

8. THE IMPACT OF THE FAST TRACK ON FORMER FARM WORKERS*

8.1 Introduction, Methodology and Background

This chapter examines the impacts of the Fast Track (FTLRP) on former farm workers in terms of their re-employment, access to severance packages, access to resettlement land, their repatriation, their social welfare and citizenship status. Thus, the situation of former farm workers is assessed from empirical and secondary evidence in relation to current Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ) policy and programmes, including the efficacy of their implementation. The role of non-governmental organisations' (NGOs) support programmes for former farm workers since the FTLRP is also examined. The chapter then draws specific conclusions and recommendations to address the identified issues.

Farm labour was concentrated in the Mashonaland Provinces with about 65% of the total farm labour force, followed by Manicaland (16%), Masvingo (10%), and Matabeleland North and South and Midlands (6%). Structural changes in farm labour have tended to be more pronounced in the Mashonaland Provinces and in Manicaland, due to the phenomenal growth of horticultural production. Thus permanent farm labour in Mashonaland declined from 73% in 1983 to 54% in 2002, while in Manicaland the casual labour force grew from 26% to 59%.

8.2 GoZ Policy on Former Farm Workers

GoZ policy on former farm workers in relation to land reform is covered by four measures: the obligation of LSCF to pay severance packages to the disengaged workers; GoZ assistance in the repatriation of those who wish to be repatriated; provision of resettlement land to those who needed it and re-employment by the new farmers.

In addition, the general policy perspective of GoZ officials on former farm workers who lose their jobs as a result of

1

¹ * Original research and draft for this chapter by Mr W Chambati and Prof S. Moyo

compulsory farm acquisition appears to be that those who remain in the country and do not gain access to new farm work or to land will, like other unemployed people, have to be re-absorbed into the wider economy, including in communal areas. Furthermore, GoZ policy entails the provision of a variety of social and administrative services to farm workers as a particular social group, within its general social welfare and social services policies and programmes. These policies are elaborated next.

8.2.1 Social services policy

GoZ social welfare and services programmes include farm workers. The MPSL & SW runs various intervention programmes for vulnerable groups (which include former farm workers' households, although they are not specifically targeted) throughout the country. These include the Basic Education Assistance Module (BEAM), which pays school fees for vulnerable children, supplementary feeding schemes and Children in Difficult Circumstances. Community based selection committees, which also include registered NGOs, determine the beneficiaries. In addition, the GoZ in partnership with other donors, NGOs and LSCFs, is also involved in the provision of social services to farm workers, most notably in recent years in the distribution of food supplies and HIV/AIDS support as part of the wider social relief effort. Former farm workers however, seem to be relatively less well catered for in these than their counterparts.

The extent to which each of these GoZ policies and measures have in practice mitigated the impact of the FTLRP on former farm workers in general is discussed next, along five axis, namely their re-employment, severance benefits, access to land and residency, repatriation and citizenship, and social services support.

8.3 Existing Situation: Impact of FTLRP on Former Farm Workers

8.3.1 Overview pattern of FTLRP impact

The pattern of FTLRP impact on former farm workers is diverse and complex. It varies widely among districts, depending on the nature of their agricultural activities, the scale of farms, their vicinity to the communal areas and other local economic and social dynamics. There have been both positive and negative effects of the FTLRP on farm workers in the former LSCF sector.

The employment status of former farm workers is critical to assessing the impact of FTLRP since it defines the scope of their new livelihoods. Losses in farm worker employment, as well as job retention in the remaining LSCFs, were encountered in the agrarian sector. Moreover, it appears that such former farm worker job losses could change after this transitional period when uptake of land and establishment of production become normalised.

It is estimated that over 85 000 fulltime farm workers are still in employment (CFU, 2003). This is because large agro-industrial estates (sugar, coffee, tea and forest plantations) were not affected by the land acquisition programme (Moyo, 2003). The majority of former farm workers who lost their jobs worked on farms with relatively lower levels of permanent farm labourers (maize, beef, tobacco and wheat farms) compared to plantation estates located mostly in the Eastern Highlands (Manicaland Province) and the Lowveld (Masvingo Province) (Moyo, 2003). We estimate that about 50 000 casual and part-time workers could have retained their jobs in these regions and on the remaining LSCFs. This pattern suggests that more women would have been the losers since they dominated the part-time labour force.

In Zvishavane District for instance, all farm workers remained with their employers after the compulsory

acquisition of LSCFs for redistribution, except for two workers who opted to be resettled under the FTLRP. Some studies cite a 50% job loss of former farm workers, but ignore new forms of re-employment such as piecework or *maricho*. In Midlands Province, farm worker job losses were minimal (Provincial Land Committee, 2003) since former employers retained most of their farm workers.

Thus some of the former farm workers have been re-employed by new farmers and state farms. Others have relocated to their communal areas, some stayed on the farms they worked on and some moved to informal settlements which have emerged since the FTLRP. Very few have been reported returning to their foreign homes of descent in neighbouring countries.

Table 8.1: Overall Status of Former Farm Workers in Chikomba District (2003)

Status	Number	Percentage (%)
Allocated Land	123	20
State Farm	100	17
New Farms (model A1 and A2)	None	None
Relocated to other LSCF	60	10
Relocated to Communal Area	302	50
Squatting	18	3
Total	604	100

Source: Field Evidence

But the situation varies among districts. In the Chikomba case, we found a broadly based distribution of former farm worker destination (Table 9.1). Findings were that 47% of the former farm workers had been visibly accommodated in the new agrarian set up, as follows; allocated land (20%), re-employed (27%) and another 3% estimated to be squatting in the Charter Estate and in peri-urban Chivhu. But in districts such as Chiredzi and in the Eastern Highlands, more farm workers remained employed. These patterns of impacts of the FTLRP on the former farm workers are discussed further below.

8.3.2 Re-employment of displaced former farm workers

Some of the full and part-time workers who lost their jobs have been re-engaged in various LSCF sub-sectors, such as state farms, A2 farms, indigenous commercial farms and in remaining white LSCFs, but mostly on a part-time basis. For instance, before the FTLRP there were 465 permanent (73%) and 168 (27%) casual farm workers in Chikomba District (FCTZ, 2002). As a result of the FTLRP, only 160 former fulltime farm workers retained jobs in Chikomba and most of them were now casuals, having lost their job security and employment benefits. The government-run Charter Estates absorbed most of the re-engaged former farm workers in Chikomba, and close to 40% of its labour force were from former white owned LSCFs. These were now re-employed mainly as casuals. But in other districts, such as Norton, former farm workers re-employed by new A2 farmers at Maine Farm have kept their job positions and status of employment.

Thus, a new agricultural employment structure has emerged with the changed agrarian structure, in which more new potential employers, including A2 farmers, ARDA, remaining large scale commercial and indigenous farmers, are now re-engaging former farm workers on a limited basis. Some new farmers brought their own labour, ('new farm workers'), instead of hiring

existing labour of former farm workers form compulsorily acquired farms. The new farm workers are usually distant relatives of the farm owner from the extended family.

The situation was different in other districts, such as Chegutu, Kadoma and Kwekwe, where an estimated 50% of former farm workers are still employed and, of these, 40% are employed by new A2 farmers (ZCDT, 2003)

There are various reasons given for the non-engagement of former farm workers by the new farmers. Former farm workers were largely viewed as opponents of the FTLRP, who opposed the farm occupations through which the majority of the model A1 beneficiaries gained land before they were then officially resettled through the District Councils. Farm workers tended to protect the employers' property, hence the existing animosity between them and the new A1 farmers. On A2 farms, there has been general mistrust of former farm workers and the new farmers have employed people they know. Also, the fact that former farm workers have been in employment means that they are relatively aware of the labour laws and the conditions (wages and benefits) under which they are supposed to work, a fact which has made them less attractive to new farmers. But in some districts, some former LSCF farm workers are refusing to work for new farmers and some are now involved in alternative income earning activities, such as gold panning (see Box 8.1), resulting in labour shortages in some districts.

Box 8.1: Farm Labour Shortage and Gold Panning (A2 farmer, Goromonzi District)
Former farm workers involved in gold panning refused to harvest maize at a daily rate of Z\$1 500 for a model A2 farmer. But the former farm workers instead agreed to be paid one kg of sugar per day, which they resold on the parallel market at inflated prices in gold panning communities.

8.3.3 Severance packages for former farm workers

The magnitude and scale of severance payments made to former farm workers varies widely among the districts. Sachikonye (2003) estimated that only 23% of the former farm workers had received their

severance packages countrywide. Other evidence (ZCDT, 2003) in Kadoma, Chegutu and Kwekwe districts also found only 21% had received their packages from former employers.

Former farm worker unions have been promoting the payment of such packages. In Marondera for example, more farm workers were paid their terminal benefits with the assistance of Zimbabwe Federation of Trade Unions (ZFTU), which in turn deducted between 25% and 35% of the severance package for their services (AIAS Field Surveys; Magaramombe, 2003).

The delay in the payment of severance packages can be partly attributed to the fact that most former LSCF farmers have not received their compensation for land improvements, given that GoZ policy allows for staggered payments in relation to the eventual payment of GoZ compensation. But a number of the LSCF farmers have part paid former farm workers from other resources.

Some of those former farm workers who had received their terminal benefits (for example in Kadoma, Chegutu and Kwekwe) used the bulk of the money to meet their food requirements, whilst others used it for various purposes including school fees, labola, asset accumulation, etc. (ZCDT, 2003). Huge sums from the retrenchment packages are also reported to have been spent on drinking in various districts. The retrenchment packages of former farm workers did not stretch far enough to secure future livelihoods. Some former farm workers are reported to be living in desperate conditions and have resorted to alternative legal and/or illegal income earning activities. The situation is even more critical for part-time workers who were not eligible for terminal employment benefits.

Although, severance pay was meant for farm workers on compulsorily acquired farms, some workers on

operational LSCFs in Mazowe also demanded terminal benefits from their employers. These, in some cases, were paid and the workers lost their jobs or job security in the process.

8.3.4 Repatriation and citizenship of former farm workers

The preference survey by MP&SW before the FTLRP in 2001 showed that less than 3% of the migrant former farm workers wanted to return to their countries of origin, since most of them have lived and worked in Zimbabwe for the greater part of their lives, and some are second or third generation 'citizens'. The Repatriation Unit in the MP&SW has not handled any requests from former farm workers who wished to return to their motherland since the beginning of the FTLRP. This can be attributed to the fact that those former farm workers who wished to be repatriated are not aware of the availability of such facilities from the GoZ. However, it is possible that some migrant former farm workers might have returned on their own to their countries of origin without seeking assistance from the MP & SW.

8.3.5 Land allocation to former farm workers

There is a national perception that very few former farm workers benefited from the FTLRP as new landowners. Official GoZ statistics show that, by mid-2002, only 2% of the total beneficiaries of the model A1 (2 087 out of 110 885 beneficiaries) were former farm workers. These GoZ figures suggest that only 0.6% of all the former farm workers before the FTLRP, gained resettlement land. However, the rate of land allocation to former farm workers varies in different parts of the country.

In Goromonzi, official records show that 1.5% (26 out of 1 719 beneficiaries of model A1) of the beneficiaries of the land resettlement programme were former farm workers (AIAS Field Surveys; Marongwe, 2003). This

gives an average of 2.8 former farm workers per farm on the 47 farms compulsorily acquired for redistribution. The rate of land allocation to former farm workers in the Midlands Province was very low, due to greater retention of farm workers on remaining LSCFs. Based on four districts, the average rate of land allocation to former farm workers was 0.46 per farm, Gweru (0.5), Kwekwe (0.19), Mberengwa (1.2) and Zvishavane (0.11). Field evidence from Kwekwe and Gweru showed that only one out of 150 beneficiaries was a former farm worker (AIAS Field Surveys).

While, official records from the Chikomba District Council, for instance, show that only 12 former farm workers (0.36% of the beneficiaries) out of 3 292 new farmers in model A1 were beneficiaries of the programme, field evidence shows otherwise (Table 8-2). More than 5% of the beneficiaries of A1 farms were former farm workers. Chikomba had, on average, 3.3 farm workers per farm, while official data suggests only 0.32 per farm. This disparity between official records from the District Council and our field findings, where 12 former farm workers are said to have benefited on 37 farms, compares poorly with 20 benefiting on only six farms. This suggested that a number of former farm workers benefited from the FTLRP through their communal areas, by presenting themselves as peasant farmers.

Projecting our field findings of a land allocation rate of 3.3 former farm workers per farm on 37 compulsorily acquired farms shows that potentially an estimated 123 former farm workers could have benefited from the FTLRP in Chikomba District. This implies that potentially about 20% of the former farm workers on compulsorily acquired farms were allocated land. This figure could actually be higher if farm workers on farms not compulsorily acquired for resettlement are considered since some also got land. This confirms statements from the Chikomba District Council that many former farm workers who had nowhere to go after compulsory farm acquisitions were allocated land.

In Mazowe District an estimated rate of 8.1 former farm workers allocated per farm was found (AIAS Field Surveys; Magaramombe, 2003). Here they constituted 16% of the total beneficiaries of the FTLRP. But within their group they only amounted to 2.3% of all former farm workers on compulsorily acquired farms.

Table 8.2: Farm Worker Resettlement in model A1 in Chikomba District

Name of Farm	Total No. of Plot Holders	No of Farm Workers Resettled	% of Farm Workers Resettled	Average Plot Size (Ha)
Ingulubi	145	8	5.5	30
Uitky	21	2	9.5	15
Bathest	46	6	13	30
Nyatsitsi	62	4	6	4.25
Total	274	20	8.5	

Source: Field Surveys

This, out of all the beneficiaries of the model A1 resettlement, field evidence suggests an estimated 8.5% were former farm workers, compared to official figures of 2%. Taking this and other data into account, we estimate that at least 5% of the beneficiaries of the model A1 resettlement could be former farm workers.

It is also important to note that, in some districts, farms were specifically allocated to former farm worker resettlement. In Mazowe, two farms (Dawye and Masasa) were set aside for the benefit of 350 farm workers, while some farm workers acquired land under a similar initiative in Zvimba North. This setting aside of land for farm worker resettlement is

commendable because former farm workers deserved such preference and require at least land for residential plots since they still seek jobs. Former farm workers have lived on private land with no agricultural or residential 'tenure rights' and the situation is worse for migrant workers who have no access to land elsewhere since they do not have ties to the communal areas and had no other home except the farm compound.

Although some former farm workers who benefited from the land reform programme practice farming in their own right, field findings show an emerging pattern of maintaining employment contacts as a strategy to cushion themselves from poverty. The fact that their specialist skills are mostly in areas not dominant in new resettlement schemes, which are mostly maize focused, can be a limiting factor in this. This leads them to contract out on short assignments whenever they are needed since there is a mismatch of skills deployment. A case in point is the government-run Charter Estate, where close to 60 workers have plot holdings acquired during the FTLRP within and outside the district.

This dual 'belonging' is not new to farm workers, as their spouses maintain their plots during their absence. Thus, during the rain season there is a critical shortage of labour in general as farm workers engage in own agricultural production. In some areas however, they have abandoned their new landholdings for the higher rewards offered by gold panning. In Zvimba North for instance, some 300 former farm workers abandoned their plot allocations to venture into the lucrative gold panning, shifting valuable skills and experience out of agricultural production.

8.3.6 Residential status of former farm workers

The FTLRP has had numerous effects on the residential status of former farm workers, who had resided on their employer's property for the greater part of their employment life. Some former farm workers

have been forced to move off the farms to make way for new settlers, under either the A1 or A2 models, while some are still resident on farms acquired under FTLRP, either as squatters or in agreement with the new owners. Those displaced in this manner are often stranded on the outskirts of the farms or they trek to the fast growing 'informal settlements' where social conditions are desperate. Others with ties in the communal areas have relocated there.

Former farm workers in other districts, such as Seke, Hwedza, Esigodine and Marondera mainly remained in the former large scale commercial farming area compounds and migrate temporarily within these confines to informal settlements to seek work on new farms and remaining large scale commercial farms. Some simply stayed put on the farms they used to work on with various arrangements in existence with the new farmers.¹ In Mazowe District only 3% of the former farm workers were reported to have relocated to their communal home. Most of those former farm workers who did not access land under the FTLRP and remained in the former large scale commercial farming areas are migrant workers with no links to the communal areas.

There were claims by Rural District Council (RDC) officials in Mberengwa District, for example, that no former farm worker has been left homeless or destitute as a result of land redistribution programme. The Chikomba Rural District Council also made this claim. There were no informal settlements in Chikomba. However these have sprouted since the onset of the FTLRP in other districts, such as in Chihwiti and Gambuli informal settlements in Chinhoyi, where an estimated 51% of the households were former farm workers in the district (Save the Children Fund and FCTZ, 2002).

Evidence from Chikomba District shows that 50% of the former farm workers (mostly originally from communal areas and surrounding districts, Chihota,

1

¹ .FCTZ, 2002; Magaramombe, 2003; Sachikonye, 2003; Save the Children Fund and FCTZ,2002.

²USAID, 1998; Moyo et. Al., 2000; AIAS and KWA, 2002.

Buhera, Gutu, Mwenezi and Masvingo) from compulsory acquired farms went to the communal areas (Table 8.1). This supports arguments of the 'peasantariat' nature of former farm workers, given their ties with the communal areas.² They belonged to two communities, the LSCF and the communal area, mainly because close to 50% of the former farms workers were employed on a part-time basis and practiced their own agricultural production in their communal areas. This is not inconsistent with our earlier argument that at least 50% of the former farm workers were part-time workers with links to the communal area especially in a district like Chikomba.

Such former farm workers thus already had access to land before the FTLRP, although questions might be asked about the size and quality of their landholdings in the communal areas, and whether these provide a sustainable livelihood. In some Mashonaland districts, former farm workers, mostly with no previous ties to the communal areas have bought residential and/or agricultural plots from headmen. This further increased congestion in the communal areas possibly reversing the decongestion gains of the FTLRP. Some of the former farm workers have resurfaced in the new resettlement areas as they got land as peasants through 'their' chiefs in the communal areas.

8.3.7 Social impact of FTLRP on former farm workers

Access to social services among the former farm workers has further deteriorated as a result of the FTLRP, especially among those who have been displaced. A gap has been created since the resource endowed former white farmers contributed substantially to the provision of social services for their workers, and the RDCs have been incapacitated by the absence of taxes from the LSCF sector, since new farmers are not yet paying these taxes.

Schooling rates have always been lowest in the farm worker community, even before the FTLRP. For

example in 1997, only 59% of the children of farm workers attended primary school compared to 79% and 89% in the communal and urban areas respectively (Sachikonye and Zishiri, 1999). Schooling rates have worsened since the FTLRP as there is an estimated primary school dropout rate ranging from 15% to 55% in Manicaland (Sachikonye, 2003). The major reason for dropping out of school is the inability to pay school fees after the breadwinners lost their jobs. Furthermore, schools are sometimes located very far away from their new residential places.

But in some cases, there has been minimal disruption of social services. For example, former farm workers in Marondera district, especially in Model A1 schemes, have been allowed to continue residing in the farm compound and facilities such as water and sanitation are being shared by former farm workers and new settlers. Problems in access occur more in Model A2 schemes, where access to social services is sometimes limited to those on that particular plot. It is notable, therefore, that facilities such as schools and clinics are being shared in some resettlement areas (see Box 8.2)

Box 8.2: Access to Schooling Facilities at Maine Farm, Model A2 (in Norton)

At Maine Farm, which has seven subdivisions, the primary school and compound are located on one plot. All farm workers in all plots share the compound and their children continue attending school on that plot. One farm health worker, who is paid by one of the farmers who employs the bulk of the farm workers, services the farm.

Health centres have always been limited and located far away in the LSCF areas. Farm worker households were usually served by mobile clinics, which visited on a monthly basis. In addition, most farms employed a farm health worker. However, only about 60% of the former farm workers had access to a health worker before the FTLRP, compared to higher access rates in the communal areas. The health services and other community support systems that former employers provided have tended to be disrupted by the FTLRP. In 2002 the level of basic primary health care had decreased among farm worker households. Only 42% of the mothers knew how to prepare sugar and salt solution used to treat diarrhoea, a decline from rates of above 60% in the late 1980s (FTCZ, 2002).

The problem of farm worker marginalisation in social service provision is also partly a reflection of their social exclusion because of public perceptions that they are foreign citizens. For those former farm workers that have been resettled and/or re-engaged by the new farmers, their level of integration in these new societies has been very low. On one hand, this is due to the hostility against farm workers by new settlers. But, on the other hand, this has been attributed to the lack of a 'strong moral order' among former farm workers who tend to be stereotyped as having unstable 'marriage' practices, usually tied to the matrilineal institutions of their original culture.

Some former farm workers appear to be still tied to their motherland, whence they hope to return, and are thus reluctant to fully integrate into Zimbabwean society. This is at times referred to as a 'migrant mindset'. In the absence of an effective local government administrative system in the former LSCF areas (e.g. chiefs, headmen and village heads), farm workers were used to the paternalistic governance relations between them and the white farmers. The governance system of communal areas that has been extended to new resettlement areas (model A1) seems unsuitable for former farm workers. Hence the tendency for them to be accused of being undisciplined, disobedient and refusing to be governed.

Former farm workers are also alleged to be involved disproportionately in antisocial activities in resettlement areas, such as theft and prostitution (see AIAS Field Survey; Magaramombe, 2003; Midlands Provincial Land Committee, 2003; see Box 8.3). Some are reported to be engaged in illegal gold panning, which exacerbates environmental degradation. In Kadoma district for instance, gold panning is the major source of income for 46% of the former farm worker households (ZCDT, 2003)

Box 8.3: Former Farm Workers and New Settlers Relations

At one farm in Goromonzi, former farm workers residing in the farm compound refused to work for new farmers and are accused of stealing agricultural produce and using water paid by new farmers. In Mazowe, some farm workers have to work for new farmers for low wages as part of their conditions for continued residency in farm compounds. In other areas former farm workers and new settlers are co-existing harmoniously, for example in Chikomba former farm workers provides consultancy labour services to new farmers in cattle disease, diagnosis and treatment.

Thus, farm workers also tend to be largely excluded from the new settler associations and have no influence in developmental activities in their areas. Also, RDCs have not been able to reach out to them in the new resettlement areas. Where they have been re-employed, the landlord-labour tenant relationship that existed in the former LSCF under what was termed 'domestic government' (Rutherford, 2000 in Moyo, 2003) has largely been replaced by new social patronage systems which are also low paying and less job secure, especially in model A1 schemes.

8.4 Recommendations

8.4.1 policy framework for former farm worker support

The Goz should refine its policy measures in support of former, retained and new farm workers. It should produce a coherent and integrated policy statement in consultation with relevant stakeholders and ensure that it is widely disseminated in relevant government ministries, throughout RDCs and local government offices, among farm workers and their organisations, to new farmers and to NGOs.

The policy should clearly articulate the fact that farm workers are Zimbabweans and specify the special measures and procedures to be followed to speedily procure their citizenship, identification and travel documents. The strategy adopted should be based upon integrating farm workers into a service provision programme involving other rural groups, such as new settlers and non-farm rural communities, in resettlement areas and elsewhere. Other elements of this policy are examined below

8.4.2 Rural service and residential centres

The policy should focus on creating viable rural communities through the creation of rural service centres and hamlets for provision of services to farm workers and new settlers in A1 areas and for non-

farm entrepreneurs and workers within resettlement areas. Such centres should be built around some of the centrally located existing farm compounds. These should be augmented in area and excised from A1 and A2 land subdivisions. These centres should be turned into state properties governed by local authorities in collaboration with farm workers, settlers and relevant government agencies, within the existing hierarchy of settlements and administrative structures. This rural service centre programme could be initiated on a pilot basis in every district and expanded to all resettlement and remaining LSCF areas over the following five years. Government, the various stakeholders and humanitarian support service agencies should contribute adequate resources to this project, through which satellite social services can be provided.

8.4.3 Gender dimensions of former farm worker support

The GoZ and NGO partners should incorporate a clear-cut, gender based component into the proposed refinement of policy on farm workers and particularly with regard to support for former farm workers. The aim should be to both enhance the rights of women farm workers with respect to access to land in their own right, the security of their land tenure on their own and jointly held land, greater protection of their labour rights, including their appropriate grading, remuneration and contractual arrangements, and to ensure that they also gain adequate retrenchment benefits. In addition to this, their social vulnerability should be relieved by ensuring that they gain adequate access to identity and citizenship documentation as part of a programme of providing comprehensive social support (schooling and health), food and nutritional assistance, HIV/AIDS effects support, and economic rights (land tenure, skills and extension training, farming and housing subsidies etc) for vulnerable women and children. Adequate budgets, personnel and innovative gender balanced

intervention strategies should be designed by specialists in this and incorporated into GoZ policy and programmes. This effort should ensure that gender proficient agencies, professionals, women's representative organisations and women farm workers are adequately involved in policy design and programme implementation.

8.4.4 Social and ancillary services provision

The GoZ, NGOs and relevant stakeholders should undertake a detailed survey to document and plan for the long term and large scale provision of social and related services to farm workers and new settlers, especially those in A1 areas. These should include health, HIV/AIDS, nutrition and food support, education and literacy, skills development and beneficiation, small enterprise management and labour relations management activities. Such a plan should form the basis of coordinated social service provision based on adequate resource mobilisation by all the stakeholders and the GoZ. The target should be to raise per capita provision of social services to at least the levels obtaining in other service centres. These services should be backed by tax incentives and subsidies for employers and farm workers to contribute to the development of various social services.

8.4.5 Farm worker identity and citizenship documentation

The GoZ should re-launch its mobile services for the provision of Ids and passports to farm workers through the Home Affairs and Immigration departments, in collaboration with farm worker's organisations, farmers and NGOs. The target should be to complete this documentation process within five years. The pending amendments to the Citizenship Act should be speedily concluded to facilitate this activity. Furthermore, all stakeholders should increase their allocation of resources to this process.

8.4.6 Farm worker access to resettlement and residential land

The GoZ policy should aim to provide all farm workers, particularly former farm workers, with access to adequate land either for farming (of the A1 type) or for residential purposes (including room for food and nutritional gardens). Such access should be backed by secure title to the land in the form of long term inheritable leases. Policy incentives (tax breaks) should be provided to employers to support the building of suitable housing for farm workers. Programmes to assist farm workers who could build their own houses should also be designed. This means that the GoZ should speedily move to allocate more of the currently unallocated land to former farm workers so that they attain a level of 15% of the land redistribution beneficiaries, either as new farmland owners or as residential landowners.

8.4.7 Protection of re-engaged former and new farm workers

The GoZ should mount a special programme to enforce its existing laws on farm workers' working conditions (wage rates, benefits, leave, severance payments etc.) and to improve awareness of farm workers' rights and employers' obligations. Such a programme should be accompanied by activities to retrain former farm workers, upgrade their existing skills, and ensure formal recognition of their skills and appropriate grading of farm workers according to their skill. The GoZ should encourage and regulate the evolution of farm labour recruitment agencies through appropriate incentives and support their work by ensuring that adequate information on the workers' skills and availability is widely disseminated throughout the country among new farmers. The purpose should be to ensure maximum and protected utilisation of former farm worker skills by new farmers, and to encourage mutual social and economic coexistence and cooperation between farm workers and new farmers.