scope of Work will respond to both USAID/Zimbabwe's WID Action Plan request for more gender disaggregated analysis and will provide to the Mission in general, gender disaggregated information that will strengthen Mission objectives in ongoing and future activities.

This scope of work can be viewed as a complementary piece to the more exhaustive ZASA evaluation scheduled to take place in 1990. It offers a focused impact analysis of gender dynamics affecting communal farm marketed maize and cotton.

Background

Zasa

The Zimbabwe Agricultural Sector Assistance Program (ZASA) is a controlled resource transfer whose basic objective is to support implementation of GOZ policies that will improve the agricultural production, productivity and incomes of Zimbabwe's smallholder farmers. Originally approved in 1982, the start-up date was delayed until 1983 due to logistical reasons. The program's completion date has been extended through June 30, 1992.

Of the \$55 million funding, \$42.75 million has been allocated for a commodity import component to provide funds for agricultural inputs, primarily for the private sector; the remaining \$12.25 million is for technical assistance, training and public sector agricultural equipment. All foreign exchange provided for commodity imports has been expended. Local currency is generated by the commodity import mechanism.

The funds are jointly programmed by the GOZ and USAID, through the interministerial ZASA Working Group. The Working Group is chaired by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Policy Development (MFEPD) and includes the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG); Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and Rural Development (MLRRD); the Ministry of Trade and Commerce; the University of Zimbabwe, and USAID/Zimbabwe. Together they approve budget allocations and program orientation. Among the many implementers the Working Group collaborates with are such notables as the Agricultural Finance Corporation (AFC), the Department of Agricultural, Technical and Extension Services (AGRITEX), the Agricultural and Rural Development Authority and the Department of Cooperatives.

Funds support development activities in seven constraint areas. Accompanying their listing below, are summarized recommendations made in the 1985 evaluation of the ZASA Project in an effort to strengthen activity adaptation to address the needs of small farmholders:

- Agricultural Research. Small landholder adaptation suggests continued research into farm power sources, labor availability, small-scale mechanization, variety trials on traditional crops, variety trials on drought resistant crops, new and adaptive cropping system.
- Agriculture Extension. Recommendations include strengthening training programs, providing access to production inputs and information, adding transportation equipment, increasing service provision, reorganizing assignment locations, increasing the number of field agents.
- Agriculture Manpower Training. Continue providing short-term technical training to agriculture staff, replace or expand missing technical staff at training and academic institutions, improve management level of the Cooperative Union and the Department of Cooperatives under the Ministry of Lands, Resettlement and Rural Development.
- Agriculture Credit. Continue support of already successful Small Farmer Credit Scheme, the Resettlement Credit Scheme.
- Land and Water Use Including Irrigation. Increase support of GOZ administrative capacity to respond to smallholder irrigation needs, increase research into irrigation and management of irrigation water.

- Input Supply and Marketing. ZASA's strategy for improving input supply and marketing services was to develop a large network of cooperative societies to serve the smallholder population. The original target of constructing 40 warehouses has been reached. Approximately one-half of the projected 400 local sales input/produce assembly points were finished in construction at the time of the 1985 evaluation. However, neither warehouse nor local facilities were fully functioning at this juncture. As the smallholder increases his/her market orientation in crop production/productivity, the fully operating cooperatives grow in importance.
- Policy/Planning. Continue to support GOZ policy of assigning priority to improving the economic status of smallholders, support adequate price incentives to achieve needed investments and production effort, continue agriculture budget allocations.

Communal Land Territories

Communal land territory occupies about one-half of the arable land in Zimbabwe (49 percent). Similar to practices elsewhere in Africa, they were set up as Tribal Trusts and served the colonialists as sources of labor and repositories for retired workers. They are located in every agro-ecological zone of Zimbabwe, but all share in common the agricultural marginality of land that is inherently infertile, inconsistently viable, over-populated and over-cultivated.

As a point of clarification, many official data reports group "small-scale commercial farms," "resettlement areas" and "communal lands" into a single aggregate when presenting information on the lower economic sector of small farmer activity. They are categorically referred to as "smallholder farmers." Broken down into their respective subsectors, however, it is apparent that communal land farmers are the largest group in terms of designated land holdings and population: small-scale commercial farms hold the smallest proportion of land--only 3.6 percent of the country's land total, 4.3 percent of the arable land, and 8,500 farming units. Resettlement areas comprise 7 percent of the country's land total, 8 percent of the arable land, and 36,000 farming units. Communal land numbers on the other hand, represent 42 percent of the total land, 49 percent of the agricultural land and 850,000 farm units. (See Table 1.)

The remaining classification of land is referred to as the large commercial farms. They are lands owned by the most well-to-do economic sector of the country. Typically, they were lands claimed and cultivated by the original colonists of Zimbabwe. Most of them still are not owned by the indigenous people of the country. "The pattern of land division between the blacks and whites that had evolved during the 90 years of colonial rule is such that not only is the majority of the population confined to less than half the country, but most of the areas set aside for the blacks are located in the agriculturally more marginal parts of the country. These also coincide with areas of inherently infertile sand soils derived from granitic formations and widespread exposed rock domes and iselbergs." (Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography, *ibid*, p. 153.) Due to a legislated policy of the current GOZ, these lands can only be purchased on a "willing-seller/willing-buyer" basis. Approximately 1,000 farms exchanged hands in the period between 1982 and 1988. (See Table 1.)

Land is also classified according to arability. There are five agro-ecological zones in Zimbabwe, each relating primarily to the pattern of rainfall that can be found there. Sixty-five percent of the land in the country is in Zone IV and Zone V. This land is semi-arid. It experiences erratic rainfall, severe dry spells and is of marginal agricultural use. Seventy-four percent of the smallholder farmers can be found there. Another 17 percent of smallholder farmers can be found in Zone III. The effectiveness of agricultural productivity in this zone is inconsistent due to fairly severe mid-season dry spell and periodic heavy rainfalls. Table 2 below links agro-ecological zone to arability and location of smallholder farms.

In addition to using agro-ecological zones, information available through the Central Statistical Office identifies smallholder activity by province. Zimbabwe is divided into eight provinces. The 1982 census figures report that the majority of smallholder farms are located in the three provinces of Masvingo, Midlands, and Manicaland. Consistent with other reports describing agricultural land cultivated by the smallholder, these three provinces are significantly impacted by agro-ecological systems described by Zones III, IV, and V.

However, despite the constraints posed by these less well-endowed agro-ecological systems, the GMB Producer's Registry and CSO 1984 records report that the average quantity of maize sold per household between the years 1980 and 1986 rose substantially in these three provinces. For example, in 1980, smallholder households in the Midlands were selling an average of 98 kg. of

maize to the GMB. In 1986, they were delivering 425 kg. The per household amounts in Masvingo and Manicaland rose a respective 370 and 435 percent in the same period of time. (See Table 3.)

Table 1
FARM HOLDING IN ZIMBABWE PER TYPE AND ARABILITY

Farm Type	% of Land in Zimbabwe		% of Arable Land		# of Farm Units (000s)		Average Size of Holding (Hectares)		Average Amount Cultivated (Hectares)	
	1982	1988	1982	1988	1982	1988	1982	1988	1982	1988
Large Commercial Farms	40	33	70	39	5-6	4.5	Varies	Varies	Varies	Varies
Communal Land Farms	45	42	?	49	750	850	22	22	2.5	?
Small-Scale Farms		3.6	?	4.3	?	8.5	?	125	Varies	Varies
Resettle-ment Areas	?	7	?	8	?	36	12	?	Varies	Varies

Table 2

Zone	% of Land in Zimbabwe*	Recommended Use**	Smallholder % per Zone***	% of Large Commercial per Each Zone
I	1.8	Afforestation, subtropical fruits, tea and coffee	1	3
II	15.0	Intensive System Farming, both livestock and crops	8	27
III	18.7	Semi-Intensive, mid-season dry spell make enterprise based solely crops slightly marginal	17	45
IV	37.8	Rainfall generally too low and erratic for cash cropping; drought resistant crops and livestock recommended	45	26
V	26.7	Rainfall is erratic, temperatures high, crop production marginal, recommended use for livestock	29	22

*The Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography, *ibid*, 1988.

**Consultant Group on International Agricultural Research, Study Paper #6, 1985.

***Agriculture Sector Study, published by the World Bank, December 3, 1983.

Table 3

**AVERAGE QUANTITY OF MAIZE SOLD PER HOUSEHOLD BY
PROVINCE TO THE GMB, 1980-1986* (in kg.)**

Province	AVERAGE SOLD PER HOUSEHOLD							Total 1980-1986**	
	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	Tonnes	(%)
Manicaland	64	245	201	22	146	403	279	228,022	8.2
Mashonaland Central	224	996	1,284	654	1,250	1,756	1,589	565,162	20.5
Mashonaland East	197	626	1,097	287	912	1,578	897	587,433	21.3
Mashonaland West	391	1,475	1,389	1,084	1,691	2,503	2,334	683,211	24.8
Masvingo	39	211	72	>1	283	636	145	234,284	8.5
Matabeleland North	3	54	21	14	204	506	10	53,670	1.9
Matabeleland South	18	55	35	12	22	74	8	16,596	0.6
Midlands	98	499	230	15	307	916	425	371,369	13.5
Sector's Average (kg)	111	450	444	176	494	926	568		
Sector's Total (Tonnes)	87,421	363,274	366,418	150,312	432,690	832,655	524,842		

*The crop is normally harvested during May-July and sold shortly after. The GMB (Grain Marketing Board) intake year runs from April to the following March. Thus, the 1986 harvest crop was sold during the intake year April 1986 to March 1987.

**Plus another 17,875 tonnes that were not assigned to a particular province.

SOURCES: Compiled from GMB Producers' Registry records; CSO (undated); CSO (1984); Stanning, J. (1987).

Smallholder farmers in the three Mashonaland provinces have also done remarkably well. These provinces have some of the best agricultural land in the country. However, less than 10 percent of smallholder farmers have holdings in the rich Mashonaland provinces. Despite that, average smallholder household delivery in each of the three provinces have increased significantly between 1980 and 1986 (See Table 3). Average household yield for Mashonaland Central alone rose over 700 percent from 1980 delivery to 1986.

Rights to cultivate land within communal land areas are determined by the Village Headman. He generally allocates 22 hectares of land to each farm household--of which an average of 2.5 hectares is cultivated. The rest of the land either lies fallow or is used for livestock. Allocation of land is invariably made directly to the male head of the family. Should he die, the Headman may reallocate it or divide it up among surviving family members. Surviving wives have no traditional land rights. Their welfare is left up to the discretion of the Headman and the acquiescence family members directly related to the husband.

An estimated 75 percent of the rural population are women and children--the majority of men departing in search of paid labor. The wives left behind by their spouses are left with responsibilities to cultivate cash crops for cash earnings and food crops, by which the family feeds itself. In the early 1980s, interviews with communal land women described frustrations one would expect to find in such a situation. They describe carrying the burden alone without access to resources or ability to make decisions. Autonomy extends only as far as the husband allows it. They report frustrations in decisions made by an absent husband. They fear that emphasis on mono-cropping will deprive them of land needed to feed their family, but have little influence in the choice of crop type. Checks made out by the marketing boards are written to the "head of the household." They exercise little, if any, control over expenditures. Divorce is an easy and simple matter in the communal lands. In the experience of these women, being divorced is analogous to being landless. Being landless is the same as having no source of living. The divorced woman becomes entirely dependent on family members.

The proposed study/survey should provide some indication of whether the conditions described above are still typical of the women farmers on Zimbabwe's communal lands.

**SCOPE OF WORK FOR PHASE I–LIMITED IMPACT ASSESSMENT
DETERMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INCREASED MARKETED YIELDS
OF COMMUNAL LANDS AND ACREAGE UNDER CULTIVATION**

Purpose

Phase I proposes to present a comparative analysis of marketed maize and cotton harvested on communal farm units from the time of independence to the end of the 1988 harvest season. In seeking to explain causes for increased marketed yield, this study will determine the role, if any, the following four variables played:

- Communal Land Overall Area Size. A determination will be made of any significant change in the total area of land designated as Communal Land during this time period. A relevant change in land size under cultivation might determine the major factor in increased yields in Communal Land areas. No change or an insignificant increase would suggest other variables at play.
- Household Unit Size Under Cultivation. A determination will be made as to whether a change in average unit size allocated to farmer household within Communal Land area occurred. Similar to the above variable, a change in the amount of arable land under cultivation as per household unit, may be held accountable for increased marketed yield as per household. If no significant change is determined, this variable is discounted.
- Area under Cultivation of Maize and Cotton. A determination will be made as to whether the total area of land devoted to maize and cotton cultivation increased at the expense of other crops or by extensive use of formerly fallow lands in the Communal Lands areas.
- Constant Land Size and Increased Market Yield. A determination will be made as to whether marketed output increased on cultivation units that remained constant in size. A correlation between increased resource availability and user access might be a contributing factor to increased marketed yield.

Influencing factors affecting crop yield and market share independent of the presence of agricultural support activities (such as weather conditions, changes in prices offered by the marketing board, currency devaluation, male urban migration, war, material or infrastructure destruction) will be identified as such and included in the conclusions drawn from the study. Variables introduced or resulting from GOZ intervention (training opportunities, commodity imports, credit, and research) will also be identified as such and included in the conclusions.

N.B.: The Phase II household survey will further refine the role each variable played in increasing the marketed yield of maize and cotton, and approximate the weight each variable carried within the household unit itself.

Study Approach

Of particular assistance to this phase of the Scope of Work is the information available at the Central Statistical Office (CSO) and the National Office of Statistics in Zimbabwe. The CSO conducted an Intercensal Demography Survey in July of 1987 and 1988. This was a general demographic survey that included 20,000 households nationally. Together with the companion Zimbabwe Demography and Health Survey (completed in April 1990), gender disaggregated information on farming households, including household members, residency status, occupation and economic condition are expected to be obtainable for this study/survey.

Other suggested sources of information include the respective crop marketing boards, previous evaluations from USAID, data statistics from the World Bank regional office, and the African Development Bank. Relevant information obtained from these sources should be complemented by interviews with associated departments within the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Cooperatives, Ministry for Community Development and Women's Affairs, knowledgeable members of the Working Group and USAID/Zimbabwe.

The consultant will collect and analyze as much information as can be obtained in order to determine the roles played in increased marketed yield.

Consultant Tasks

In conducting Phase I, the GENESYS consultant will:

- Discuss information needs in detail with AID/Washington staff (PPC/WID, AFWID, Zimbabwe desk officer and appropriate others), USAID/Zimbabwe staff.,
- Identify the extent to which communal land holdings remained the same in overall designation and individual farmer unit.
- Identify significant actions taken by the Working Group and associated implementing institutions, in addressing small-scale farmer needs. This might include identifying key actions designed to effect production practices, access to commercial markets, market participation itself, crop mix, or income return.
- Identify any eligibility requirements for accessing the introduced agricultural resources: Is agricultural assistance applicable to all households or only those with certain types of resources already in hand (i.e., size of arable land holding, some form of credit collateral, references, economic status, etc.)? Which members of the household receive assistance?
- Identify any prerequisites that are gender biased (e.g., membership in cooperative land ownership).
- Identify the key components of the methodology used by GOZ to target smallholder farms. For example, how was information about the resources distributed at the community level? Is promotional information channeled through networks reaching both male and female audiences? How was information elicited to identify smallholder needs? What kinds of considerations were made in identifying networks appropriate to respective gender roles?
- Highlight areas of resource concentration in Communal Land areas and type of resource(s) introduced (i.e., newly constructed agricultural storage facilities, newly operating cooperatives, input-sales centers, increased number of agriculture extension workers, rehabilitated or newly constructed marketing roads, etc.).

- Identify other relevant variables affecting gender differences increased in marketed output that can be further pursued in Phase II study.
- Access available demographic material and identify Communal Land areas by the percent of households that are male-headed with male not normally present construed to mean away from farming household at least 20 full days a month, male-headed and present and female-headed households.
- Determine whether marketed maize/cotton increases were due to greater productivity or increased land under cultivation; provide hypothesis for links between yield increases, increases in marketed output, and GOA resource input.
- Conduct at least one on-site visit to a Communal Land area to deepen familiarity for reaching report conclusions.
- Analyze data and prepare report as detailed under "Reporting Requirements."
- Identify local resources (e.g., universities, research organizations) capable of conducting survey research in Phase II and discuss the proposed study design with them.

Consultant Considerations

Approximately 3 CVs will be transmitted to USAID/Zimbabwe for this consultancy. The Mission will select the one it finds most appropriate for this SOW. Because of the relatively short amount of time allocated to Phase I of this Scope of Work, there will be a compounded demand on the consultant's ability to collect and identify key pieces of information relevant to a limited impact assessment. The consultant will furthermore be pressed to analyze and disaggregate the information in such a manner that will provide the starting point for Phase II. For these reasons, it is suggested that the consultant have demonstrable experience in research design, identifying policy related signifiers, resource management and economic analysis. The consultant will construct the bridge between Phase I data results and Phase II orientation. The consultant must approach this task with that responsibility in mind.

Time Frame - Phase I

Literature Review	3 days
Informant Interviews	4 days
Data Analysis and Report Preparation	10 days
Draft Report	3 days
Preliminary Phase II Data Collection	5 days
Supplemental Report	2 days
Total work days in the field and AID/W	27 days

Reporting Requirements

Before departing from Zimbabwe, the consultant shall submit the draft report to the Mission for suggestions and approval. The final report shall include sections covering the following topics:

1. Purpose of study.
2. Questions the study was designed to answer.
3. General description of the study approach and a summary of major findings.
4. Comparative reports of marketed output by crop and by year and communal sector producers.
5. Identification of concentrated regions of GOZ agricultural support activities.
6. Selected information on household type as per category, in Communal Land areas.
7. Conclusions.

SCOPE OF WORK FOR PHASE II—RANDOM HOUSEHOLD FIELD SURVEYS EXAMINING THE LINKS BETWEEN GENDER-ACCESSED RESOURCES AND INCREASED MARKETED YIELD OF MAIZE AND COTTON

Purpose

Phase II of this Scope of Work proposes to conduct a random household survey of Communal Land farmers. Its purpose is to assess the causes of the significant increase in agricultural yields and marketed output of maize and cotton at the household level looking at gender-impact on the implementation and effectiveness of ZAS assisted GOZ agricultural programs. In a like manner, it will assess ZASA/GOZ effectiveness in reaching male and female farmers appropriate to their roles and responsibilities, and how this has/has not resulted in increases of marketed maize and cotton since 1980.

Given that women are major contributors to agricultural production, this may be an important factor in program effectiveness. On the other hand, female farmers may have received disproportionately less resources. Data analysis of the sample survey will demonstrate whether there exists a link between increased yields and ZASA/GOZ resource use. At the same time, it will further identify gender considerations that will be useful in strengthening program impact. This assessment will study the extent to which women and men received program-funded benefits and the resulting impact.

A subsection of the survey will include questions to be asked directly to village chiefs as representative community leaders of the areas in which the random survey takes place. In addition to eliciting information from him as a Communal Land farmer and his assessment of the new agricultural resources available, it will ask him what considerations he takes into account in allocating land and about the allocation of land between women and men.

Study Approach

Phase II will use a field survey that will focus on three types of households in project-impacted communal land areas as identified in Phase I: male-headed households, male-headed households where the male is normally absent, and female-headed households.

Specific questions will be derived from the following themes:

1. How is gender a factor in household economic production activities?
 - What is the division of labor within the agricultural household in activities, and how important is it to the activity is women's/men's labor?
 - Are women and men responsible for different crops, different tasks for the same crops, or production of the same crops on different fields? How did promotion of cash crops affect men's and women's abilities to produce other crops--particularly those cultivated to meet family nutrition needs? What was the impact on labor allocation and availability by gender?
 - What are the income sources for men/women within the different kinds of households?
 - Who in the household is responsible for which expenditure for the family and the operation of the farm?
 - What gender-based differences exist in access to and control of resources used in agricultural production and other income-producing activities of the household?
 - What gender-based differences exist in decisions made about types of crops cultivated, use of resources, and production practices?
2. Who within the family received the program resource? Was the choice appropriate to her/his roles and responsibility? Was there a match between access to resource and role/responsibilities in the household?
3. Who actually used the resource? For example, was technical advice about harvesting given to the person who actually harvested the crop or to another household member?

4. What has been the last season's experience with crop yield and marketing?
5. What changes in the last ten years have contributed in some way to increased marketed output.
 - Compared to land holdings in/around 1980, has the arable land available to the specific farming household been increased?
 - Does the interviewee have a general impression of maize and cotton production in 1980? How does this compare to their yields in the last three to four years?
 - To which factors does the farmer attribute her/his increased output if the plot cultivated has remained constant (i.e., use of fertilizer, pesticides, irrigation, advice from extension agents, improved seeds)?
 - Has the amount of household land cultivated for cash crops (and specifically maize and cotton) or the amount of land cultivated for food crops changed? Has the amount of land for either been reduced for the sake of the other?
6. How were improved techniques for increased production accessed? Is there a match between access to a resource and information provided about the best technology for using that resource, i.e., is the farmer told of new high seeds but unable to buy them?
7. Who benefitted from the resources and how? Is there recognition that these resources came through the government for the purpose of increasing yields?
 - How did income earnings and distribution change within the household as a result of the project? Did income increase differentially for men and women? Did anyone lose any other sources of income because of increased responsibilities using the new program resources?

- Was the resource applicable to all households or only those with certain types of resources (e.g., households with land title, large acreage, literacy, etc.)? How does this relate to male/female-headed households (e.g., do irrigation projects essentially assist only more affluent, probably male-headed households)?
 - Were any resources targeted explicitly toward increasing agricultural productivity of women's agricultural labor?
 - Given gender division of labor and the control of income from different crops by men and women, what interest did women have in using the resource/participating in project activities?
8. Is the crop sold at the farm gate or at a marketing center? How are crops transported to cooperative marketing centers? How far does the farmer have to travel to get the crop to market? Who takes the crop to market? How is payment made? Who receives the payment? Has the market used or accessible to market centers changed since 1980? Has this been favorable to female farmers in marketing their crop?
 9. Can any direct linkage be traced between access to program resources and appropriate matching of the resources by gender roles and responsibilities within the household to the increased productivity.
 10. What considerations does the village chief weight in allocating land? Because allocation of Communal Land follows traditional practices, this question targets the area Chief specifically asking him what guides him in making his decision.

To achieve the required level of significance from which trends can be identified, the survey will include a total of 300 households divided among the three categories and stratified by type of household headship. A subsection of the questionnaire will be designed to be answered by village chiefs in approximately 25 villages in the random survey. Recent surveys conducted in the field have reported a 90 percent response rate. It is expected that the total number of surveys being planned will result in a final number that will permit findings of use to further programming.

Consultant Tasks

1. Develop a detailed plan for conducting the survey based on Phase I findings and information obtained and discussions held with key informants. This plan will include:
 - A description of the study's comparative design, data sources project selection criteria, proposed data collection techniques, time estimates, analysis, reporting format and content, and other related requirements.
 - A list of staff requirements. The consultant explore the potential for a collaborative relationship with the University of Zimbabwe and the possibility of utilizing experience student interviewers. The consultant will recommend the number and gender of required interviewers. If possible, consideration should be made to matching language and tribal heritage of the interviewers with those of the interviewed in targeted locations.
 - A plan for logistics. Consideration must be given to accessibility of targeted areas, modes of transportation, accommodation support while in the field.
2. Design the questionnaire. In addition to determining the usual information about age, sex, and marital status, the questionnaire will draw from the question-areas listed in the previous section giving consideration to factors of length and application. After the questionnaire has been designed, it will be vetted through relevant offices for comments, corrections and modifications.
3. Questionnaire Pretesting. The consultant will pretest the questionnaire in two areas that will not be among those covered in the final survey. In-depth interviews with ten households representing the three categories plus one village chief in program impacted areas will further refine the scope of the survey and assist in its final form.
4. Survey implementation. After making any necessary changes in the final questionnaire, interviewers will be teamed off and assigned to their locality of data collection. The interviewers will individually conduct no more than four household interviews a day.

Three teams of interviewers will be able to complete 4 households a day or 300 households in about 25 days of survey work.

In the event that both the male head of the household and his wife/wives are present, the interviewers must be prepared to conduct separate interviews with each--once with the male household head and again with the (senior) wife.

5. Analyze the data and prepare report as detailed under "Reporting Requirements."

Consultant Qualifications

Consultant must have experience in the design and implementation of surveys in Africa, preferably in Zimbabwe or southern Africa. This includes experience in data collection and analysis, including formal and informal interviewing, purposive sampling, on-site observations, use of official records, etc. The consultant should also have experience in developing and implementing data processing plans, and analyzing and presenting survey data. Experience in gender-related issues and agriculture is required. If desired, technical assistance and support from PPC/WID are available to assist local institutions to carry out the survey and help analyze data.

Time Frame

Literature Review	1
Material and Logistical Preparation	5
Design of Workplan and Questionnaire	6
Pilot Testing/Questionnaire	4
Survey Implementation	24
Data Tabulation;Analysis and Report Preparation	13
Total days	53

Reporting Requirements

Before day 6, the consultant shall submit the detailed workplan as described above to the USAID and PPC/WID Office. By or before day 10 the consultant shall submit the draft questionnaire. Thereafter, the consultant shall submit monthly progress reports indicating progress toward completion of the workplan.

The Phase II final report shall be submitted to the Mission and PPC/WID, if funding is provided on or before 10 days after completion of data Analysis. The final report will include sections covering the following topics:

1. The purpose of the survey.
2. Questions that the survey was designed to answer.
3. General description of the study approach and a summary of the major findings.
4. Detailed discussion of the methodology:
 - Description of the study and sample designs.
 - Data collection methodology.
 - Pilot test results.
 - Data processing methodology.
 - Problems encountered/adjustments made.
 - The final questionnaire.
5. Detailed survey results.
6. Statistical analysis of the survey data.

Accompanying the final report, the consultant will deliver any interviewer manuals developed, listing the names, titles, addresses and telephone numbers of key informants, and interviewers and all the data gathered during the pretest and final interviews.

Scope of Work Deliverables

In addition to the reports specified in the previous "Reporting Requirement" sections, the Final Report will also include the following:

1. Purpose of the study.
2. Questions the study was designed to answer.
3. General description of the study approach and a summary of major findings.
4. Identification of successful ZASA project strategy.
5. Recommendations for strengthening gender considerations into on-going ZASA and future agricultural activities in Zimbabwe.
6. Conclusions that can be drawn.
7. Appendices to include all final reports of both phases.

ILLUSTRATIVE BUDGETS FOR PHASE I AND PHASE II

The budgets which follows are firm for U.S. Costs but illustrative for in-country labor costs. Moreover if the Phase II activities were managed entirely by an in-country organization, it might be more expensive for institutional overhead but less expensive for consultants costs.

The budgets are predicated on a 40/60 match. If, however, a PIOT or PIOTs were received in AID/W before June 25, the rate would be a 25/75 match.

THE FUTURES GROUP - ZASA PHASE I ILLUSTRATIVE BUDGET
GENESYS MATCH 60-40

Line Item	Units	Cost
Salaries [project office]		
Senior Staff	MB 1	230.77
Research Staff		
Support Staff	2	192.31
Salaries [home office]		
TOTAL SALARIES		
Overhead [project office]		406.15
Overhead [home office]		0.00
TOTAL OVERHEAD		
Consultants:	D. RATE DAYS	
		0.00
		0.00
TOTAL CONSULTANTS		
Travel	RATE UNITS	
Air Fare		0.00
Per Diem		0.00
Local Travel		0.00
Terminus Travel		0.00
Visas/Medical		0.00
TOTAL TRAVEL		
Subcontracts		
Keys MacManus, Inc.		0.00
Ernst & Young		0.00
MSI		26,986.00
TOTAL SUBCONTRACTS		
Other Direct Costs		
Communications		280.00
Printing		180.00
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS		
SUBTOTAL COSTS		28,275.23
FEE1 [Internal] at 7%		90.25
FEE2 [On Subcontracts] at 2%		539.72
TOTAL COST WITH FEE		
	MISSION PORTION	11,562.08
	MATCH PORTION	17,343.12

ZIMBABWE AG STUDY - PHASE I
ILLUSTRATIVE BUDGET

1. LABOR	Days	Rate	Amount	Total
Full Time Employees				
WARREN, ROBERTA	5	200	1,000	
FRASER, ROSE SUPPORT	5	123	615	
MORTON, ALICE TPM	2	295	590	
			\$2,205	
Intermittent Employees				
HIRSHMAN, DAVID	27	250	6,750	
			\$6,750	
		Total Labor:	\$8,955	\$8,955
2. FRINGE BENEFITS				
Fulltime Labor:		29.00%	\$639	
Intermittent Labor:		7.89%	\$533	
		Total Fringe Benefits:	\$1,172	\$10,127
3. OVERHEAD				
		36.00%	\$3,646	
				\$13,773
4. TRAVEL				
Description	No.	Fare		
1 RT DC-HARARE	1	4,760	4,760	
			\$4,760	\$18,533

ZIMBABWE AG STUDY - PHASE I
ILLUSTRATIVE BUDGET

5. PER DIEM				
	Location	Days	Allowance	
	-----	-----	-----	
	HARARE	18	117	2,106

				\$2,106
				\$20,639
6. OTHER TRAVEL EXPENSES				
	Pre-departure Expenses			100
	Local Transportation	18	15	270
	DBA Insurance			120
	SOS Insurance			30

				\$520
				\$21,159
7. OTHER DIRECT EXPENSES				
	Communications			350
	Photocopying			280
	Local Secretarial Support			280
	Computer Rental	18	25	450

				\$1,360
				\$22,519
8. GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE				
			12.00%	\$2,702

				\$25,221
9. FEE				
			7.00%	\$1,765
10. T O T A L				
				=====
				\$26,986

THE FUTURES GROUP - ZASA ILLUSTRATIVE BUDGET PHASE II
GENESYS MATCH 60/40

Line Item	Units	Cost	TOTALS
Salaries [project office]			
Senior Staff MB	3	692.31	
Research Staff			
Support Staff	3	288.46	
Salaries [home office]			
TOTAL SALARIES			980.77
Overhead [project office]		941.54	
Overhead [home office]		0.00	
TOTAL OVERHEAD			941.54
Consultants:	D. RATE	DAYS	
TOTAL CONSULTANTS			0.00
Travel	RATE	UNITS	
Air Fare			
Per Diem			
Local Travel		0	0.00
Terminus Travel		0	0.00
Visas/Medical		0	0.00
TOTAL TRAVEL			0.00
Subcontracts			
Keys MacManus, Inc		0.00	
Ernst & Young		0.00	
MSI		63,997.00	
TOTAL SUBCONTRACTS			63,997.00
Other Direct Costs			
Communications		230.00	
Printing		0.00	
TOTAL_OTHER DIRECT COSTS			230.00
SUBTOTAL COSTS		66,149.31	
FEE1 [Internal] at 7%		150.66	
FEE2 [On Subcontracts] at 2%		1,279.94	
TOTAL COST WITH FEE			67,579.91
	MISSION PORTION	27,031.96	
	MATCH PORTION	40,547.95	

MSI ZIMBABWE ZASA PHASE II

ILLUSTRATIVE BUDGET

1. LABOR	Days	Rate	Amount	Total
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Full Time Employees				

WARREN, ROBERTA	9	200	1,800	
FRASER, ROSE	10	123	1,230	

			\$3,030	
Intermittent Employees				

HIRSHMAN, DAVID	53	250	13,250	

			\$13,250	

		Total Labor:	\$16,280	\$16,280

2. FRINGE BENEFITS				
Fulltime Labor:		29.00%	\$879	
Intermittent Labor:		7.89%	\$1,045	

		Total Fringe Benefits:	\$1,924	\$18,204

3. OVERHEAD				
		36.00%	\$6,553	

				\$24,757
4. TRAVEL				
Description	No.	Fare		
-----	-----	-----		
RT DC-HARARAE	1	4,760	4,760	

			\$4,760	\$29,517
5. PER DIEM				
Location	Days	Allowance		
-----	-----	-----		
HARARE	46	117	5,382	

			\$5,382	\$34,899

MSI ZIMBABWE ZASA PHASE II

ILLUSTRATIVE BUDGET

6. OTHER TRAVEL EXPENSES			
Pre-departure Expenses			150
Local Transportation	46	25	1,150
DBA Insurance			359
SOS Insurance			69

			\$1,728
			\$36,627
7. OTHER DIRECT EXPENSES			
Communications			250
Photocopying			500
Local Secretarial Support			875
Computer Rental	46	25	1,150
Local Assistants			2,000
Local Enumerators (includes local travel cost			12,000

			\$16,775
			\$53,402
8. GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE		12.00%	\$6,408

			\$59,810
9. FEE		7.00%	\$4,187
			=====
10. T O T A L			\$63,997

REFERENCES

1. Agriculture Sector Study, World Bank, December 3, 1983.
2. Chitaga-Machingaura, R. M., "Women in Agriculture in Zimbabwe," published in Ecoforum, Vol. 13, No. 2, October 1988.
3. Chimedza, Ruvimbo, "Women's Access to and Control Over Land: The Case of Zimbabwe", published by Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Department of Agricultural Economics & Extension. University of Zimbabwe, October 1988.
4. Hubbs, V., Draft ZASA Scope of Work, The GENESYS Project, March 1990.
5. Pankurst, D. and Jacobs, S., "Land Tenure, Gender Relations, and Agricultural Production: The Case of Zimbabwe Peasantry," published in Agriculture, Women and Land, The African Experience, edited by J. Davison, Westview Press, 1988.
6. Zimbabwe Agriculture Sector Assistance, 1985 Evaluation Report, USAID, 1985.
7. Zimbabwe and the CIGAR Centers: A Study of Their Collaboration in Agricultural Research, Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CIGAR), Study Paper #6, 1985.
8. Zinyama, L. M., "Commercialization of Small-Scale Agriculture in Zimbabwe: Some Emerging Patterns of Spatial Differentiation," Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography, Vol. 9, #2, December 1988.