

The Impact of Drought in South Africa

**for the
Consumption Year 2016-2017**



National Outcome Forecast Analysis

Analysis of Fourteen Livelihood Zones in Limpopo, KwaZulu-Natal and Free State Provinces, with a Synthesis for the Remainder of the Country



agriculture, forestry & fisheries

Department:
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Financed by:

The United Kingdom Department For International Development (DFID) and the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC)

Implemented by:

The South Africa Vulnerability Assessment Committee (SAVAC), which is comprised of:

- Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries;
- Department of Social Development;
- Office of the President;
- Department of Health;
- Statistics South Africa;
- Provincial Departments of Agriculture;
- National Agricultural Marketing Council;
- Agricultural Research Council;
- South African Weather Service;
- University of Fort Hare;
- University of Limpopo;
- University of Pretoria;
- University of KwaZulu-Natal;
- University of the Western Cape;
- International and local cooperating agencies: OXFAM;
- UN Partners: UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNAIDS, FAO;

The SAVAC is led by the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries with technical support from the SADC Regional Vulnerability Assessment and Technical Assistance Team

Enquiries: please contact SAVAC Secretariat

Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

Postal and courier address:

XA-GF-02, Private Bag X250 Pretoria, 0013
South Africa

Tel. +27 (0)123196736

Fax. +27 (0)123196694

Email: MotlateloMAM@daff.gov.za

Physical address:

20 Agriculture Place, Steve Biko Street, Arcadia,
0083

This paper was researched and written by Charles Rethman

Contact: rethman@telkomsa.net, +27 21 6861510 (office), +27 71 6735502 (cell)

Data and the entire analysis are available on Github:



<https://github.com/CharlesRethman/HEA-Analysis-ZA-2016>

Acknowledgements

The South Africa Vulnerability Assessment Committee (SAVAC) and the participating consultant would sincerely like to extend their gratitude to the Republic of South Africa Government, through the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries for providing coordination and oversight in addition to material support of transport, financial resources, office equipment and stationary and for this exercise.

The author and SAVAC would also want to extend its gratitude to all agencies and government departments, who willingly met with the author and discussed the information at their disposal. In particular, the author thanks Mr Molatelo Mamadi and Ms Thulile Dlamini in DAFF for their support during this process, Mr Christo Joubert at NAMC and Ms Tracy Davids at BFAP for their assistance. Dr Johan Malherbe of ARC-ISCW was helpful in providing some of the SPI data and quaternary drainage shape files.

Thanks are also due to provincial governments, who provided data and participated in all programmes leading up to this exercise, such as the baselines assessments.

The author and SAVAC also thanks the SADC Regional Vulnerability Assessment and Analysis (RVAA) programme through the Programme Management Unit (PMU) for funding the exercise and making it possible.

Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

Items in *italics* refer to definitions elsewhere in the list:

ARC	Agricultural Research Council
ARC-ISCW	<i>ARC</i> – Institute for Soil, Climate and Water
ASI	Agricultural stress index
Baseline	A description of a <i>livelihood zone</i> , its <i>wealth breakdown</i> and the <i>livelihood strategies</i> households can employ to survive
BSS	<i>Baseline</i> storage spreadsheet
CEC	Crop Estimates Committee
Consumption year	A period lasting from the beginning of the harvest one year until just before the next harvest (the following year). In the summer rainfall parts of South Africa, the consumption year usually runs from April one year to March the next. A consumption year is sometimes also called the ‘agricultural marketing year’.
CPI	Consumer price index
CRS	Coordinate reference system (same as SRS)
DAFF	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
EA	Enumeration areas, geographical areas used in the census for counting the population. An EA is defined as an area that can theoretically be covered by one enumerator in one day during the census, although in practice and EA may require more than one day for coverage
ESA	Enumeration small areas, the smallest geographical units for which population data from the national census are made available. ESAs are derived by combining EAs so as to ensure that EA data cannot reveal individual data on households and violate privacy laws
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
FAO-GIEWS	<i>FAO</i> – Global Information and Early Warning System
FEWSNET	United States Famine Early Warning System Network
Food energy deficit	A deficit in reaching the average minimum daily food energy requirement (which is 8800 kJ), using the cheapest diet, a <i>simple starch diet</i> .
FPL	Food poverty Line, a <i>poverty threshold</i> devised by Statistics SA that consists of a basket of diverse (but necessarily healthy) food stuffs whose energy content equates to 8800 kilojoules (kJ) per person per day. The FPL is higher than the cost of 8800 kJ of a <i>simple starch diet</i> (which may include a very small addition of legumes and cooking oil only) because it contains a variety of other more expensive food items, which are, based on food consumption surveys, considered reasonable for use as the minimum household expenditure
GIS	Geographic information system
kcal, cal, Cal	Kilocalorie (kcal), a non-official unit of energy, in common use for food energy by nutritionists in many countries. It is easily confused with the Calorie (Cal), or ‘large’ calorie, which is also 1,000 calories (cal).
KJ, J	Kilojoule, derived from the official SI unit of energy, the joule (J), and adopted by the South African Bureau of Standards (SABS). In practical use in this report for food energy, rather than kilocalories (kcal). 1 kJ = 1,000 J = 0.2388459 kcal, or 1 kcal = 4.1868 kJ

LBPL	Lower Bound Poverty Line, a <i>poverty threshold</i> expressed as an income level that includes food purchases from the food poverty line, as well as a minimum of non-food goods and services to assist in determining a standard of living
Livelihood	The sum of the ways in which people obtain food and the goods and services that they need for a defined standard of living
Livelihood strategies	The different ways that people can obtain food and income to meet their minimum needs, as well as the priorities for their expenditure
LZ	Livelihood zone, a geographical area where people broadly share the same patterns of <i>livelihood</i> ; due to geographical factors that determine their sources of food, income and their expenditures
MT	Metric tons
NAMC	National Agriculture Marketing Council
NIDS	National Income Dynamics Survey
NOFA	National outcome forecast analysis
NVAC	National Vulnerability Assessment Committee
OFA	Outcome forecast analysis
Poverty threshold	An income or consumption threshold below which people are considered to have insufficient means to meet all the most immediate needs as well as the investments they must make to progress out of poverty
Response analysis	Analysis of the <i>response strategies</i> that includes checking their impact on household assets (the degree of destructiveness of the response strategies) and the impact of the hazard on them as well.
Response strategies	In the context of this report, response strategies are <i>livelihood strategies</i> that can be expanded or adapted to increase access to the minimum food, goods and services households need in order to reach their defined <i>poverty thresholds</i> . Examples of response strategies are: seeking additional employment, requesting help from kin, or switching expenditure to the most essential goods and services. However, strategies like reducing food intake are not considered ‘response’ strategies in this analysis as they will not help the household reach its appropriate <i>poverty threshold</i> ; rather, these strategies may be termed ‘coping strategies’.
RFA	Rainfall anomaly
RSA	The Republic of South Africa
RVAA Programme	The (SADC) Regional Vulnerability Assessment and Analysis Programme
RVAC	Regional Vulnerability Assessment Committee
SA	South Africa (abbreviation for the <i>Republic of South Africa</i>)
SABS	South African Bureau of Standards
SADC	The Southern African Development Community
SASSA	South Africa Social Security Agency
SAVAC	South African Vulnerability Assessment Committee
Scenario	A scenario is a group of assumptions made for various unknown future variables that influence the analysis. Key variables that are usually assumed in a scenario are: the coming agricultural season weather

	conditions, the timing of the coming seasons, prices for all commodities in future and the availability or otherwise of jobs and casual labour.
SI	International System of Units (French: Système international d'unités, SI)
Simple starch diet	In this document a simple starch diet is one often used to determine households' food energy threshold, i.e., a diet of starches that will supply (for the short term) the minimum energy needed to survive. Starches are the cheapest kilojoules and hence the simple starch threshold is often lower than the <i>food poverty line (FPL)</i> . The 'starch basket' for South Africa consists of a mixture of primarily maize meal, together with some rice, wheat flour, potatoes and sweet potatoes. Although a minimum threshold based on the simple starch diet is used in this analysis, the <i>FPL</i> , <i>LBPL</i> and <i>UBPL</i> are also used because the author wishes to inform broader issues on poverty and inequality, especially the <u>impact of the drought on increasing poverty and inequality</u> , which is topical in South Africa.
SPI	Standard precipitation index
SQL	Structured query language
SRS	Spatial reference system (same as CRS)
Stats SA	Statistics South Africa, the legally mandated government agency for collecting and analysing key national statistics for South Africa
SZAS	Single zone analysis spreadsheet
UBPL	Upper Bound Poverty Line. The highest absolute poverty line determined by Stats SA; it consists of the same basket of goods and services as the <i>LBPL</i> but with additional non-food components. The numbers or proportions of households below the UBPL is reported for statements on general poverty, while the FPL is used for acute or extreme poverty.
VCI	Vegetation condition index
VHI	Vegetation health index
Wealth breakdown	The process of subdividing a <i>livelihood zone</i> 's households into <i>wealth groups</i>
Wealth group	A group of households within the same <i>livelihood zone</i> who share similarities in terms of their assets and resources and similar access to food, goods and services



 agriculture,
forestry & fisheries
Department:
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

South Africa Livelihood Zones

50 0 50 100 150 200 250 km

Projection: Albers Equal Area with
standard parallels at 24.2° S and 32.8° S.

Datum and ellipsoid: WGS 1984.

Prepared by CW Rethman for the South
African Vulnerability Assessment
Committee (SAVAC) and the SADC
Regional Hunger and Vulnerability
Programme.




Figure 1: Map of the livelihood zones of South Africa

South Africa - Livelihood Zones - Legend

- International boundaries
- Provincial boundaries
- Dams and water bodies
- Rivers and watercourses
- Provincial capitals
- Other large towns

Limpopo Livelihood Zones

- 59101: ZALOC - Lowveld open access cattle and other income
- 59151: ZALER - Central Limpopo cattle ranching
- 59152: ZALGR - Lowveld game ranching
- 59153: ZAWCG - North western cattle and game ranching
- 59155: ZAHGR - Highveld cattle and game farming
- 59201: ZALCM - Lowveld open access mixed farming
- 59202: ZANOC - Northern open access cattle and dryland crops
- 59203: ZASLC - Southern Limpopo open access cattle and crops
- 59205: ZAHMI - Highveld open access mixed income
- 59251: ZALCV - North central Limpopo cattle and vegetables
- 59252: ZALEM - Limpopo Escarpment Mixed Farming
- 59253: ZAEMA - Eastern mountains mixed agriculture
- 59301: ZALOF - North eastern Limpopo open access fruit farming
- 59302: ZALOI - Lowveld open access irrigated cropping
- 59303: ZAHIC - Highveld open access intensive cropping
- 59351: ZALIC - Limpopo River intensive crop farming
- 59352: ZALFF - North eastern Limpopo intensive fruit farming
- 59353: ZASLC - Southern Limpopo crop farming
- 59354: ZAHFC - Hoedspruit Fruit and Cereal
- 59355: ZAHOI - Highveld Olifants River irrigated farming
- 59356: ZANBI - North western bushveld irrigated
- 59903: ZAPRO - Protected nature, forest or game reserve, gazetted

Mpumalanga Livelihood Zones

- 59101: ZALOC - Lowveld open access cattle and other income
- 59104: ZABOL - Highveld border open access livestock
- 59155: ZAHGR - Highveld cattle and game farming
- 59156: ZALCL - Lowveld cattle and livestock grazing
- 59158: ZAPLD - Upland dairy and stock farming
- 59201: ZALCM - Lowveld open access mixed farming
- 59205: ZAHMI - Highveld open access mixed income
- 59253: ZAEMA - Eastern mountains mixed agriculture
- 59254: ZACMW - Central maize, wheat and cattle
- 59256: ZAMLC - Cold highveld mixed livestock and crops
- 59303: ZAHIC - Highveld open access intensive cropping
- 59357: ZAELC - Eastern lowveld mixed cropping
- 59358: ZAHVC - Highveld vegetables and crops
- 59451: ZALSU - Lowveld commercial sugar farming
- 59551: ZAFOR - Agriforestry plantations and forests

- 59904: ZAPRC - Community conservation area
- 59903: ZAPRO - Protected nature, forest or game reserve, gazetted
- 59950: ZAPRP - Protected, private nature or game reserve

North West Livelihood Zones

- 59102: ZAKOL - Kgalagadi open access livestock and other income
- 59103: ZAOOG - Western open access cattle and game farming
- 59153: ZAWCG - North western cattle and game ranching
- 59154: ZASWG - Swartruggeren game ranching
- 59155: ZAHGR - Highveld cattle and game farming
- 59204: ZANWC - North western open access cattle crops
- 59253: ZACMF - Central maize, wheat and cattle
- 59255: ZANWX - North West exclusive access smallholders
- 59355: ZANBI - North western bushveld irrigated
- 59360: ZAVIC - Vryburg irrigated crops
- 59362: ZAVHI - Vaal-Harts irrigated crops
- 59903: ZAPRO - Protected nature, forest or game reserve, gazetted

Northern Cape Livelihood Zones

- 59102: ZAKOL - Kgalagadi open access livestock and other income
- 59153: ZAWCG - North western cattle and game ranching
- 59157: ZAGKA - Great Karoo small stock
- 59159: ZAXGF - Xariep-Great Fish valley small stock
- 59263: ZACKA - Cederberg Karoo
- 59362: ZAVHI - Vaal-Harts irrigated crops
- 59363: ZAORI - Orange River intensive irrigation
- 59901: ZARES - Restricted area
- 59903: ZAPRO - Protected nature, forest or game reserve, gazetted

Gauteng Livelihood Zones

- 59155: ZAHGR - Highveld cattle and game farming
- 59254: ZACMW - Central maize, wheat and cattle
- 59355: ZAHVC - Highveld vegetables and crops
- 59903: ZAPRO - Protected nature, forest or game reserve, gazetted

Free State Livelihood Zones

- 59108: ZACHO - Cold highlands open access livestock
- 59155: ZAHGR - Highveld cattle and game farming
- 59159: ZAXGF - Xariep-Great Fish valley small stock
- 59208: ZAOCC - Free State open access cattle and crops
- 59254: ZACMW - Central maize, wheat and cattle
- 59257: ZAHWC - Upper Senqu and Harrismith cereal and cattle
- 59259: ZASSC - Free State small stock and crops
- 59361: ZACMC - Central mixed cropping
- 59362: ZAVHI - Vaal-Harts irrigated crops
- 59363: ZAORI - Orange River intensive irrigation
- 59364: ZACEH - South east cereal and horticulture
- 59903: ZAPRO - Protected nature, forest or game reserve, gazetted

KwaZulu-Natal Livelihood Zones

- 59105: ZATGL - Thukela and Lebombo sparsely populated
- 59106: ZACNI - Coastal open access non-crop income
- 59107: ZAOLO - Inland open access livestock and other income
- 59158: ZAPLD - Upland dairy and stock farming
- 59206: ZALRC - Open access low intensity rainfed cultivation
- 59207: ZANFL - Northern inland open access farming and livestock
- 59209: ZAKHO - Ukhahlamba open access intense crops and livestock
- 59210: ZAMMO - Mzimkulu-Mkomazi midlands open access mixed farming
- 59258: ZAEFM - KwaZulu-Natal extensive mixed farming
- 59304: ZANCC - North coast open access intense cultivation
- 59305: ZASCO - South coast intensive open access cropping
- 59365: ZAWIV - Weenen vegetables and other farming
- 59366: ZAIFF - Intensive fruit farming
- 59452: ZACSU - Coastal and Midlands sugar producing
- 59551: ZAFOR - Agriforestry plantations and forests
- 59903: ZAPRO - Protected nature, forest or game reserve, gazetted

Eastern Cape Livelihood Zones

- 59108: ZACHO - Cold highlands open access livestock
- 59109: ZAVTO - Valley thicket open access livestock
- 59110: ZAMOL - Midlands open access livestock and dairy
- 59157: ZAGKA - Great Karoo small stock
- 59158: ZAPLD - Upland dairy and stock farming
- 59159: ZAXGF - Xariep-Great Fish valley small stock
- 59160: ZACHX - Cold moist highlands exclusive access livestock
- 59161: ZAKHL - Karoo highlands livestock
- 59162: ZAMXL - Midlands exclusive access livestock and dairy
- 59163: ZAKUK - Baviaans Karoo mountains livestock
- 59211: ZAMIO - Midlands and coastal open access mixed livestock and crops
- 59257: ZAHWC - Upper Senqu and Harrismith cereal and cattle
- 59260: ZAMIX - Midlands and coastal exclusive access mixed livestock and crops
- 59261: ZAHMX - Highland exclusive access mixed farming
- 59262: ZAMEM - Emalahleni midlands mixed access mixed livestock and crops
- 59269: ZALAN - Kou-Kamma Langkloof valley crops and livestock
- 59367: ZAFCI - Great Fish and Camdeboo irrigated farming
- 59373: ZASUN - Addo Sundays River and other irrigated farms
- 59452: ZACSU - Coastal and Midlands sugar producing
- 59551: ZAFOR - Agriforestry plantations and forests
- 59552: ZAWIL - Wilderness-Plettenberg lakes forest and cattle
- 59902: ZAPRU - Uncultivated, unbuilt or unused area
- 59903: ZAPRO - Protected nature, forest or game reserve, gazetted

Western Cape Livelihood Zones

- 59157: ZAGKA - Great Karoo small stock
- 59163: ZAKUK - Baviaans Karoo mountains livestock
- 59164: ZASCD - Southern coast duneveld

- 59263: ZACKA - Cederberg Karoo
- 59264: ZAWSC - West Coast and Bredasdorp grain and small stock
- 59265: ZASWA - Swartland mixed grain, fruit and dairy
- 59266: ZALKH - Little Karoo high fruit and dairy mixed farming
- 59267: ZAKSW - Kango-Swartberg livestock and crops
- 59268: ZALKA - Little Karoo ostriches and mixed farming
- 59269: ZALAN - Kou-Kamma Langkloof valley crops and livestock
- 59270: ZAOUT - Outeniqua plateau mixed farming, dairy and forests
- 59271: ZACHR - Caledon-Heidelberg-Riversdale small grain, dairy and livestock
- 59368: ZAOCL - Lower Olifants River-Vredendal valley
- 59369: ZAOUC - Upper Olifants citrus and potatoes
- 59370: ZAVIN - Cape Winelands vineyards, fruit and other farming
- 59371: ZACGE - Ceres-Grabouw-Elgin cold fruit growing
- 59372: ZABB - Breede Bot and Riviersonderend valley fruit and wine farming
- 59374: ZAPHI - Philippi and other horticulture
- 59375: ZAWIL - Wilderness-Plettenberg lakes forest and cattle
- 59701: ZAUHF - Urban, residential, fishing high unemployment
- 59900: ZAGOV - Government area
- 59902: ZAPRU - Uncultivated, unbuilt or unused area
- 59903: ZAPRO - Protected nature, forest or game reserve, gazetted
- 59905: ZAPRP - Protected, private nature or game reserve

Urban Livelihood Zones

- 59802: ZAUO - Urban, commercial / mercantile
- 59804: ZAUED - Urban, education / health / services
- 59806: ZAUIN - Urban, industrial / transport
- 59831: ZAUIS - Urban, residential, informal better serviced
- 59832: ZAUIC - Urban, residential, informal service constrained
- 59841: ZAUBM - Urban, residential, combined planned-informal
- 59842: ZAUBH - Urban, residential, combined planned-informal high unemployment
- 59843: ZABA - Urban, residential, combined planned-informal acute unemployment
- 59844: ZAUBE - Urban, residential, combined planned-informal extreme poverty
- 59851: ZAUUM - Urban, residential, municipal high-rise middle income
- 59852: ZAUHH - Urban, residential, municipal high-rise high unemployment
- 59861: ZAUHM - Urban, residential, high-rise affluent and middle-income
- 59862: ZAUHH - Urban, residential tenements, high unemployment
- 59863: ZAUHA - Urban, residential tenements, acute unemployment
- 59864: ZAUHE - Urban, residential tenements, extreme poverty
- 59871: ZAUHM - Urban, residential, mixed building affluent and middle-income
- 59872: ZAUMH - Urban, residential, mixed building high unemployment
- 59873: ZAUMA - Urban, residential, mixed building acute unemployment
- 59881: ZAULM - Urban, residential, low-rise affluent and middle-income
- 59882: ZAULH - Urban, residential, low-rise high unemployment
- 59883: ZAULA - Urban, residential, low-rise acute unemployment
- 59884: ZAULE - Urban, residential, low-rise extreme poverty
- 59890: ZAUSM - Urban, smallholdings, uncultivated or grazing

Executive Summary

Southern African Development Community member states have been carrying out assessments annually (or sometimes more frequently) since 2002 under the coordination of the Regional Vulnerability Assessment and Analysis Programme (RVAA Programme), itself reporting to the Regional Vulnerability Assessment Committee. These assessments have been joint undertakings between governments, local and international non-government organisations, academia and international multi-lateral agencies (such as the UN agencies). Within this system, National Vulnerability Assessment Committees (NVACs) have been formed and in South Africa, the South African Vulnerability Assessment Committee, chaired by the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, has been established, along with a secretariat in the Subsistence Farming and Food Security Directorate. The SAVAC is mandated with undertaking food security, risk and vulnerability assessments and the author was requested to carry out this study with a view to understanding the impact of the current drought in the country, as well as other factors such as poor economic performance.

During 2014 and 2015 the value of the Rand slipped from around R8.00 to the United States Dollar down to less than R15.00. This has its origins in many issues, such as declining global commodity prices, but it is also subject to influence from good or bad governance, the former able to halt or minimise fall out from external factors, the latter a cause of accelerated damage. The drought caused the late onset of the 2015/2016 summer agricultural season and the resultant extremely poor production has forced the country to import a massive proportion of basic foods, especially cereals. Having been purchased on the world market in Dollars and then transported to Randfontein, the cost of these imports is high. South Africa is not alone in this predicament; neighbouring countries are experiencing even worse failures and critical shortages.

The SAVAC uses a combination of two approaches for assessing risk and vulnerability. The first is longitudinal in nature as it studies the impacts of events over a specific time frames (usually a year), while concerning itself less with the details of variations between individuals and households. The other approach is a cross-sectional ‘snapshot’ of conditions at a point in time, which provides details of the variations across a population. The former approach is called the Household Economy Approach (HEA) and is the section to which this report is dedicated.

HEA uses a framework of collecting detailed ‘baselines’ on households’ livelihoods for a period, usually a year, so that a coherent, logical picture of how a group of households obtain their cash income, their food income and what they expend money on is understood in depth. The information is aggregated geographically by livelihood zones and locally by wealth groups. Armed with these baselines, an analyst can investigate the prevailing or forecast conditions to understand their effect on the lives of the poor. During this study, the author made use of existing baselines, but was also forced to synthesise baseline livelihoods pictures using data from other sources, so that good national coverage could be achieved. These ‘synthesis’ baselines include the remaining open access livelihood zones (livestock, mixed and cropping), farm workers and the urban poor.

In order to determine the extent and degree of impact of the drought, different sources were used. The average of the Vegetation Condition Index (VCI) for January 2016 was chosen for the extent and this image was digitised and applied to crop data for crop problem specification. Other problem specifications, e.g. for livestock, self-employment activities, small business or petty trading, casual labour (agricultural, construction and domestic), formal labour, wild foods, fishing, social grants and loans access were also studied. Some of these problem specifications could not be determined as they still had to occur in the future.

Prices were analysed and from the data it would appear that staple prices are likely to be around 35% higher this year than last year. This is 65% higher than in the baseline year and the problem specification is thus 165% (problem specification = this year / last year).

The analysis aimed at understanding how households would meet their basic needs. These needs are defined according to four thresholds: food energy, the food poverty line (FPL), the lower bound poverty line (LBPL) and the upper bound poverty line (UBPL). The food energy threshold is about households reaching their minimum average food energy requirement through basic starches and cereals only. The FPL includes other food commodities for a more varied (though not necessarily healthy) diet. The LBPL

and UBPL include a further basket of commodities, the difference between the two being quantities.

The problem specifications divided the geography into drought hazard affected areas and non-hazard areas. Furthermore, households within these areas and within the wealth groups can be divided into those who receive social grants and those who do not.

Social grants play such a crucial role in livelihoods that their presence or absence is decisive in risk and vulnerability; generally, the effect of social grants is much greater than the effect of the drought.

The results of the analysis were scraped off the analysis spreadsheets and placed into a PostgreSQL database for spatial and relational querying. The PostgreSQL queries combine the livelihood zones and their temporary ‘synthesis’ zones, the drought hazard area, the enumeration small areas and their associated census populations, the population projections to 2016, the social grants access, the wealth groups, the single zone analysis spreadsheets and the four different thresholds into a series of tables for calculating summaries and for outputting maps.

The provincial summarised results are show in **Tables 1 to 4**. Detailed maps can be found on pages 53 to 57, in **Figures 39 to 46**.

There are approximately **4,883,000 people who will have a food energy deficit**—which amounts to **420,900 MT** of cereal equivalent over the whole consumption year. These people have a critical food shortage and are likely to hungry or engage in damaging livelihood strategies to stay alive. These are the poorest people who do *not* receive social grants. There are approximately **4,915,500 people who are below the FPL**, the sum of their deficit is **ZAR 8,130,035,000**, or about ZAR 8.13 billion. These people are *in addition* to the 20.2% of the population reported by Statistics SA as below the FPL. Approximately **25,305,600 people (45.3% of the population of the country) are below the upper bound poverty line**; their deficit amounts to approximately **ZAR 124,386,000,000** or ZAR 124.386 billion.

It is recommended that an immediate response be made for poor or indigent households that do not receive social grants (or have a family member who receives social grants). This is a matter of urgency. Furthermore, it is critical that exchange rates remain stable until sufficient stocks of food are purchased until the next harvest. This will keep food prices stable or perhaps even drop.

In the medium and long term interventions that strengthen agriculture, promote job creation and provide skills will contribute to a decrease in households below the UBPL.

Introduction

The Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF), in collaboration with the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Regional Vulnerability Assessment and Analysis (RVAA) Programme, is working towards strengthening food insecurity and vulnerability assessment in South Africa. Through this partnership, a number of activities have been conducted towards institutionalisation of the South African Vulnerability Assessment Committee (SAVAC). The activities include:

- A scoping study, a strategic plan and the formation of Provincial VACs in three provinces;
- Baselines assessments in Limpopo province;
- An outcome forecast analysis (OFA) in Limpopo;
- Baselines assessments in Free State and KwaZulu-Natal provinces, and;
- This exercise, a national outcome forecast analysis (NOFA).

However, during 2015 and 2016 two events have had enormous impact on the lives of the country's poorest people: the occurrence of a severe drought resulting from an extreme El Niño event and the progressive devaluation of the Rand, the country's local currency. The former has impacted on farmers' ability to produce food locally, and the latter has substantially pushed up the price of imports.

In order to understand how these factors impact downstream on households access to quality food, we need to first understand how those households make a living. This necessitates understanding *the sum¹* of the different strategies they use to obtain enough food, to acquire the services and other goods they need to achieve the acceptable standard of living.

The size and complexity of South Africa as a country requires the vulnerability assessment system to be decentralised to provincial level or through the establishment of Provincial Vulnerability Assessment Committees (PVACs). The first provincial vulnerability assessment committee (PVAC) formed was the Limpopo VAC (LimVAC) and further PVACs have been formed in KwaZulu-Natal and Free State. As result of these efforts, full baselines with livelihoods and food security indicators' assessments have been carried out in fourteen *livelihood zones* by 29 April 2016.

The SAVAC uses a system that combines the Household Economy Approach (HEA), which provides a longitudinal or temporal picture of the *depth* of changing household food access and living standards, with the Food Security Continuum (the 'Continuum'), which provides a detailed cross-sectional 'snapshot' description of people and household under different food security indicators. The basic principle underlying the Household Economy Approach is that the understanding of local livelihoods is essential for analysing the impact (at household level), of shocks such as drought, conflict or market changes. The household economy approach analysis establishes a picture of typical, normal livelihood patterns for households in different geographical areas, in order to understand a range of conditions that local communities must cope with in a normal year as its baseline assessment.

The HEA methodology has been widely adopted in most Member States in the SADC Region. The methodology saves on resources and time, making it affordable and sustainable under small budgets. The methodology also attempts to maximise the use of existing information and survey data. Besides data generated using HEA, SAVAC also uses a range of secondary sources of data such as the crop estimates from the Department of Agriculture, population projections from Statistics South Africa (Stats SA), price time series from Stats SA and NAMC and consumer price index (CPI) and inflation rates from Stats SA. Ordinarily, a field exercise is also conducted that provides an opportunity to verify secondary data with that obtained from the province, district and municipalities as well as the villagers.

The baseline information is then used as a reference point for modelling the likely effects of shocks such as drought, floods and market failure. These shocks may affect people's ability to maintain their livelihoods or in extreme cases, they could be life-threatening. Any external response to these shocks needs to be based on the provision information and analysis, which gives solid guidance for short, medium and long term relief, recovery and development initiatives.

¹ As opposed to just obtaining the single most important strategy, which is grossly misleading since poor households invariably have more than one source of livelihood.

The purpose of the forecast scenario analysis exercise was to establish whether livelihoods of the household in the area covered by the zones have been affected, compared with the baseline outcomes. This will be used to demonstrate the approach and provide recommendations for appropriate policy action.

This exercise was carried out by one consultant, who used secondary sources entirely to define problem specifications and modelling the possible effects on households. Crop failure may, for example, leave one group of households without anything to eat if crop production is their main source of food but another group may be able to cope because they have alternative sources of food and income that can make up for lost crop production.

Baseline data was used to determine the key parameters that needed to be analysed and these included crop and livestock production, prices, and government assistance programmes among others. The SAVAC also consulted Department of Agriculture Officers in the municipalities within the livelihood zones and villages to seek their technical input and participation in the forecast analysis data collection.

This report focuses on the current agricultural season in terms of general rainfall and weather conditions, crop and Livestock production and household sources of food and cash income.

The analysis combines current year monitoring data with baseline data to project the most likely scenario in the quarter of the 2015/16 consumption year.

A Summary of the Assessment Process

The process of baseline livelihood profiling started in 2014 with a livelihood zoning exercise, given the significance of geography as a determinant of livelihood patterns. A livelihood zone was visited and the next step was to define the wealth groups in the livelihood zone as wealth determines options available to the household for access to food and income.

Having patterned households according to where they live and their wealth², the next step was to generate baseline livelihood profiles for typical households in each wealth group for a defined baseline or reference consumption year. An understanding of food access is gained by investigating the sum of ways households obtain food; that is, how much food they get from their own direct food crop production, their livestock, gifts from others, exchanges or barters and from purchases. To understand the latter, information is also collected on how much cash income is earned in a year and what essential needs are met with the earned income.

Obviously, it is not practical to analyse in detail the various components of each and every household's livelihood in the country, so a level of aggregation needs to be applied.

The first level of aggregation is geographic and although administration areas are the logical basis for reporting, very often an administration area might contain a many different groups of people, whose livelihoods will be vulnerable to different shocks or hazards, for example, farmers are vulnerable to drought, miners are vulnerable to mine closures which might result from collapsing commodity prices and business people are vulnerable to exchange rate shocks. Obviously, it makes sense to segment these different groups off as much as possible before doing the analysis and geographically, this is done by defining **livelihood zones**.

Within the livelihood zones, livelihoods depend on the resources that households have at their disposal. From an analytical point of view (but hardly from a privacy perspective), it would be ideal to have a complete inventory of all assets of all households in the country. However, this is not realistic and a practical approach involves grouping households who have approximately similar assets. It is important to note that 'assets' are not just the tangible assets we normally think of like cattle, vehicles, land or money, they also include intangible 'human assets' like education or health, 'social assets' like people's networks and connections, 'political assets' like access to leaders, an ID book, etc. and 'environmental assets' like water, soil quality, forests or infrastructure. These groups of households are called **wealth groups** and in all livelihood zones there are three or four wealth groups (usually described as 'Very Poor', 'Poor', 'Middle' and 'Better Off'). These wealth groups are defined by the communities during the **wealth breakdown**, when the baseline assessment teams explore issues related to household vulnerability as well as the coping strategies and options they undertake during bad years.

Once the baseline is established, analysis can be made on the likely impact of a shock or hazard in the current year. This process involves assessing how food access will be affected by the hazard and, given households' asset holdings and capacity to earn more, what other food sources can be added or expanded to make up for the initial shortfall. After all these factors are considered, final deficits emerge once households have exhausting all their coping strategies. The SAVAC used the period April 2013 to March 2014 as the baseline or reference consumption year and therefore the current analysis reflects the impact of current problems for the forecast period of 2013 to 2014.

The key parameters evaluated in April 2016

Using the baseline profiles, key parameters of change in each livelihood were identified. Each parameter affects a particular source of food, source of income or expenditure by changing either the access to the quantity of that source or the price for which it is either bought or sold. Examples of key parameters are the crops grown by households, their livestock, their labour, the social grants they receive from government and the food and non-food items that they purchase. With consumption, foodstuffs are grouped into staple and non-staple, and are combined with non-food expenditure to be compared with accepted standards, called **thresholds**, which are: the food energy requirement, the Food Poverty Line (FPL), the Lower Bound Poverty line (LBPL) and the Upper Bound Poverty Lines (UBPL).

² Wealth is defined in terms of asset holdings and incomes

Key parameters always compare the consumption year under review (in this case the period from April 2016 to March 2017) with the baseline consumption years (in all livelihoods it is the period from April 2013 to March 2014). An important characteristic of key parameters is whether they are *known* or *unknown*: known parameters are those which impact on livelihoods early in the consumption year and thus have already occurred, allowing their measurement, while unknown parameters have yet to occur during the consumption year and so cannot be measured. Of course, with the consumption year under review only just having started, there remain a lot of unknown parameters, which can only be included by constructing scenarios.

The key parameters assessed included:

- Household own-production and how this year it compares with that in the baseline year March 2013;
- Household access to food from agricultural labour exchange and how this compares with the baseline year;
- Access to food from livestock products and how this compares with the baseline year;
- Quantities of income-activities in the current year from crop sales, livestock sales, agricultural labour, other casual labour, petty trading, access to social grants and other income activities that vary across wealth groups, compared with the baseline;
- The prices of maize and livestock in the current year compared with baseline year prices;
- The price of items in the minimum non staple basket (soap, paraffin, matches, sugar, Tea and salt), and the essential expenditure basket (education, medical, ploughing, seed, livestock treatment, cooking oil, clothing and grinding costs).

The key parameters for 2016/2017 were compared with the baseline, 2013/2014, and the findings from this analysis formed the current year problem specification for scenario modelling.

Methodology

The six stages of the household Economy Approach

The South Africa Vulnerability Assessment Committee (SAVAC), conducts assessments and analysis using a livelihoods based analytical framework, called the Household Economy Approach (HEA), for modelling its forecasts. There are six stages in a household or food economy analysis:

1. **Livelihood zoning** – the area under consideration is divided into geographical areas where people broadly share similar patterns of livelihood;
2. **Wealth breakdowns** – the population in each livelihood zone is then further subdivided into wealth groups consisting of people with similar resource or asset bases;

These first two stages are concerned with dividing the population into groups of households that share similar characteristics in terms of their access to food and income. The assumption underlying these two stages is that access to food and income is determined by two factors; geography and economic status (i.e. relative wealth). While geography (where a household lives) determines the options for obtaining food and income, wealth generally determines a household's ability to exploit those options.

3. The third stage involves developing a detailed picture of food access, income and expenditure for each wealth group in 'typical' or 'normal' year. This picture describes household **livelihood strategies**.

The resulting product from these first three stages is called the **baseline**³. The data from these stages are stored in maps (the livelihood zones, as in **Figure 1** on page 7) and in the **baseline storage spreadsheets (BSSs)**, an example of the summary of which is presented in the first four columns of **Table 5**. These BSSs are an inefficient and cumbersome store for this type of information but they

³ This baseline, which is essentially just a reference point for on-going temporal and monitoring analysis, must be distinguished from a *programmatic baseline*, which is the existing situation before an intervention, which is obviously hoping to achieve some long term change from the baseline.

nevertheless provide a summary outcome that can be used in an outcome forecast analysis (OFA).

4. The fourth stage is to define the **hazard** or change for the current year in reference to the baseline year. As we are ‘peeking’ into the future we do not know all the potential hazards that await households, so we build **scenarios** based on reasoned and stated **assumptions**. This process is called defining the **problem specification**.
5. The fifth stage is the **response analysis**; where **response strategies** that households may employ to ensure their minimum needs are met are included together with the hazard and baseline livelihood strategies.
6. The sixth and final stage is to combine all the above information (baseline access, hazard and response strategies) to generate projections of future food and income access. The results from the analysis can then be collated into totals by administrative area (such as provinces and districts) for informing decision making at the appropriate levels.

These last three steps constitute the **outcome forecast analysis (OFA)** and since, this is an OFA for the entire country, it is referred to as a **national outcome forecast analysis (NOFA)**. The process can be summarised in an *approximate mathematical form* thus⁴:

$$\text{Outcome} = \sum_{\text{each source}} (\text{Baseline} \times \text{Hazard}) + (\text{Response} \times \text{Hazard})$$

This formula is applied in a more complex way in the **single zone analysis spreadsheets (SZASs)**, into which the problem specifications are entered with the details of the analysis of the households’ responses. These spreadsheets are essentially complex calculators; they take the sources of food (in food energy terms), the sources of income and the expenditures of each wealth group from the baselines and process them through the problem specification, factoring in the response analysis and presenting the outcome, in either food energy terms or cash terms.

The resultant total (cash and non-cash) income from the analysis outcomes are compared with four thresholds: the food energy requirement, the Food Poverty Line (FPL), the Lower Bound Poverty Line (LBPL) and the Upper Bound Poverty Line (UBPL). If incomes or food sources fall below any of these thresholds a deficit is recorded. The food energy deficit is expressed in food energy terms, while the FPL, LBPL and UBPL are expressed in cash terms; this gives four output parameters to be recorded for compilation. This processes is done with a view to estimating individuals who are below the thresholds and require policy intervention.

Using 2011 census data for the **enumeration small areas** (ESAs), population growth projections and the hazard extent defined earlier during the problem specification, outcomes were converted from livelihood zones to administrative areas, so that appropriate policy interventions can be designed and implemented.

The Entire Process

In order to achieve the objectives laid out, this exercise was broken down into 36 steps:

Preparation of the Baselines

1. Prepare a synthesis-baseline for farm workers;
2. Prepare a synthesis baseline for the urban poor.

Preparation of the analysis spreadsheets;

3. Prepare analysis spreadsheets for all assessed and completed livelihood zones;
4. Prepare synthesis analysis spreadsheets for the remaining open access livelihood zones in the country;
5. Prepare analysis spreadsheets for farm workers and for the urban poor.

⁴ There is a lot more to the analysis calculations than what is presented in this formula—for instance, it includes aspects of switching expenditure, which is the preference a more efficient source over another.

Collecting data from secondary sources

6. Collect secondary source data for crop production, largely from the Crop Estimates Committee (CEC) for each harvest from 2013 onwards;
7. Collect secondary source satellite imagery and climatic spatial data (for example, the Standard Precipitation index);
8. Collect secondary source data for price problem specifications;
9. Collect secondary economic forecasts such as inflation, gross domestic product (GDP) and gross national product (GNP) growth rates.

Defining the hazard area and getting crop production problem specifications

10. To define the “hazard-affected” spatial area in the country, review and choose from the various rainfall and vegetation maps and remote sensing raster images;
11. Use a desktop Geographic Information System (GIS) to geo-reference the raster image or convert the origin rainfall vector feature set to the map coordinate reference system (CRS);
12. For raster images, in the desktop GIS, convert the colour remote sensing images to greyscale if the image contains more than one colour (for example, from red to yellow to green) by applying different weightings on each primary colour (red, blue and green) to ensure that each colour does not overlap with another colour’s grey shade value (e.g. dark green must be a different grey value from dark red);
13. Remove the any lines or borders within the image by filtering out all-black or dark grey pixels (which should be beyond the darkest colour shade);
14. Convert the raster image to vector polygons (‘polygonise’ or ‘vectorise’), with an attribute in the polygon table holding the greyscale value.
15. Import the vector feature set into a geo-spatially enabled database (such as PostGIS) for further operations;
16. Switch the greyscale values to text values representing the range of covered by each colour in the original raster image. This should result in an ordinal text value that traverses the remote sensing image from its lowest value range to its highest range;
17. Filter out all polygons smaller than nine pixels;
18. Buffer the resultant polygons to make sure that they overlap one another that polygons separated by only one pixel will be combined;
19. Remove any edge boundaries or other image paraphernalia by cropping the image to a polygon that defines the area of interest.
20. Select an appropriate cut-off for the vector layer on the new ordinal value column, so only the “hazard-affected” (in the current case, “drought-affected”) areas are shown;
21. Union (“dissolve” in ESRI parlance) the resultant filtered polygons in single multi-polygon for the remaining “hazard-affected” areas (which can be dumped to obtain separate single-polygon features, if needed);
22. Compile the crop estimate data to obtain provincial commercial crop problem specifications and national ‘subsistence’ crop problem specifications;
23. Overlay (“intersect” and “union”, in ESRI parlance) the “hazard-affected” area polygons onto the crop national crop areas;
24. Choose appropriate values for normal or non-hazard crop problem specifications in the open-access (or ‘subsistence agriculture’) and commercial areas in each province, then calculate the problem specification for the drought hazard areas using the crop estimates problem specs from step 22 (above);
25. Obtain, derive or choose scenarios for problem specifications of other agricultural production (crops, livestock, game, aquaculture, fishing);

26. Obtain, derive or choose scenarios for employment opportunities, self-employment opportunities and small business problem specifications;
27. Obtain, derive or choose scenarios for problem specifications on prices;
28. Decide on the ratios of grant and non-grant recipients; the analysis should be split into two cases: those that receive grants and those that do not.

Run the outcome analysis on the spreadsheets

29. Enter all the problem specifications in all the outcome analysis spreadsheets to run the analysis (to save time, a strategic approach can be made by entering common problem specifications, copying the spreadsheets and then entering the variants for each scenario);
30. View and study each livelihood zone/hazard grouping to understand and account for the analysis;
31. Collect all the outcomes (food deficit, food poverty line deficit, lower bound poverty line deficit and upper bound poverty line deficit) for each wealth group in each scenario in each livelihood zone into a single large table.

Attribute the analysis to populations and calculate the totals

32. Overlay (“intersect” and “union”, in ESRI parlance) the “hazard-affected” area polygons onto the enumeration small areas (SAs), and assign an attribute “hazard affected” as well as the month and date to a new table of small areas;
33. Calculate the affected populations in each enumeration small area (ESA) and their deficits for each threshold.
34. Create pivot tables for each outcome;
35. Map the numbers of people (or percentages of people) affected for each outcome;
36. Map the amounts of deficit for each outcome.

This involved a considerable amount of processing. To get the job done quicker, scripts were written and applied to many of the processes. Fortunately, this can be done given modern software and database tools such as Postgres, PostGIS, NodeJS and the QGIS desktop mapping application (with its many plugins).

The outcomes are presented as graphs, tables and maps from **Figure 16** on page 37, **Table 10** on page 39, to **Figure 46** on page 57 and **Tables 16** on page 51 and **17** on page 52.

Findings

The findings follow the 37 steps outlined above and are explained in sequence.

The Baselines

Farm Workers (Step 1)

Data for the farm workers was obtained from the two main surveys, the Western Cape Provincial Agriculture's 'Farm Worker Household Survey Reports 2014/15'⁵, the 'Farm Sectoral Determination: An Analysis Of Agricultural Wages In South Africa' by the Bureau for Food and Agricultural Policy.

Farm workers are divided here into three categories that are used in place of wealth groups: full-time employed, seasonal or temporarily employed and casual workers. Full time employees by and large enjoy all the benefits befitting employees under the Basic Conditions of Employment Act; although there may be exceptions to this the general pattern is compliance. However, not all farm workers are full-time employed and the nature of farming is such that at certain times of the year demand for labour increases. Conversely, mechanisation provides an alternative, though capital-intensive route for employers. There is also a gradual process acquisition of commercial farms by corporate entities—family farms are decreasing in number.


The main difference between temporary/seasonal workers and casuals is that casuals will do piecework for many different employers, getting hired for particular jobs that need doing, whilst temporary or seasonal workers will be hired for somewhat longer periods (months instead of weeks or days) and are more likely to be hired repeatedly. Casual workers generally have the most menial work, and the lowest incomes.

The studies above gave the sources of income for casual workers as casual labour, self-employment and social grants, with a little bit of public works employment and food aid (usually through school feeding programmes) included as well. The pattern is very similar for seasonal workers, although they are often able to engage in small business activities such as selling airtime, hawking goods or running a small stall. This is because their slightly higher incomes allow them the possibility of saving for the minimal capital for these very small enterprises.

It was found that full-time employees often have small businesses as well, perhaps being run by another member of the family. These small businesses bolster household incomes to almost double the wages of the worker.

The studies found that very few farm workers, regardless of their employment status, do their own farming on any significant scale. Consequently nearly all food consumed is from purchases. **Figure 2** shows the baseline total incomes.

Figure 2: Commercial farm workers' livelihoods



Urban Poor (Step 2)

Urban areas are geographically delineated by wealth, wealthier people tend to live in plush suburbs that exclude poorer households. Therefore, to exclude the wealthiest urban households from this analysis, only the urban livelihood zones with poor households were included. Thus, the urban livelihoods zones included for this analysis are:

- The informal settlements: LZ codes 59830, 59831 and 59832;
- The combined formal and informal settlements: LZ codes 59840, 59841, 59842, 59843 and 59844;
- Municipal high rise areas with extreme poverty: LZ codes 59852
- Residential tenements with high unemployment or poverty: LZ codes 59862, 59863 and 59864;
- Mixed residential areas with high unemployment or poverty: LZ codes 59872 and 59873;
- Low rise residential areas with high unemployment or poverty: LZ codes 59882, 59883 and 59884;

In the analysis, these livelihood zone codes are all mapped to a temporary ‘analysis code’: 59899 representing the ‘Urban Poor’.


The Information for the baselines data for the Urban Poor was obtained from the National Income Dynamics Surveys (**NIDS**) Wave 4⁶ and its associated papers⁷. The NIDS data has variables that link numbers of households with amounts of income for each source. This has to be converted to amounts of income per group; in this case we are looking at the urban and the poorest half of the population. This half was divided into four (quartiles), for which livelihoods with cash income and expenditure were constructed.

The poorest two quartiles depend most on social grants, although cash gifts, casual work and self-employment also contribute—some income for the second quartile comes from a small business or petty trading activity. The first quartile are also below the upper bound poverty line (UBPL), although they are above the lower bound and food poverty lines.

It is only in the third quartile that employment becomes a significant part of income. Nevertheless, casual work still plays an important role.

An issue with poor urban households is that they often have relatives in rural areas as well; these relatives may expect remittances and support from their urban counterparts. However, for this analysis, the rural and urban households are treated as distinct from one another. Even though there may be money transfers and other links between, they remain two independent economic units.

Figure 3: Urban poor households’ livelihoods



The Analysis Spreadsheets

Existing baselines (Step 3)

Single zone analysis spreadsheets (SZASs) were prepared from the existing baselines. These spreadsheets contain an income equivalent of both food sources and cash sources (the ‘total income’)

6 The NIDS data is available on the DataFirst data portal (<https://www.datafirst.uct.ac.za>), which is maintained by the School of Economics in the University of Cape Town:

<https://www.datafirst.uct.ac.za/dataportal/index.php/catalog/571/datafile/F34/?limit=100&offset=200#page=F36&tab=data-dictionary>

7 Daniels Reza C., Finn Arden and Musundwa Sibongile, 2012/6, *Wealth in the National Income Dynamics Study Wave 2*, Working Paper Series Number 83

so that food produced and consumed directly is included in the analysis and access calculations. The food purchased is based on the commodities in the food poverty line (FPL), so all income calculations reference to this and the other two poverty lines, the lower bound poverty line (LBPL) and the upper bound poverty line (UBPL). An example of this spreadsheet is given below in **Table 5** (the red-bordered cell is where the deficit will appear if there is one), while **Table 6** show the total income summary section of the spreadsheet (the deficits are highlighted with boundaries and coloured text if they are present: khaki for the UPBL deficit—as in **Table 6**, orange for a LBPL deficit and red for an FPL deficit).

Table 5 - Example of an analysis spreadsheet

ZAKHC: 59208

Okhahlamba open access intense crops and livestock

BASELINE ACCESS				PROBLEM SPECIFICATION				RESPONSE			SUMMARY		
Sources of Food : Poor HHs													
	Baseline Access	Expand ability	Max. Access	Problem %norm	Food Intake kJ/day	Con.prob %norm	Max.curr Access	Curr. Access	Baseline Access	Initial Deficit	Curr. Access		
Cows' milk - season 1	2%	0%	2%	20%	baseline: 8800	20%	0%	0%	2%	0%	1%		
Own meat	2%	0%	2%	20%		20%	0%	0%	2%	0%	1%		
Maize: kg produced	19%	0%	19%	30%	for analysis:	30%	6%	6%	19%	6%	6%		
Beans: kg produced	3%	0%	3%	20%	8800	20%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%		
potatoes: kg produced	1%	2%	3%	20%		20%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%		
Food aid	12%	0%	12%	100%		100%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%		
Purchase - other	1%	-1%	0%	100%		100%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%		
Purchase - desirable	0%	0%	0%	100%		100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		
Purchase - fpl non staple	20%	3%	22%	100%		100%	22%	21%	20%	20%	21%		
Purchase - staple	59%		303%	100%		100%	155%	59%	59%	29%	59%		
food deficit								0%		30%	0%		
total	120%	4%	368%				197%				70%		
							adj.factor = 0.46						
Income : Poor HHs													
	Baseline Access	Expand ability	Max. Access	Problem %norm	Comm. Price	Staple Price	Con.prob %norm	Max.curr Access	Curr. Access	Baseline Access	Initial Deficit	Curr. Access	% of baseline income
Cash													
Cattle sales - local: no. sold	6,750	0	6,750	50%	118%	165%	59%	3,983	3,983	13%	7%	7%	
Goat sales - local: no. sold	3,000	-2,500	500	50%	118%	165%	59%	295	1,093	6%	3%	2%	
Sheep sales - local: no. sold	0	0	0	50%	118%	165%	59%	0	0	0%	0%	0%	
Chicken sales: no. sold	0	0	0	100%	118%	165%	118%	0	0	0%	0%	0%	
Maize: kg produced	0	0	0	30%	140%	165%	42%	0	0	0%	0%	0%	
Beans: kg produced	1,500	0	1,500	20%	140%	165%	28%	420	420	3%	1%	1%	
potatoes: kg produced	160	-160	0	20%	140%	165%	28%	0	24	0%	0%	0%	
Agricultural cash income – see Data2	2,760	0	2,760	50%	111%	165%	56%	1,532	1,532	5%	3%	3%	
Construction cash income – see Data2	0	0	0	50%	111%	165%	56%	0	0	0%	0%	0%	
Domestic work cash income	2,200	0	2,200	50%	111%	165%	56%	1,221	1,221	4%	2%	2%	
Labour migration(formal employment)	0	0	0	40%	118%	165%	47%	0	0	0%	0%	0%	
Small business – see Data2	0	0	0	80%	118%	165%	94%	0	0	0%	0%	0%	
Social development – see Data2	22,020	0	22,020	100%	118%	165%	118%	25,984	25,984	41%	49%	49%	
Public works -- see Data2	14,916	0	14,916	100%	118%	165%	118%	17,601	17,601	28%	33%	33%	
Gifts/social support: type (Child support, Pension and Foster Care)	0	0	0	100%	100%	165%	100%	0	0	0%	0%	0%	
Remittances	0	0	0	100%	111%	165%	111%	0	0	0%	0%	0%	
total:	53,306	-2,660	50,646					51,035	51,857	100%	99%	97%	
Expenditure : Poor HHs													
	Baseline Expend			Problem %norm	Comm. Price		Con.prob %norm	Max.curr Expend	Curr. Expend	Baseline Expend	Initial Deficit	Curr. Expend	% of baseline expenditure
Cash													
fpl non-staple food	14,936			100%	140%		140%	20,910	20,910	28%	39%	39%	
lbpl	15,579			100%	118%		118%	18,383	18,383	29%	34%	34%	
ubpl	27,744			100%	118%		118%	0	1,141	52%	14%	2%	
resilience	4,656			100%	118%		118%	0	0	9%	0%	0%	
staple food	6,940							30,125	11,423	13%	11%	21%	
other	0							0	0	0%	0%	0%	
total:	53,306							51,035	51,857	131%	99%	97%	
exp. deficit								18,383	0		-20%	0%	
Cost of staple													
name of staple	mix												
kg pppd	0.65												
HH size	8												
cost per kg	6.24												
cost of staple	11,771							165%	19,422				
cost of FPL (100% staple & non-staple)	24,063							149%	35,969				

It will noticed that although food sources like own crops consumed or wild foods consumed are treated as an income, food purchases are not. Food purchases, although a source of food, are an item of

expenditure rather than an income. It must be emphasised that for income, household sizes of all the wealth groups are normalised to that of the ‘poor’ wealth group (in the case in **Table 5** and **6** above, it is eight people), while baseline incomes are adjusted to what the FPL would have cost in today’s Rands. The

Table 6 - Example of the analysis spreadsheet total income and deficits summary

Baseline	Init Def	Response	
Own crops consumed	4,042	1,267	1,306
Own crops sold	2,481	465	444
Animal products consumed	853	188	188
Animal products sold	0	0	0
Animals sold	14,575	5,753	5,076
Wild foods consumed and sold	0	0	0
Labour - casual	7,414	2,753	2,753
Labour - formal emp	0	0	0
Labour - public works	22,297	17,601	17,601
Self - employment	0	0	0
Small business/petty trading	0	0	0
Food transfer - official	2,095	2,312	2,312
Food transfer - gifts	0	0	0
Cash transfer - official	32,916	25,984	25,984
Cash transfer - gifts	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTAL	86,673	56,322	55,664
Food Poverty line	35,969	35,969	35,969
Lower Bound Poverty line	54,352	54,352	54,352
Upper Bound Poverty line	87,090	87,090	87,090
Resilience line			
FPL Deficit	0	0	0
LBPL Deficit	0	0	0
UBPL Deficit	417	30,768	31,426

Other Open Access Livelihood Zones, Farm Workers and the Urban Poor (Step 3 to 5)

No baselines exist for the remainder of the open access tenure livelihood zones and it is not possible to synthesise them each in any way without fresh and adequate field data. But to do the analysis, some sort of ‘baseline’ was needed and these were made for the three main types of open access livelihood zone: livestock-dominated based zones, mixed crops and livestock based zones and more crop-dominated livelihood zones. The baseline livelihood source summaries for these zones were derived from averages of the existing zones of the same type, as it is likely that the actual patterns on the ground of the unknown livelihood zones will be similar to the ‘known’ and completed livelihood zones. These were entered directly into the single zone analysis spreadsheets (SZAs) so that the problem specifications could be prepared.

Secondary Source Data (Step 6 to 9)

This analysis was completed entirely with data from secondary sources. Normally, when an assessment of this nature is undertaken, some primary data will still be captured and used alongside that from the secondary indicators. This helps to ‘ground truth’ the analysis, as well as filling in the indicator gaps that monitoring systems often leave out in livelihoods, such as: casual labour opportunities, informal or petty trading, crafts and self-employment.

Hazard Definition and Problem Specification (Steps 10 to 28)

The hazards people face can be broken into two types: spatial and non-spatial. Spatial hazards are those that are confined to particular geographical areas (such as crop failures resulting from drought or floods), whereas non-spatial hazards are those that afflict people (but not necessarily all people) in all areas (such as a general rise in prices or changes to social development policies).

With both hazard types, a determination needs to be made for those that experience the hazard versus those that do not.


Usually, a combination of approaches are applied to arrive at a spatial definition of the hazard. The first

approach is to use some sort of spatial hazard data, such as remote sensing images, while the second approach is to look at the production factors of interest (for example, crops or livestock).

Climatic Spatial Data and Remote Sensing (Step 10)

The author looked at several types of remote sensing data sets and these include:

- Rainfall deviation from satellite images (source: FAO);
- Rainfall deviation from local sources (source: ARC-ISCW);
- Standard precipitation index (SPI) (source: ARC-ISCW);
- Normalised differential vegetation index (NDVI) (source: FAO-GIEWS);
- Vegetation condition index (VCI) (source: FAO-GIEWS);
- Vegetation health index (VHI) (source: FAO-GIEWS); and



- Agriculture stress index (ASI) (source: FAO-GIEWS).

At first glance, the agricultural stress index (ASI) appeared to be the simplest and most attractive set to use to determine hazard areas, with a historical set of images for each dekad that shows how, where and when the drought developed to its most devastating. **Figure 4** shows the development of the drought over the months from November 2015 to February 2016. The ASI has the advantage that it is a combination of a range of factors that affect crop performance, so in many ways it is good for establishing a problem specification. However, it also suffers some disadvantages:

- The ASI focusses only on crops, while in many affected parts of the country livestock are the key productive components; and
- The ASI only shows results for the current cropping season, so areas with different seasonal priorities (such as winter rainfall) have to come from a different set of images.

Nevertheless, the images in **Figure 4** do show the extent of crop failure: the dark red areas of North West, Free State and northern KwaZulu-Natal, as well as the red or orange parts of KwaZulu-Natal, Eastern Cape and Limpopo. Note, the winter rainfall Western Cape and the vast area under livestock grazing in North West, Northern Cape and Free State do not show up.

Therefore, the analyst considered precipitation and vegetation maps for more information.

Precipitation, when compared with the long term average as in the rainfall anomaly (RFA), is an important determinant, although crop and grazing conditions depend as much on the *distribution* of rainfall as they do on the total amount that fell. The standard precipitation index (SPI) takes these factors into account (SPI - McKee et al., 1993) and was formulated to display drought events from rainfall data by quantifying precipitation deficits on different time scales. Spatially, the data are grouped per quaternary catchment for each time period and are based on the historical distribution of rainfall. The time period chosen here is the three-month average, so each image (for each month) represents a moving average over 24 months, twelve months, six months, three months and a single month for that particular month. These are published by the Agricultural Research Council's Institute For Soil, Climate And Water (ARC-ISCW) in their monthly publication "*Umlindi – the Watchman*".

The development of the drought is clear from the images. It began in the north of KwaZulu-Natal in December 2014, spread up to southern Mpumalanga in February 2015 and on to North West in March 2015, afflicting Free State in October 2015. The drought reached its worst in December 2015, with the rains finally arriving in the summer rainfall regions in January 2016. A month after the onset of these rains, the natural vegetation was showing recovery, although the cropping season was lost for much of North West, Free State, Northern Cape, northern KwaZulu-Natal, northern Eastern Cape, the lowveld of Mpumalanga and Limpopo and the Swartland area of Western Cape.


Lastly, the condition of the vegetation shows the impact of rainfall (or the lack of it) on the actual crops and grazing. The vegetation condition index (VCI) has been chosen here.


Figures 5, 6 and 7 contain a time series of SPI, RFA and VCI, starting in December 2014 (in 2014 there was a localised drought in North West Province) and running up until February 2016. The SPI images are for three-month categories, which means they are like a three-month moving average ending at the particular month (e.g. the three-month SPI for November 2015 is the SPI for September, October and November 2015).

The vegetation condition image for January 2016 was chosen because it captures the after-effects of the previous months' low rainfall, as well as the relief that some parts of the country received that month for the limited rains.

Georeferencing, conversion of colour raster images to single-value vector format (Steps 11 to 16)

Much of the analysis depends on land area measurements: for example, the overlapping or common area between map features representing different variables. Considering that the analysis takes place at a national (small) scale, the maps need to be reprojected to a suitable coordinate reference system (CRS) for measuring area reasonably quickly.








Figure 8: VCI image reprojected to the South African Albers Equal Area (please note the provincial boundaries are those of the image and are incorrect)

The South African Albers Equal Area Conical CRS does this well and so the images are georeferenced and reprojected to it⁸; the result is shown below in **Figure 8**.

The colours in the image where the drought was worst are those with a value less than 0.35, that is: dark red, red and dark orange. The analyst was unable to obtain the original images with pixel values representing the VCI value, so the colour spectrum from this image was converted to suitable values.

This was done by converting the pixel colours to greyscale, adjusting the red and green shades so that they do not have the same grey values (dark red and dark green can convert to the same grey shade, but obviously they represent opposite values on the image). This way, the green and red coloured pixels are staggered from one another in terms of grey shading. The result is shown below in **Figure 9**, note the greyscale colour value in square brackets after the VCI value on the legend (e.g. “[RGB=151,151,151]”).

The country and level 1 boundaries in the raster images needed removal. Fortunately, this was easily done by filtering the greyscale image on black and very dark values. It did, unfortunately, also leave ‘holes’, ‘gashes’ or blank values where the lines used to be.

This raster image could then be converted to a vector format. The conversion process applies a union (a ‘merge’ or ‘dissolve’) to adjacent pixels having the same shade, so that the resultant vector feature has polygons that comprise one or more pixels, depending on the shade values. The grey-shade values appeared as an attribute column on the vector table and were mapped to the VCI ranges by adding a column with the ranges values as text. The result was imported into PostGIS/Postgres and is shown in **Figure 10**. Note that although this graphic appears to be similar in its presentation as the greyscale

⁸ The general shape of continental South Africa (i.e., excluding Marion and Gough Islands), being somewhat wider (east-west dimension) than its height (north-south dimension) makes it suited to a conical projection. If the standard parallels are chosen correctly, Albers Equal Area gives a good representation of land area throughout the country, at the expense of distorting directional accuracy (except along the longitude of centre) and polygon shapes. The standard parallels used in all national maps with this projection have been chosen at 24.2° S and 32.8° S, with the longitude of centre at 25.1° E. The projection uses the World Geodetic Survey 1984 datum and ellipsoid, while map measurements and coordinates are in metres.

Figure 9: VCI image converted to greyscale, with reds offset from greens to ensure separation of shades (please note the provincial boundaries are those of the image and are incorrect)

Figure 10: VCI raster image converted to polygon vector format with the VCI value range restored

image in **Figure 9**, it is in fact fundamentally different because the previously green areas of the map are now lighter than any of the red or orange areas. For example, compare the coastal belt just south of Durban, which was to be green in the original VCI image in **Figure 8**, then became a darker grey in **Figure 9** and a lighter orange in **Figure 10**.

Buffering, cleaning and filtering out the small groups of pixels (Steps 17 to 19)

Very small areas of low vegetation condition could be considered outliers or anomalies that do not need to be included in the general hazard area. All features smaller than nine pixels were thus filtered out and the remaining features buffered by 1500 metres to ensure that when they are combined by a union into larger polygon features set out as

Figure 11: The process of selecting only larger groups of pixels and buffering them, shown for VCI values of 0.25 to 0.3

the drought-affected area, they are closer to one another than one pixel width (which is approximately 2500 metres).

At this point all the extra graphics and paraphernalia from the remote-sensing images can be removed as well; they are easily filtered out with simple spatial query parameters.

Figure 13: The drought hazard area (affected area) superimposed onto the original VCI image for January 2016 (please note the provincial boundaries are those of the image and are incorrect)

Obtaining the hazard area; filtering the worst affected pixels and then combining them together with a union (Step 20 and 21)

The threshold for ‘drought’ conditions was set at all VCI values below 0.35 and the buffered polygons were then combined to form a single ‘drought hazard area’ feature set. This drought hazard area is shown below in **Figure 12**. The feature set polygons were initially combined into a single large multipolygon, which was dumped into its many constituent pieces, so that the feature set table now has many rows, which are spatially indexed.

Figure 13 shows the drought hazard area superimposed onto the original VCI remote sensing image. The result is a satisfactory coverage of the worst drought areas in the country.

Crop Production

Analysing the crop estimates and obtaining worst and best areas (Step 22)

Crop estimates from the Crop Estimates Committee (CEC). These are published four times for each summer and winter season. However, the estimates available from the CEC on their website are totals for the provinces only, with the addition of a national figure for ‘subsistence’ agriculture. Going forward, it will be extremely useful if these provincial crop estimate numbers could be further broken, perhaps into district-level numbers or even better, municipality-level. This data will contain a lot more local resolution.

Crop problem specifications are arrived at by dividing this year’s production by the baseline year’s production over the same area. In all livelihood zones the baseline consumption year was 2013-2014, so the harvests achieved in 2013 served as the comparative production data, i.e., the problem specification is derived by dividing 2016 production data by 2013 production data.

Table 8 below shows the production data for the 2013 baseline year, the current year (where available) and the problem spec for non-commercially grown and commercially grown major crops—with the commercially grown major crops subdivided by province.

Figure 14: Drought hazard area overlaid onto the major agricultural regions

Obtaining agricultural problem specifications for hazard and non-hazard sections (Steps 23 to 25)

The difficulty is that CEC crop estimates and problem specifications apply to the whole of each province; they do not discriminate between drought-affected and non-drought affected areas in each province. To discriminate between these two cases, the breakdown between ‘normal’ and ‘drought-affected’ areas was achieved by overlaying the drought hazard area from **Figure 12** onto the major agricultural regions, as shown in **Figure 15**, and then comparing the area of land under the hazard with that which is not for the agricultural region.

Areas under the hazard sections and non-hazard sections were derived through a spatial union of the hazard area, the agricultural regions and the provinces.

In terms of grain crops—primarily maize in the summer rainfall parts of the country—the approach was to decide on a reasonable crop problem specification for the *non-hazard* (or ‘normal’) sections of each agricultural region in each province and then calculate the *hazard section* problem specification from the CEC data for the province, the non-hazard problem specification and the comparative land areas for the hazard and non-hazard sections. Consideration was made on the degree of coverage of the hazard section on the agricultural regions in the province as well as the CEC crop estimates for that province when deciding on an appropriate non-hazard problem specification.

In badly affected provinces (Free State, KwaZulu-Natal, Eastern Cape and North West) the non-hazard problem specification was 77%. In Limpopo, the drought varied in its intensity across the province, and the *non-hazard section* problem specification was 140%, while in Mpumalanga the *non-hazard section*, which in the end was larger than in Free State or KwaZulu-Natal due to the January rains, nevertheless suffered reduced production, so problem specification was set at 70%. The ‘subsistence’ (or open-access tenure) agricultural region also has maize production and also has hazard and non-hazard sections, although there are significant variations in the degree of affectedness from the hazard. A problem specification of 109% (i.e., 9% more than 2013 production) was used for the *non-hazard section* in these subsistence regions. In Northern Cape and Western Cape, the tiny areas under maize were generally quite good in the *non-hazard sections*, being irrigated, and achieved a high problem

specification of 200% (or double the 2013 value)⁹. At the time of analysis, winter crop production data for 2016 in were not available.

Table 7 - Crop production and problem specification values

Province	Datum	Maize, white	Maize, yellow	Sorghum	Beans	Soya	Sunflower	Groundnuts	Wheat
Non-commercial	BL Prod	459,995	215,095						
	CY Prod	286,175	149,565						
	P. Spec	62%	70%						
Limpopo, commercial	BL Prod	153,000	136,300	21,000	10,800	55,000	79,200	1,200	142,800
	CY Prod	173,250	127,600	9,800	4,500	38,400	48,750	2,000	N/A
	P. Spec	113%	94%	47%	42%	70%	62%	167%	N/A
Mpumalanga, commercial	BL Prod	1,020,000	1,980,000	44,850	11,900	369,000	10,230	750	27,900
	CY Prod	672,000	1,452,000	35,000	6,000	360,000	4,400	-	N/A
	P. Spec	66%	73%	78%	50%	98%	43%	0%	N/A
North West, commercial	BL Prod	1,158,250	437,500	11,970	4,800	17,600	175,000	10,000	105,450
	CY Prod	680,000	200,000	3,900	3,300	13,950	232,750	8,550	N/A
	P. Spec	59%	46%	33%	69%	79%	133%	86%	N/A
Northern Cape, commercial	BL Prod	25,300	647,700	-	1,700	7,000	100	14,000	298,200
	CY Prod	35,625	665,000	-	630	12,400	600	15,500	N/A
	P.Spec	141%	103%	-	37%	177%	600%	111%	N/A
Gauteng, commercial	BL Prod	370,000	239,250	1,500	3,400	32,000	5,070	-	6,000
	CY Prod	205,800	218,400	-	3,500	48,300	-	-	N/A
	P.Spec	56%	91%	0%	103%	151%	0%	-	N/A
Free State	BL Prod	2,573,750	2,272,500	7,400	19,200	225,750	297,000	16,200	252,000
	CY Prod	1,092,000	37,800	37,800	17,000	156,600	440,000	6,500	N/A
	P.Spec	42%	42%	511%	89%	69%	148%	40%	N/A
KwaZulu-Natal	BL Prod	258,500	312,000	1,344	7,800	80,000	-	150	37,800
	CY Prod	193,800	278,400	2,000	2,640	61,600	-	-	N/A
	P.Spec	75%	89%	149%	34%	77%	-	-	N/A
Eastern Cape	BL Prod	18,500	87,000	-	200	750	-	-	19,800
	Prod	10,000	60,000	-	375	2,100	-	-	N/A
	P.Spec	54%	69%	-	188%	280%	-	-	N/A
Western Cape	BL Prod	3,000	30,000	-	400	-	-	-	914,500
	CY Prod	5,000	40,000	-	150	1,200	-	-	N/A
	P.Spec	167%	133%	-	38%	-	-	-	N/A
Total Commercial	BL Prod	5,580,300	6,142,250	88,064	60,200	787,100	566,600	42,300	1,804,450
	CY Prod	3,067,475	3,986,900	88,500	38,095	694,550	730,500	32,550	N/A
	P. Spec	55%	65%	60%	63%	88%	129%	77%	N/A

This resulted in problem specifications of 27% to 49% in all the provinces with large portions of the hazard section within them (highly-affected provinces).

Table 8 - Crop production disaggregation for all provinces

Province	Agriculture Type	Area Agric. Type (Ha)	CEC Pr. Spec	Hazard	Hazard Area (Ha)	% Hazard Area	Hazard Prob. Spec
All provinces	Subsistence grains	13,198,889	62%	drought	7,884,053	60%	30%
				normal	5,314,836	40%	109%
Eastern Cape	Commercial grains	288,584	54%	drought	139,844	48%	30%
				normal	148,740	52%	77%
Free State	Commercial grains	7,987,746	42%	drought	6,804,745	85%	36%
				normal	1,183,001	15%	77%
Gauteng	Commercial grains	271,004	56%	drought	137,155	51%	36%
				normal	133,849	49%	77%
KwaZulu-Natal	Commercial grains	492	75%	drought	20	4%	27%
				normal	472	96%	77%
Limpopo	Commercial grains	1,023,062	113%	drought	285,091	28%	43%
				normal	737,971	72%	140%
Mpumalanga	Commercial grains	2,974,656	66%	drought	287,721	10%	29%
				normal	2,686,935	90%	70%
North West	Commercial grains	4,640,096	59%	drought	3,004,416	65%	49%
				normal	1,635,680	35%	77%
Northern Cape	Commercial grains	97	141%	drought	88	91%	135%
				normal	9	9%	200%
Western Cape	Commercial grains	2,097,713	167%	drought	508,228	24%	64%
				normal	1,589,485	76%	200%

The results are presented in Table 8 above. These are very approximate calculations and are intended to illustrate a principle for estimating local problem specifications, not provide the most accurate answer. More accurate problem specifications can be obtained by viewing production data at a lower

9 It must be remembered that total maize production in these two provinces is very small, so this seemingly high problem specification has little bearing on outcomes in these two provinces.

geographical level, such as municipality or lower. Detailed estimates have been produced at provincial and local levels both commercial and non-commercial growers using aerial and ground surveys, such as the *Producer Independent Crop Estimate System* by SiQ¹⁰. These kinds of surveys are recommended for improving accuracy in future analyses.

The key crop problem specifications used in this analysis is that for ‘subsistence’ agricultural region grains, which were set at 30% in the hazard areas and 109% in the non-hazard (normal) areas. Problem specifications for other crops were set at 20% in the hazard areas and 100% in the non-hazard areas. Similarly, livestock production (milk and meat) problem specifications were set at 20% in hazard areas and 50% in non-hazard areas.

Obtaining problem specifications for employment, self-employment, small business and prices (Step 26)

It is well-known that most South Africans purchase their food and this implies that an understanding of cash income sources are critical for any food security analysis in the country. Cash income sources consist of employment, grants¹¹, self-employment, small businesses, gifts and remittances. It is important to differentiate between an income source quantity and the income itself: income source quantity refers to the amount of the thing people can use to get income, whereas income itself also takes into account the effect of *prices*, which will be dealt with in the next section. The problem specifications for the income source quantity and its price may be independent of one another, which is why they are analysed separately. Examples of income source quantities are ‘days of work’ for casual labour, ‘bundles of firewood’ for self-employment or ‘sales volume’ for small business. **Table 9** lists a summary of the most important income source quantity problem specifications for hazard and non-hazard section.

Table 9 - Income source quantity problem specifications for types of livelihood zones (where data are not shown it is because the income source is not in the baseline).

Livelihood zone types (abbreviation, code)	Hazard section	Agricultura l casual labour	Construction casual labour	Domestic casual labour	Formal employment	Labour migration	Self- employment	Small business	Gifts	Remittance s
Urban poor (ZAUP, 59800)	Hazard	50%	50%	50%	100%		100%	100%	100%	100%
	Non-hazard	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	100%
Commercial farm workers (ZAFW, 59050)	Hazard	50%	50%	50%	60%		80%	100%		
	Non-hazard	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	100%
Rural open-access LZs	Hazard	50%	50%	50%	60%	40%	80%	80%	100%	100%
	Non-hazard	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	80%	80%	100%	100%

Without any field surveys to draw upon, it was not possible to obtain problem specification data for each zone. Rather, single national problem specifications were applied, with some changes between rural open access livelihood zones, the commercial farm workers and the urban poor being apparent in formal employment (prospects in urban areas, whether hazard-affected or not, are the same as before), self-employment and small business.

Obtaining problem specifications on prices (Step 27)

The first and foremost price to watch is staple; staple is not important in the diet of many South Africans; it is a key input or influence for other necessary food commodities.

Obtaining price problem specifications is about looking into the future—what will the price likely be over the period from the current year’s harvest (from April 2016) to the next year’s harvest (from April 2017)? As it is impossible to know this forecast, a scenario has to be constructed that will form the basis of the analysis. The scenario does not dictate that this will *become the future*; it merely says that “given some presently unknown conditions, this is the *likely* consequence at household level”.

10 Website: <http://www.siq.co.za/pices.php>

11 Grants are considered in the section below as they are a special case and they also have enormous impact on the outcomes for rural people.

Using data from the National Agricultural Marketing Council (NAMC) and the CPI baskets from Statistics SA, a trend graph of average prices for a 5 kg packet of maize meal was constructed. The graph was arranged into a series of lines, each line representing the prices for the *consumption year*, a period that starts from the harvest and runs through to just before the next harvest. By looking at the average shape of

the line over the year and then projecting ahead from the last known data point (in this case it was April 2016) using this average shape, a curve ‘forecast’ or scenario curve can be generated. This scenario follows the average annual trend—in the case of maize meal the prices usually rise up towards the end of the consumption year. The problem specification is derived by taking the average price for the forecast year and dividing by the average of the baseline year (the assumption being here that most households purchase food all year round).

Using this analysis, the purchase prices of staple food commodities (maize meal, samp, bread and rice) are projected (by March 2017) to increase **by around 65% more than the baseline year** (April 2013 to March 2014). This massive increase and represents a jump of 35% from last year alone. The staple price problem specification is thus 165% (current year average price/baseline year average price) and it is applied to all livelihood zones. This projection is based on the previous price changes and on forecasts for inflation generally. This may or may not change in reality—a lot will depend on the domestic supply situation, the country's import requirements and the position with the Rand weakening further against the major currencies.

In rural areas in all livelihood zones there are fewer outlets and distribution costs mean that staple prices in the villages are higher than in towns or cities. Traders who increase their prices of food commodities beyond that of increases elsewhere are seen as exploiting vulnerable rural communities. This is because ‘very poor’ and ‘poor’ households in these zones purchase 50–70% of their annual food requirements, increases in staple prices seriously affects their access to food. This is a key parameter for the SAVAC to monitor.


Other Food Items' Purchase Price Changes

A diet that is confined to staples is not healthy and diversity is essential for people to obtain all the nutrients they require, providing them with the capacity for a productive and dignified life. In order to account this required diversity, the SAVAC were required to refer to standard food baskets used in other surveys, such as the Living Standards Surveys and General Household Surveys. The latter compares levels of consumption with poverty levels, the lowest of which is the Food Poverty Line (FPL). The FPL is composed of a list of varied commodities, the sum of the energy content of which still equals 8800 kJ per person per day (2100 kcal per person per day).

The SAVAC has used the same list of commodities for its FPL as those in the income-expenditure surveys, which, taken together with staple, represents the minimum threshold for household incomes in the villages. SAVAC Rand values for this threshold are similar to the provincial threshold used by Statistics South Africa, the differences reflect the purely rural local variations in prices and availability of commodities.

The non-staple FPL items are projected to increase at the provincial non-cereal food inflation rates, with the projection for the coming months based on the overall food inflation projections. The resultant

Figure 15: Maize meal prices from April 2013 to April 2017 (projected)



problem specification for the 2016-2017 consumption year for non-staple foods is 140%, or an increase in prices of 40% since the baseline year (April 2013 to March 2014). This was applied to all livelihood zones.

Prices of non-food basket items (for the LBPL and UBPL)

In addition to non-staple food products, households need to purchase other goods and services that meet their basic needs. These goods and services include items such as soap, paraffin, electricity, matches, salt (zero food energy), tea or coffee (zero food energy), services, schooling, health, veterinary, taxes, community contributions, clothing, communications, transport and so on.

When the cost of the smallest quantity of these commodities is added to that of staple and non-staple food, this becomes the Lower Bound Poverty Line (LBPL). When a larger quantity of each of these commodities is used, it defines the Upper Bound Poverty Line (UBPL).

Lastly, there are important investments that households must make each year if they are to have sustainable livelihoods. This means that they must spend on maintenance of all their capital (human, social, physical, environmental and financial) if they are to be able to develop themselves further and withstand or recover from future livelihood hazards. This expenditure therefore includes livelihood-specific investments in inputs for agriculture or business activities (including labour), educational investments, health and nutrition investments. Critically, these investments usually have a knock-on impacts from one wealth group to another; for example, money spent on labour hire by the better-off adds significantly to poorer households' incomes.

The sum of the expenditure on all of these investments with the other preceding expenditures in the UBPL, LBPL, FPL and staple purchase, make up the Resilience Line. Unlike the FPL, LBPL and UBPL, the Resilience Line varies across wealth groups, as households with more productive assets must spend more to maintain and use those assets.

The team used the general prevailing inflation rate with a forecast for the coming months to obtain the change in price from the baseline year (April 2013 to March 2014) to the current forecast year (April 2016 to March 2017) for the LBPL, UBPL and the resilience line. The resultant problem specification for these thresholds is 118%, or an 18% increase in prices. This was applied to all livelihood zones.

Food purchase availability

Generally, food is available in all retail outlets, such as the big grocery chain stores such as Pick'n Pay, Spar, and Shoprite, as well as the smaller local stores. There are some areas within the rural livelihood zones that may need monitoring to confirm food availability.

Grants and non-grants recipients (Step 28)

Social grants are, for many families, a life-saving necessity. Furthermore, they are often the largest single source of income for many households and therefore are pivotal in this analysis. The two grants that have the largest impact are Old Age Grants and Child Support Grants. Although other grants such as War Veterans Grants are of substantial value for poor people, they provided to very small proportions of the population. However, the odds of a poor household having at least one child or one elderly person (male over 65 years or female over 60 years) and qualifying for social grants are reasonable and this is why social grants are factored into the livelihoods baselines. Nevertheless, there are *still* some households that do not qualify for some technical reason or are unable to benefit—what of them?

In order to capture them on our model, we consider two possible scenarios: one with social grants and one without. This means that the income source quantity problem specification for social grants is either 100% (representing those with grants) or 0% (representing those without grants).

This means that in each livelihood zone or analysis group there are four possible 'partition scenarios'—scenarios partitioning people into one of four possible groups: **hazard section with grants**, **hazard section without grants**, **non-hazard section with grants** and **non-hazard section without grants**.

This analysis does not include possible emergency or short term interventions or grants; this is because the analysis seeks to *inform* the design of such responses by stating the forecast should these responses not be present.

The Analysis (Steps 29 to 31)

Running the analysis (Step 29)

Each scenario in each livelihood zone was completed on a single-zone analysis spreadsheet (SZAS), the SZAS file containing individual sheets for each wealth group, with the livelihoods outcomes compared with the three different thresholds (food poverty line (FPL, in cash and food terms), the lower bound poverty line (LBPL) and the upper bound poverty line (UBPL). This means that in a livelihood zone there is one SZAS file for each partition scenario, or four SZAS files per zone, leading to a total of 76 SZASs over 19 livelihood zones. Usually, there are four wealth groups in a livelihood zone, although some have only three and this means that, in effect, this NOFA covered a total of 292 different analyses.

The calculated problem specification percentages from steps 23 to 28 above, which are the changes in the current year compared to baseline year, were entered into the analysis spreadsheet to calculate the food and expenditure deficit. These problem specs are only entered into a set of columns in the sheet for the ‘poor’ wealth group; the SZAS copies them to the other wealth groups itself. Based on expandability factors already entered into the SZAS, it automatically computes the outcomes.

The livelihoods analysis (Step 30)

It must be emphasised that the drought this year was only one hazard; the other powerful hazard is economic: the price changes. Hence, even people living in non-drought areas may still be at the same risk of food insecurity because of this. Similarly, people that are exposed to a certain kind of hazard may not be vulnerable to it (for example, people earning a salary will likely not be as vulnerable to drought as people who farm). This will be explored below as we studying the livelihood systems and explore the impacts of the various changes in environmental and the economic situations for different wealth groups.

Analysis was done for both the drought-affected and unaffected areas of each livelihood zone. Both unaffected and affected areas had the same or very similar price problem specifications; the differences being in crop and livestock production.

Affected areas fared slightly worse than unaffected areas but the difference was not substantial, highlighting the relative unimportance of agriculture as a source of food and income, compared with social grants, paid employment and small businesses. The hazards that are more likely to have an impact on livelihoods and consumption levels are therefore those that affect these incomes and expenditure, such as high borrowing rates (affecting the government's ability to deliver on social grants, as well as loans for starting businesses), high food purchase prices and the lack of opportunities for work (agricultural, domestic and short-term contracts, such as construction).

The poorest households invest the least in agriculture; they depend on social grants and casual work as their main source of income. The casual work may be domestic, construction or agricultural—in the case of the latter it may be local (within the village or on commercial farms). The direct impact of the drought on them has therefore been the least—indirectly, they may suffer from reduced work opportunities. This may seem counter-intuitive to readers schooled in regarding village economies as “subsistence agriculture”. Similarly, the better-off have either full-time employment or a small business that cushions their livelihood from losses due to drought or weather hazards. Hence, in rural open-access livelihood zones, it is often the ‘middle’ households who are more dependent on agriculture but lack the cushions of full-time employment, a small business or social grants and who are *directly* most vulnerable to drought.

The very poor and poor households do depend heavily on the market for their food and, with the kind of income activities in which they engage in such as weeding work, harvesting work, low-level petty trading, craft selling and domestic work already stretched to the limit, opportunities for them to expand their income are minimal. Hence, their vulnerability is to *price changes and shocks*.

Wealthier households may dispose of assets or switch non-essential expenditure to food purchases and essential expenditure.

In an analysis of this kind in South Africa, while starvation or life-threatening mass hunger are important issues to be aware of, our focus is generally more on poverty, living standards and the opportunities people have for escaping the worst conditions. This means that over time, the analysis factors in

impoverishment brought on by external events to households' livelihoods. The comprehensive safety net and social grant system ought to cover the bare minimum needs for all citizens, automatically preventing famine or extreme deprivation for the great majority of people. However, the grant system is designed around needs for an average year, while this assessment studies the impact of ephemeral change, from one year to the next. Therefore it is not surprising, given the leap upwards in food prices, that there are food poverty line deficits in many livelihood zones, especially among the unfortunate few households that lack access to any substantial social grants.

The analysis converts all production (including that which is consumed directly) into a cash equivalent, based on what it would cost to have purchased the items that are produced and consumed directly, and then adding the cash values together over a whole year to obtain an annual total income.

Example 1: Okhahlamba Open-Access Intense Crops and Livestock

Figure 16: Livelihood strategies for the **drought hazard-affected** Okhahlamba open-access intense crops and livestock livelihood zone (ZAKHC, 59208), **with** social grants





Figure 17: Livelihood strategies for the **drought hazard-affected** Okhahlamba open-access intense crops and livestock livelihood zone (ZAKHC, 59208), **without** social grants



Figures 16 and **17** show the annual total incomes for Okhahlamba open-access intense crops and livestock livelihood zone (ZAKHC, 59208) in the drought hazard-affected areas where households do and do not receive social grants, respectively. All four wealth groups are shown in the graphs, which include the baseline and the forecast year; the four bars on the left representing each wealth group in the baseline situation and the four bars on the right representing the same for the forecast situation. It is important to note three features with these graphs:

- The wealth groups are broken down by different percentages (the better-off are fewest in number)—the bars do **not** represent quartiles;
- Income values and expenditure thresholds have been normalised to a common household size;
- Income values and expenditure thresholds have been normalised to today's Food Poverty Line cost. This means that the FPL in the baseline is set the same as that of the current forecast year

Figure 18: Livelihood strategies for the **non-affected** Okhahlamba open-access intense crops and livestock livelihood zone (ZAKHC, 59208), **with** social grants





Figure 19: Livelihood strategies for the **non-affected** Okhahlamba open-access intense crops and livestock livelihood zone (ZAKHC, 59208), **without** social grants




and thus stable incomes, such as from full-time employment, will appear diminished because of reduced purchasing power. Based on their relative cost, the LBPL and UBPL lines may be higher or lower than in the baseline.

Contrast the drought situation with the non-drought affected analyses for the two grant and non-grant groups: the substantial difference is with the ‘middle’ wealth group, who lost their production the drought hazard-affected area: their total incomes thus fall below the UBPL. **Table 10** summarise these deficits and the patterns can be seen there.

Table 10 - Summary of annual deficits in Rands for Okhahlamba open-access intense crops and livestock LZ (ZAKHC, 59208)

Poverty line	Hazard	Very Poor		Poor		Middle		Better-off	
		Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants
UBPL	No Drought	46,248	73,516	19,320	47,033	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	52,175	79,443	31,426	58,187	17,218	25,852	No deficit	No deficit
LBPL	No Drought	13,510	40,778	No deficit	14,295	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	19,437	46,705	No deficit	25,449	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
FPL	No Drought	No deficit	22,395	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	1,054	28,322	No deficit	7,066	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit

Figure 20: Livelihood strategies for the **drought hazard-affected** north coast open-access intense cultivation livelihood zone (ZANCC, 59304), **with** social grants




Example 2: North Coast Open-Access Intense Cultivation

The north coast of KwaZulu-Natal was badly affected by the drought. The plains north of Empangeni up to Mkuze contain good agricultural land that is extensively cropped and constitute the North coast open access intense cultivation livelihood zone (ZANCC, 50304). The situation for drought hazard-affected areas with and without grants are given in **Figures 20** and **21** below.

Notice how the poorest households can nevertheless reach the food poverty line, even with the impact of the drought, which is important in this crop-growing livelihood, provided they are receiving at least some social grants. However, for the unlucky few households that do not receive grants, their effective income falls to critically low levels and their situation is dire. Also, the ‘middle’ and ‘better-off’ households are farmers in this zone; this makes them vulnerable to the drought, which has pulled them both down below the UBPL. Essentially, in this zone, communities are impoverished by the drought and hungry if they do not receive social grants.

Figure 22 and **23** show the same graphs for households in the non-drought affected part of the livelihood zone. Income from crops remains good, although declining purchasing power due to high food

Figure 21: Livelihood strategies for the **drought hazard-affected** north coast open access intense cultivation livelihood zone (ZANCC, 59304), **without** social grants



prices reduces incomes across the board somewhat.

Once again, the poorest households without grants are the ones in a critical state, well below the food poverty line, regardless of whether they are in the drought-affected area or not. **Table 11** lists the deficits for this livelihood zone.

Figure 22: Livelihood strategies for the **non-affected** north coast open access intense cultivation livelihood zone (ZANCC, 59304), **with** social grants




Figure 23: Livelihood strategies for the **non-affected** north coast open access intense cultivation livelihood zone (ZANCC, 59304), **without** social grants





Table II - Summary of annual deficits in Rands for north coast open access intense cultivation LZ (ZANCC, 59304)

Poverty line	Hazard	Very Poor		Poor		Middle		Better-off	
		Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants
UBPL	No Drought	40,573	73,990	37,867	71,284	No deficit	5,257	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	48,754	82,172	49,019	82,436	41,740	51,793	5,578	15,445
LBPL	No Drought	3,743	37,160	1,036	34,454	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	11,924	45,341	12,188	45,606	4,910	14,963	No deficit	No deficit
FPL	No Drought	No deficit	17,895	No deficit	15,189	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	No deficit	26,077	No deficit	26,341	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit

Example 3: Free State Open Access Cattle and Crops

Figure 24: Livelihood strategies for the **drought hazard-affected** Free State open access cattle and crops livelihood zone (ZAOCC, 59209), **with** social grants



The Free State open access cattle and crops endured the drought's worst: 'middle' and 'better-off' households' income will reduce by a third and social grants will be vital for the 'poor' and 'very poor'.

Figure 25: Livelihood strategies for the **drought hazard-affected** Free State open access cattle and crops livelihood zone (ZAOCC, 59209), **without** social grants




Figure 26: Livelihood strategies for the **non-affected** Free State open-access cattle and crops livelihood zone (ZAOCC, 59209), **with** social grants




Figure 27: Livelihood strategies for the **non-affected** Free State open-access cattle and crops livelihood zone (ZAOCC, 59209), **without** social grants




Table 12 - Summary of annual deficits in Rands for the Free State open access cattle and crops LZ (ZAOCC, 59304)

Poverty line	Hazard	Very Poor		Poor		Middle		Better-off	
		Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants
UBPL	No Drought	16,887	34,279	6,656	24,273	No deficit	15,444	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	19,879	37,515	10,475	28,107	4,762	24,205	No deficit	No deficit
LBPL	No Drought	No deficit	13,818	No deficit	3,812	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	No deficit	17,054	No deficit	7,646	No deficit	3,744	No deficit	No deficit
FPL	No Drought	No deficit	2,329	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	No deficit	5,565	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit

Example 4: Southern Limpopo open-access livestock and crops

Livelihoods in this zone, which is mostly in Sekhukhune District, rely mostly on social grants (for the

Figure 28: Livelihood strategies for the **drought hazard-affected** southern Limpopo open access livestock and crops livelihood zone (ZASLC, 59203), **with** social grants





Figure 29: Livelihood strategies for the **drought hazard-affected** southern Limpopo open access livestock and crops livelihood zone (ZASLC, 59203), **without** social grants



'very poor', 'poor' and 'middle' and formal employment (for the better-off and middle). There is some contribution from remittances and a little from livestock. Cropping is minimal. Consequently, the *direct* impacts of the drought are small but in the case of the 'very poor', it makes the difference between being above or below the LBPL. The *indirect* impact from high food purchase prices is drastic, virtually cutting purchasing power in half. Not having access to grants has the most impact, and 'poor' and 'very poor' households in this situation are below the food poverty line as well as the having a food energy deficit.

Figures 28 to 31 and **Table 13** show the analysis and summarise its results.

Figure 30: Livelihood strategies for the **non-affected** southern Limpopo open access livestock and crops livelihood zone (ZASLC, 59203), **with** social grants




Figure 31: Livelihood strategies for the **non-affected** southern Limpopo open access livestock and crops livelihood zone (ZASLC, 59203), **without** social grants




Table 13 - Summary of annual deficits in Rands for the southern Limpopo open access livestock and crops LZ (ZASLC, 59203)

Poverty line	Hazard	Very Poor		Poor		Middle		Better-off	
		Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants
UBPL	No Drought	21,851	44,747	8,939	31,755	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	27,010	50,178	19,409	42,386	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
LBPL	No Drought	20,194	No deficit	7,201	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	2,546	25,625	No deficit	17,833	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
FPL	No Drought	4,991	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	10,421	No deficit	2,630	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit

Example 5: Farm workers on commercial farms

Figure 32: Livelihood strategies for the **drought hazard-affected** farm workers (ZA FW, 59050), **with** social grants





Figure 33: Livelihood strategies for the **drought hazard-affected** farm workers (ZA FW, 59050), **without** social grants



Farm workers with social grants have similar livelihoods and deficits in both the hazard-affected areas (see **Figure 32**) and in the non-affected areas (see **Figure 34**), since their incomes are actually derived from cash sources and grants—although casual labour opportunities are somewhat affected by the drought.

Figure 34: Livelihood strategies for the **non-affected** farm workers (ZA FW, 59050), **with** social grants




Figure 35: Livelihood strategies for the **non-affected** farm workers (ZA FW, 59050), **without** social grants





Table 14 - Summary of annual deficits in Rands for farm workers (ZA FW, 59050)

Poverty line	Hazard	Casuals		Temporary/Seasonal		Full-time
		Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants	No Grants
UBPL	No Drought	20,202	26,574	14,491	20,863	No deficit
	Drought	29,359	35,731	25,370	31,742	No deficit
LBPL	No Drought	3,833	10,205	No deficit	4,494	No deficit
	Drought	12,990	19,362	9,001	15,373	No deficit
FPL	No Drought	No deficit	1,014	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
	Drought	3,798	10,170	No deficit	6,182	No deficit

Figure 36: Livelihood strategies for the urban poor (ZA FW, 59050), **with** social grants




Example 6: The Urban Poor

Because agricultural activities amount to almost nothing towards households' livelihoods in urban areas, the impact of the drought *directly* on the total incomes of urban households because of the drought is negligible. The *indirect* impact through high purchase prices for food stuffs is significant and damaging—but this is not determined by whether the households live in an urban area that is in the drought-affected part of the country or not. The outcomes for households remain the same both inside and out of the drought area.

Casual and formal work opportunities have been affected by the drought; these is a consequence of individuals protecting their essential expenditure to be able to manage the increased prices, and businesses spending less on labour due to high borrowing costs and tighter budgets.

Social grants, however, do make a difference. Poorer quartile 1 and quartile 2 households without

Figure 37: Livelihood strategies for the urban poor (ZA FW, 59050), **without** social grants



access to social grants have far disastrously high deficits for all poverty lines. These are reported in **Table 15** below.

Table 15 - Summary of annual deficits in Rands for the urban poor (ZAUP, 59800)

Poverty line	Hazard	Quartile 1		Quartile 2		Quartile 3		Quartile 4	
		Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants	Grants	No Grants
UBPL	No Drought	23,308	35,341	14,583	25,712	6,320	9,590	No deficit	No deficit
LBPL	No Drought	6,939	18,972	No deficit	9,343	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit
FPL	No Drought	No deficit	9,781	No deficit	151	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit	No deficit

Collecting all the outcomes together (Step 31)

A command line interface (CLI) program called `collect_analysis.js`¹² was written in JavaScript that 'scrapes' the single zone analysis spreadsheets of all their relevant outcomes and enters the data into a PostgreSQL database table, `zaf.tbl_ofa_analysis`. This PostgreSQL table can then be joined to hazard and spatial tables in a query for computing the affected populations, total numbers and administrative area breakdowns. 'Spreadsheet scraping' saves time, automating the otherwise laborious process of copying and pasting data from 76 analysis spreadsheets (1,168 data transfers), which would be daunting, to say the least.

12 The routine is published in Appendix C, along with instructions on how to run it.

Finalising the totals (Steps 32 to 36)

Assigning hazard status to the smallest population units (Step 32)

The number of affected people is calculated using the enumeration small areas (ESAs) and their associated data from the 2011 Statistics South Africa Population and Household Census. To make this work, the hazard area needs to be defined in terms of these ESAs.

The division between affected and unaffected populations under study are calculated by overlaying the drought hazard affected areas from **Figure 12** onto the ESAs and then to assign an attribute, for the current assessment, of either ‘drought’ or ‘normal’ to the whole ESA (ESAs are not split up). This decision on whether to assign a value of ‘drought’ or ‘normal’ to an ESA was based thus:

- 1) ESAs that are entirely within the drought hazard affected area are classified affected and are assigned a value of ‘drought’.
- 2) ESAs that straddle a drought hazard affected area boundary and but have more than 33% of their area overlapping it are classified affected and assigned a value of ‘drought’.
- 3) ESAs that straddle a drought hazard affected area boundary but have less than 33% of their area overlapping it are classified unaffected and assigned a value of ‘normal’.
- 4) Small Areas that lie entirely outside the drought hazard affected area are classified unaffected and are assigned a value of ‘normal’.

This process was carried out automatically in PostgreSQL/PostGIS by a query called `hazard_analysis.sql`. The segmented ESA results from this query can then be mapped and are presented in **Figure 38**. Since the ESAs already have a livelihood zone attribute attached to them, it is possible to distinguish ESAs and their associated populations of which livelihood analysis to apply and for which drought/normal problem specification.

Figure 38: Map of the enumeration small areas (ESAs), segmented into ‘drought’ and ‘less drought’ or ‘normal’.

Calculate the affected populations in each enumeration small area (ESA) and their deficits for each threshold (Step 33)

The baselines and analysis presented in the previous section and in **Appendix B** do not correspond exactly to the livelihood zones list. Therefore a table was constructed that maps livelihood zones to the analyses, for example, “North western cattle and game ranching (ZAWCG, 59153)” is mapped to “Commercial farm workers (ZA_FW, 59050)”. The complete list of zone mapping is provided in **Appendix A**.

The hazard-segmented ESAs, the table with ESA populations, the district population growth rates from 2011 (the year of the census) to 2016 (this year), the table that maps livelihood zones to currently available baselines and the table of outcomes by livelihood zone, drought hazard, wealth group, access to grants and threshold are all combined in a single query, `hazard_outcomes.sql`, that computes the resultant populations at risk and their combined deficits. The query generates four files in comma-separated value (CSV) format, which can readily be imported into Microsoft Excel for pivoting. This is presented below in the next section.

Summary of deficits by administrative areas (Step 34)

The following tables, **Table 16** and **Table 17**, contain a breakdown by district (or metropolitan area) of each deficit threshold, with groupings by province. Further breakdowns, by municipality, are available in **Appendix F**. These data are obtained from pivot tables that summarise the outputs from the query, `hazard_outcomes.sql`.

The most extreme deficit is food energy. These arise if households are unable to purchase a basket of cereals that will provide them with 8,800 kJ per person per day or 100% of the average daily food energy requirement. The basket of cereals comprises maize meal, rice, wheat flour, potatoes and sweet potatoes. Households with a food energy deficit are going to be hungry and they will compromise their assets, their health and do what they can to get food. Their situation goes beyond impoverishment and inequality; it is more about survival itself. This analysis suggests that, under the given scenario and with 20% of households or families not having someone with access to social grants, **approximately 4.88 million people will face this deficit**, which amounts to approximately **421,000 metric tons of grain equivalent** over the whole year.

The food poverty line is an expenditure level that provides for a more comprehensive basket of commodities than the commodities used to calculate the food energy deficit. The list of commodities is set by Statistics SA and is provided in **Appendix E**. As the cost of the food poverty line is higher than that of the simple starch diet for the food energy threshold, the number of people below this line is also somewhat higher. The analysis suggests that, under the given scenario and with 20% of households or families not having someone with access to social grants, **approximately 4.19 million people will face this deficit**. The total cost of filling the income gap is approximately **ZAR 8.13 billion** over the whole year. This amounts to an average of ZAR 1,654 per person over the whole consumption year—or R147 per month. **Note:** the actual amounts per person will differ across livelihood zones, wealth groups and affected areas and groupings.

Statistics South Africa report that 20.2% of South Africans already live below the FPL; this equates to approximately 11.295 million people over the 2016 projected population. The 4.19 million people reported (above) in this analysis are *over and above the already existing numbers*, which means a **37% increase in food poverty** this consumption year. As has been explained in the problem specification and analysis sections, this risk of increase in food poverty is largely because of food price increases, brought on by the weak Rand and low grain production (forcing more expensive imports) which resulted from the drought.

Without external action, it is likely that nutritional status, especially that of children, will decline and more people will require treatment for disorders that nutritionally-related. In addition, the South African Social Security Agency (SASSA) should see an increase in applicants for indigent or other grants.

Although the integers presented in **Table 16** and **17** are exact, the actual numbers can vary by ±15%, so they must not be used too literally. The population for the Eastern Cape with a food energy deficit could be rounded off to 588,600 people. Rounded figures are not presented because this is the way that the database calculates these outcomes and rounding errors were being minimised.

Table 16 - Food energy deficits (in metric tons), Food Poverty line deficits (in ZAR) and their associated populations at risk, per district and province

Province/District	Sum of population with a food deficit	Sum of deficit maize eq (MT)	Sum of population with an FPL deficit	Sum of FPL deficit in ZAR
Eastern Cape	588,606	61,104	588,606	1,074,977,708
Alfred Nzo	115,699	13,515	115,699	240,473,916
Amathole	108,662	11,033	108,662	184,112,926
Buffalo City	44,806	4,090	44,806	67,889,480
Cacadu	11,372	686	11,372	12,197,122
Chris Hani	69,384	6,888	69,384	129,335,329
Joe Gqabi	35,525	4,222	35,525	79,775,975
Nelson Mandela Bay	21,457	1,567	21,457	25,522,737
O.R. Tambo	181,701	19,103	181,701	335,670,223
Free State	102,946	8,962	102,946	150,563,075
Fezile Dabi	11,793	808	11,793	15,138,015
Lejweleputswa	17,139	1,224	17,139	21,856,180
Mangaung	21,551	1,584	21,551	26,787,913
Thabo Mofutsanyane	47,004	4,983	47,004	79,702,251
Xhariep	5,459	363	5,459	7,078,715
Gauteng	352,955	26,087	352,955	436,536,551
City of Johannesburg	97,988	7,379	97,988	122,130,613
City of Tshwane	98,774	7,238	98,774	121,766,334
Ekurhuleni	84,428	6,333	84,428	103,888,837
Sedibeng	27,577	1,941	27,577	32,651,046
West Rand	44,188	3,195	44,188	56,099,722
KwaZulu-Natal	1,766,923	129,689	1,799,426	2,979,042,673
Amajuba	33,940	3,600	33,940	74,353,661
Ethekwini	209,945	13,867	222,100	379,511,159
Harry Gwala	298,734	25,654	299,040	494,234,930
iLembe	83,234	5,076	90,126	177,158,099
Ugu	278,926	18,613	281,060	437,685,464
Umgungundlovu	132,045	9,188	137,298	233,306,220
Umkhanyakude	149,738	11,184	152,789	259,202,160
Umzinyathi	72,778	6,693	73,962	144,751,544
Uthukela	114,607	8,915	114,607	196,443,775
Uthungulu	218,966	13,271	220,454	305,141,747
Zululand	174,010	13,629	174,050	277,253,914
Limpopo	490,543	57,060	490,543	1,066,014,623
Capricorn	141,562	16,953	109,627	259,355,526
Greater Sekhukhune	126,742	14,282	59,869	87,474,643
Mopani	109,627	13,681	141,562	286,498,969
Vhembe	52,743	6,036	126,742	306,730,495
Waterberg	59,869	6,109	52,743	125,954,989
Mpumalanga	357,777	37,900	357,777	671,195,776
Ehlanzeni	205,183	23,788	205,183	406,715,450
Gert Sibande	51,831	4,286	51,831	72,695,682
Nkangala	100,763	9,826	100,763	191,784,644
North West	336,226	34,668	336,226	652,102,973
Bojanala	170,198	18,731	170,198	356,409,447
Dr Kenneth Kaunda	24,761	1,666	24,761	31,604,793
Dr Ruth Segomotsi Mompati	50,346	5,255	50,346	83,623,676
Ngaka Modiri Molema	90,921	9,015	90,921	180,465,058
Northern Cape	177,314	12,778	177,314	234,940,381
Frances Baard	68,922	4,563	68,922	87,872,052
John Taolo Gaetsewe	41,358	4,309	41,358	70,138,653
Namakwa	14,238	852	14,238	16,782,052
Pixley ka Seme	26,230	1,577	26,230	31,047,884
Z.F Mgawu	26,566	1,478	26,566	29,099,740
Western Cape	709,691	52,600	709,691	864,660,857
Cape Winelands	88,909	6,226	88,909	103,858,865
Central Karoo	11,555	842	11,555	14,035,297
City of Cape Town	479,152	36,370	479,152	593,484,341
Eden	68,210	4,941	68,210	80,949,693
Overberg	25,722	1,846	25,722	30,618,729
West Coast	36,143	2,376	36,143	41,713,932
Grand Total	4,882,981	420,848	4,915,484	8,130,034,617

The Lower Bound Poverty Line (LBPL) and the Upper Bound Poverty Line (UBPL) are two poverty lines used to describe absolute poverty in South Africa. Both consist of the same as the FPL basket, with the addition of non-food goods and services considered essential for survival and growth. The difference

between the LBPL and the UBPL is only in the amount of non-food goods and services in the basket; the UBPL does not include any goods or services not in the LBPL.

It is important to stress that populations with Food Energy deficits are a subset of those with FPL deficits, who are in turn themselves a subset of those with LBPL deficits, then those with UBPL Deficits.

Table I.7 - Lower bound poverty line (LBPL) deficit and population at risk per district

Row Labels	Sum of population with an LBPL deficit	Sum of LBPL deficit in ZAR	Sum of population with an UBPL deficit	Sum of population with an UBPL deficit
Eastern Cape	2,311,857	4,771,695,802	3,398,280	17,100,231,645
Alfred Nzo	482,624	1,023,151,082	688,861	3,527,722,176
Amathole	391,589	802,977,864	578,593	2,896,011,745
Buffalo City	135,403	322,571,332	276,747	1,235,456,736
Cacadu	35,643	73,454,129	66,642	306,466,986
Chris Hani	294,752	585,108,401	399,381	2,094,079,750
Joe Gqabi	147,675	343,229,492	212,550	1,102,020,447
Nelson Mandela Bay	67,685	150,825,388	161,764	672,389,052
O.R. Tambo	756,486	1,470,378,115	1,013,742	5,266,084,752
Free State	264,120	667,988,403	498,573	2,317,183,450
Fezile Dabi	24,522	66,865,251	36,688	192,425,256
Lejweleputswa	40,348	104,397,560	78,755	368,258,176
Mangaung	58,957	141,332,475	136,023	564,942,587
Thabo Mofutsanyane	130,323	326,426,954	236,278	1,120,956,687
Xhariep	9,970	28,966,162	10,829	70,600,744
Gauteng	1,004,648	2,376,515,067	2,249,959	9,371,459,629
City of Johannesburg	281,617	668,611,599	664,503	2,747,824,029
City of Tshwane	279,742	660,851,757	615,744	2,584,433,217
Ekurhuleni	251,510	584,639,117	598,721	2,471,909,781
Sedibeng	82,773	186,136,408	165,589	689,564,170
West Rand	109,006	276,276,186	205,402	877,728,432
KwaZulu-Natal	4,513,510	10,683,152,361	5,995,523	33,847,824,161
Amajuba	183,097	328,477,213	201,845	1,129,385,418
Ethewini	746,497	1,727,229,365	1,300,268	6,321,050,780
Harry Gwala	325,947	1,219,385,762	363,465	2,690,446,284
iLembe	342,807	736,587,263	455,053	2,520,849,159
Ugu	469,126	1,219,595,723	507,781	3,286,998,634
Umgungundlovu	345,221	885,095,515	534,358	2,889,334,296
Umkhanyakude	459,438	1,019,477,067	576,141	3,342,761,410
Umzinyathi	340,383	609,968,840	384,937	2,136,901,449
Uthukela	307,545	748,363,632	422,559	2,314,064,906
Uthungulu	526,467	1,131,654,850	650,574	3,811,896,197
Zululand	466,982	1,057,317,131	598,542	3,404,135,628
Limpopo	2,065,161	4,320,963,534	3,477,314	16,798,821,238
Capricorn	466,992	960,970,521	720,176	3,739,203,914
Greater Sekhukhune	232,245	366,492,090	770,513	2,920,600,369
Mopani	561,520	1,195,071,311	803,990	4,128,611,714
Vhembe	585,218	1,307,471,793	900,797	4,371,092,121
Waterberg	219,186	490,957,819	281,838	1,639,313,120
Mpumalanga	1,255,144	2,936,190,483	2,034,511	10,015,884,123
Ehlanzeni	698,458	1,694,281,069	1,144,305	5,618,522,797
Gert Sibande	167,759	366,239,603	309,633	1,444,220,180
Nkangala	388,927	875,669,811	580,573	2,953,141,145
North West	1,249,674	2,851,366,812	1,784,885	9,255,277,595
Bojanala	670,572	1,559,514,264	975,275	4,997,657,485
Dr Kenneth Kaunda	50,655	138,173,428	69,719	383,055,969
Dr Ruth Segomotsi Mompati	155,283	359,659,182	266,535	1,266,544,732
Ngaka Modiri Molema	373,164	794,019,937	473,356	2,608,019,409
Northern Cape	399,567	1,015,768,406	534,993	3,046,323,683
Frances Baard	133,018	365,873,430	149,951	964,102,504
John Taolo Gaetsewe	106,371	277,051,611	179,914	891,178,642
Namakwa	32,214	78,209,746	40,011	238,277,590
Pixley ka Seme	58,808	143,773,269	72,647	434,487,585
Z.F Mgawu	69,156	150,860,350	92,470	518,277,363
Western Cape	2,135,754	4,910,843,053	5,169,517	21,600,443,386
Cape Winelands	276,036	608,733,051	628,038	2,682,084,342
Central Karoo	33,979	78,450,449	79,215	336,341,120
City of Cape Town	1,429,017	3,338,613,834	3,560,694	14,726,071,084
Eden	213,616	475,999,117	509,503	2,132,177,068
Overberg	78,581	176,652,917	183,125	775,340,821
West Coast	104,525	232,393,686	208,942	948,428,952
Grand Total	15,199,435	34,534,483,922	25,143,555	123,353,448,910

The households with LBPL and UBPL deficits consist of those already reported to be below these lines (45,5% of the population, or 25.442 million people), as well others who are newly added to the list as a consequence of the drought and market conditions (it is not possible to separate the two). The total UBPL deficit of approximately ZAR 123 billion amounts to an average of ZAR 4,906 per at risk person per year, or R409 per at risk person per month.

The percentages of people affected for the food energy deficit and the UBPL deficit (Step 35)

The map in **Figure 39** shows the percentage of people at risk of a food energy deficit in each enumeration small area (ESA) as well as the outlines of municipalities, districts and provinces, so the distribution of populations at risk within these administrative units can be observed. It must be noted that a characteristic of ESAs is that in some rural parts of the country (notably in Limpopo, North West, Eastern Cape and KwaZulu-Natal), there are ‘islands’ of population with ESAs surrounded by a ‘sea’ of empty space where there is no ESA. This is because the ‘empty’ space is largely uninhabited grazing land and the small population data from that space is added to the ESAs in the concentrated areas, to ensure that laws on privacy of data are upheld. This creates a misleading impression that an area has a low percentage of people at risk, when in fact it is just the lack of ESAs in the area.

Figure 39: Choropleth map of the percentage of the population with a food energy deficit, by enumeration small areas, municipalities, districts and provinces.

The map in **Figure 39** is very similar to **Figure 40**, the map showing the percentages of people below the Food Poverty Line (FPL), which also shows how higher percentage ESAs follow the hazard area.

Map the amounts of deficit for each outcome (Step 36)

The deficits outcomes are mapped in two different ways:

1. The deficit per capita total of all people living in the enumeration small area (ESA); and
2. The deficit per capita of people at risk living in the ESA.

These two outcomes are presented for the food energy deficits, the food poverty line (FPL) deficits and the upper bound poverty line (UBPL) deficits in **Figures 41 to 46** from page 54 to page 57.

Figure 40: Choropleth map of the percentage of the population with a food poverty line deficit, by enumeration small areas, municipalities, districts and provinces, overlaid with the drought hazard-area.

Figure 41: Choropleth map of the food energy deficit in maize equivalent per capita total population, by enumeration small areas, municipalities, districts and provinces.

Figure 42: Choropleth map of the food energy deficit in maize equivalent per person at risk, by enumeration small areas, municipalities, districts and provinces.

Figure 43: Choropleth map of the food poverty line (FPL) deficit in Rands per capita total population, by enumeration small areas, municipalities, districts and provinces.

Figure 44: Choropleth map of the food poverty line (FPL) deficit in Rands per person at risk, by enumeration small areas, municipalities, districts and provinces.

Figure 45: Choropleth map of the upper bound poverty line (UBPL) deficit in Rands per capita total population, by enumeration small areas, municipalities, districts and provinces.

Figure 46: Choropleth map of the upper bound poverty line (UBPL) deficit in Rands per person at risk, by enumeration small areas, municipalities, districts and provinces.

Conclusion

In the current consumption year, April 2016 to March 2017, households will face difficulties with the hike in basic food prices, brought on by the weak Rand and the current drought, which has forced the country into importing a greater percentage of food stuffs, especially cereals, than is usual. On top of this, households that support themselves, albeit to a limited extent, with their own crops and agriculture, have experienced severe failures in the areas exposed to the drought. Other knock-on effects are reduced opportunities for labour-based employment, both full-time and casual. This impacts on the poorest households in both rural and urban areas the most. *Households, in both rural (traditional tenure and commercial farm areas) and urban settings, drought-affected and not-affected areas, that are unable to have at least one member access social grants are at extreme risk—they are facing critical food shortages and hunger that needs to be addressed immediately and adequately.*

The ‘poor’ and ‘very poor’ households in all livelihood zones rely mostly on purchases (an average of 80% of their total annual food energy intake) and this makes them highly vulnerable to fluctuating food prices. The combination of high food and other commodity prices, constrained work opportunities (especially through reduced availability of *both agricultural labour and domestic labour opportunities*), augmented somewhat by poor crop production from April 2016 onwards, will reduce household capacity across the board in livelihood zones to access quality food and a decent standard of living, defined by the Upper Bound Poverty Line.

Approximately 4,883,000 people are below the average food energy requirement of 8,800 kJ per person per day. The total food energy deficit be 420,850 metric tons for the whole year. There will be approximately 4,915,500 people below the Food Poverty Line (FPL) this consumption year, totalling up to a deficit of approximately ZAR 8,130,035,000. These people are *in addition to* previous numbers from income-expenditure surveys. The Upper Bound Poverty Line (UBPL), considered a measure of general poverty, will have 25,143,600 people with a deficit, that accumulates to ZAR 123,353,449,000 or ZAR 123 billion.

Recommendations

IMMEDIATE

1. Consider ramping up social grants temporarily for all indigent households. This should be aimed at those households facing food energy deficits (this generally excludes all households already on some sort of grant). It should be scaled back once food prices stabilise or, hopefully, come down from their current levels. This could be considered an emergency response;
2. Maintain financial discipline and fiscal prudence to protect the Rand from any further devaluation. This will help stabilise prices.

FURTHER ALONG

3. The Extended Public Works Programme (EPWP) can provide assets to communities and may be self-selecting to targeted the ‘very poor’ and ‘poor’ households, at the same time increasing available employment slots;
4. The SAVAC needs to continue with its high level of commitment and energy in completing the baselines. At present, funding is a constraint and the committee needs to actively seek more sustainable funding. Once this is in place, tools can be developed and systems improved to streamline and make data collection and analysis more cost-effective;
5. Crop assessments need to be extended to traditional or open access areas and made available easily to the public. The data should be available to the lowest possible level; at the very least at the municipality level. This will increase awareness of and contributions to agriculture, as well as improving this kind of analysis;
6. Pressure to deliver services must be maintained and waste minimised. Opportunities for job creation, especially in urban areas but also in the rural hinterland, need to be maximised.

LONGER TERM


7. There are opportunities to develop high potential land for increasing household incomes through irrigation of vegetables and other high value crops;
8. In many areas, food, crop and livestock production is plentiful, especially during the peak season but incomes are weak or non-existent due to the lack of markets or adequate marketing facilities. This is a priority area for investment;
9. Government agricultural inputs need to be managed efficiently and delivered on time to ensure timely operation of agricultural activities;
10. There is considerable potential for developing both individual and community micro-financing for job creating opportunities;
11. Continue with improvements in the quality and quantity of education, including adult education and training to enable opportunities in new sectors. New possibilities with e-learning arising from the spread of high bandwidth Internet, open source software and hardware, and mobile technologies should be considered.

Appendix A


List of all livelihood zones and codes included in the study, with the baselines used

Many baselines in the country have not yet been completed, so temporary ‘alternative baselines’ were synthesised in this study to permit approximate analysis. The following table lists the livelihood zones and their corresponding ‘alternative’ livelihood zones used for this analysis.

LZ Code	Alt Code	Abbrev	Alt Abbrev	Name	Alt Name
59101	59100	ZALOC	ZA1XX	Lowveld open access cattle and other income	Open access livestock husbandry
59102	59100	ZAKOL	ZA1XX	Kgalagadi open access livestock and other income	Open access livestock husbandry
59103	59100	ZAOOG	ZA1XX	Western open access cattle and game farming	Open access livestock husbandry
59104	59100	ZABOL	ZA1XX	Highveld border open access livestock	Open access livestock husbandry
59105	59105	ZATGL	ZATGL	Thukela and Lebombo sparsely populated	Thukela and Lebombo sparsely populated
59106	59106	ZACNI	ZACNI	Coastal open access non-crop income	Coastal open access non-crop income
59107	59107	ZAOLO	ZA0LO	Inland open access livestock and other income	Inland open access livestock and other income
59108	59100	ZACHO	ZA1XX	Cold highlands open access livestock	Open access livestock husbandry
59109	59100	ZAVTO	ZA1XX	Valley thicket open access livestock	Open access livestock husbandry
59110	59100	ZAMOL	ZA1XX	Midlands open access livestock and dairy	Open access livestock husbandry
59151	59050	ZALER	ZA_FW	Central Limpopo cattle ranching	Commercial farm workers
59152	59050	ZALGR	ZA_FW	Lowveld game ranching	Commercial farm workers
59153	59050	ZAWCG	ZA_FW	North western cattle and game ranching	Commercial farm workers
59154	59050	ZASWG	ZA_FW	Swartruggens game ranching	Commercial farm workers
59155	59050	ZAHGR	ZA_FW	Highveld cattle and game farming	Commercial farm workers
59156	59050	ZALCL	ZA_FW	Lowveld cattle and livestock grazing	Commercial farm workers
59157	59050	ZAGKA	ZA_FW	Great Karoo small stock	Commercial farm workers
59158	59050	ZAPLD	ZA_FW	Upland dairy and stock farming	Commercial farm workers
59159	59050	ZAXGF	ZA_FW	Xariep-Great Fish valley small stock	Commercial farm workers
59160	59050	ZACHX	ZA_FW	Cold moist highlands exclusive access livestock	Commercial farm workers
59161	59050	ZAKHL	ZA_FW	Karoo highlands livestock	Commercial farm workers
59162	59050	ZAMXL	ZA_FW	Midlands exclusive access livestock and dairy	Commercial farm workers



59264	59050	ZAWSC	ZA_FW	West Coast and Bredasdorp grain and small stock	Commercial farm workers
59265	59050	ZASWA	ZA_FW	Swartland mixed grain, fruit and dairy	Commercial farm workers
59266	59050	ZALKH	ZA_FW	Little Karoo high fruit and dairy mixed farming	Commercial farm workers
59267	59050	ZAKSW	ZA_FW	Kango-Swartberg livestock and crops	Commercial farm workers
59268	59050	ZALKA	ZA_FW	Little Karoo ostriches and mixed farming	Commercial farm workers
59269	59050	ZALAN	ZA_FW	Kou-Kamma Langkloof valley crops and livestock	Commercial farm workers
59270	59050	ZAOUT	ZA_FW	Outeniqua plateau mixed farming, dairy and forests	Commercial farm workers
59271	59050	ZACHR	ZA_FW	Caledon-Heidelberg-Riversdal small grain, dairy and livestock	Commercial farm workers
59301	59301	ZALOF	ZALOF	North eastern Limpopo open access farming	North eastern Limpopo open access farming
59302	59302	ZALOI	ZALOI	Lowveld open access irrigated cropping	Lowveld open access irrigated cropping
59303	59300	ZAHIC	ZA3XX	Highveld open access intensive cropping	Open access cropping
59304	59304	ZANCC	ZANCC	North coast open access intense cultivation	North coast open access intense cultivation
59305	59305	ZASCO	ZASCO	South coast intensive open access cropping	South coast intensive open access cropping
59351	59050	ZALIC	ZA_FW	Limpopo River intensive crop farming	Commercial farm workers
59352	59050	ZALFF	ZA_FW	North eastern Limpopo intensive fruit farming	Commercial farm workers
59353	59050	ZASLC	ZA_FW	Southern Limpopo crop farming	Commercial farm workers
59354	59050	ZAHFC	ZA_FW	Hoedspruit Fruit and Cereal	Commercial farm workers
59355	59050	ZAHOI	ZA_FW	Highveld Olifants River irrigated farming	Commercial farm workers
59356	59050	ZANBI	ZA_FW	North western bushveld irrigated	Commercial farm workers
59357	59050	ZAEJC	ZA_FW	Eastern lowveld mixed cropping	Commercial farm workers
59358	59050	ZAHVC	ZA_FW	Highveld vegetables and crops	Commercial farm workers
59360	59050	ZAVIC	ZA_FW	Vryburg irrigated crops	Commercial farm workers



Appendix B

Graphs of the livelihood zones not reported in the text

Coastal open-access non-crop income (ZACNI, 59106)




Figure 47: ZACNI livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

North eastern Limpopo open access farming (ZALOF, 59301)




Figure 48: ZALOF livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

Lowveld Open Access Irrigated Cropping Livelihood Zone (ZALOI, 59302)




Figure 49: ZALOI livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

Open access low intensity rain fed cultivation (ZALRC, 59206)




Figure 50: ZALRC livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

Mzimkulu-Mkomazi midlands open access mixed farming (ZAMMO, 59210)




Figure 51: ZAMMO livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

Northern inland open access farming and livestock (ZANFL, 59207)




Figure 52: ZANFL livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

Northern open access cattle and dry land crops livelihood zone (ZANOC, 59202)




Figure 53: ZANOC livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

Inland open access livestock and other income livelihood zone (ZAOLO, 59107)




Figure 54: ZAOLO livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

South coast intensive open access cropping (ZASCO, 59305)




Figure 55: ZASCO livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

Thukela and Lebombo sparsely populated (ZATGL, 59105)




Figure 56: ZATGL livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

Generic livestock-based open access livelihood zones (ZA1XX, 59100)




Figure 57: ZA1XX livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

Generic mixed crops- and livestock-based open access livelihood zones (ZA2XX, 59200)




Figure 58: ZA2XX livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

Generic crops-based open access livelihood zones (ZA3XX, 59300)




Figure 59: ZA2XX livelihoods for each of the four scenarios

Appendix C

Javascript for scraping the single zone analysis spreadsheets and loading the outcomes into Postgres/PostGIS.

These routines will run on Node.JS version 4.2 (www.nodejs.org), although the xlsx and pg modules will need to be installed via Node Package Manager (NPM), which comes bundled with Node.JS. On the command line, type:

```
$ npm install xlsx ,  
$ npm install pg and  
$ node collect_analysis.js
```

to start the program. You must have an instance of Postgres running with a database called ‘albers_ea’.

```
/*  
 * @file_name: collect_oucomes.js  
 *  
 */  
  
var XLSX = require('xlsx'), pg = require('pg');  
const fs = require('fs');  
  
/*  
 * Get any other user input such as user name, required dates or yes/no options. Data format can  
 * also be defined in the 'format' parameter (using a RegExp).  
 *  
 * @param question {String} Optional. Question to be asked on StdIn. If it ends in '?', ':' or ')'  
 * it will be append with a space only; if it ends with anything else it will be appended with '? '.  
 * Default 'Enter: '.  
 * @param format {RegExp}. Displays format as a regexp to the user. Default `/\w+|\s+` , any number  
 * of alphanumeric or whitespace characters allowed, nothing not allowed ( ).  
 * @param callback {Function}. `Function (cancelled, data)` where cancelled is true if user aborts  
 * (Ctrl-C).  
 *  
 */  
function ask(question, format, callback) {  
    var stdin = process.stdin, stdout = process.stdout;  
    if (question === undefined) stdout.write("Enter: ");  
    else if (question.trim().slice(-1) == ':' || question.trim().slice(-1) == '?' ||  
            question.trim().slice(-1) == ')') stdout.write(question.trim() + ' ');  
    else stdout.write(question + '? ');  
    if (format === undefined) format = /\w+|\s+/  
    stdin.setEncoding('utf8');  
  
    stdin.resume();  
    stdin.once('data', function(data) {  
        if (data.length > 1) {
```

```

        data = data.toString().trim();
    } else {
        data = data.toString();
    }
    if (data == '\u0003') {
        callback(true);
        stdout.write('\n'); // add a line and quit
        process.exit();
    }
    if (format.test(data)) {
        // clear any extraneous single characters in StdOut
        stdout.write('\u0008');
        stdout.write('\u007F');
        stdout.write('\u0008');
        callback(false, data);
    } else {
        stdout.write("It should match: " + format + "\n");
        ask(question, format, callback);
    }
});

}

/*
 * Get a password from stdin.
 * Adapted from <http://stackoverflow.com/a/10357818/122384>.
 *
 * @param prompt {String} Optional prompt. Default 'Password: '.
 * @param callback {Function} `function (cancelled, password)` where
 *     `cancelled` is true if the user aborted (Ctrl+C).
 * [CR]Added in nice fat bullet placeholders ('\u2022').
 * [CR]Fixed the backspace to trim off last placeholders and snip password string at end.
 * [CR]Fixed Ctrl-C (Quit) to add a line before the exit.
 *
 */
function getPassword(prompt, callback) {
    var stdin = process.stdin, stdout = process.stdout
    if (callback === undefined) {
        callback = prompt;
        prompt = undefined;
    }
    if (prompt === undefined) {
        prompt = 'Password';
    }
    if (prompt) {

```

```

        stdio.write(prompt + ": ");

    }

stdin.resume();
stdin.setRawMode(true);
stdin.resume();
stdin.setEncoding('utf8');

var password = '';
stdin.on('data', function (ch) {
    ch = ch + '';
    switch (ch) {
        case '\n':
        case '\r':
        case '\u0004':
            // They've finished typing their password
            stdio.write('\n');
            stdin.setRawMode(false);
            stdin.pause();
            callback(false, password);
            break;
        case '\u0003':
            // Ctrl-C
            callback(true);
            stdio.write('\n'); // add a line and quit
            process.exit();
            break;
        case '\u007F':
            // Backspace: BS to backup, DEL to remove character (but moves one forward), so BS again
            if (password.length > 0) {
                stdio.write('\u0008');
                stdio.write('\u007F');
                stdio.write('\u0008');
                password = password.slice(0, password.length - 1); // snip the password one char at end
            }
            break;
        default:
            // Other password characters
            stdio.write('\u2022');
            password += ch;
            break;
    }
});
```

}

```

/*
 * Connects to the DB and selects which analysis (month, year) the user wants load into it.
 *
 * @param pgClient {Object}. Required. Postgres client object with connection string credentials in
 * it must be passed.
 *
 */
function connectDB(pgClient) {
    // Connect the client to the database
    pgClient.connect(function(err) {
        if(err) {
            return console.error('could not connect to postgres', err);
        }
        // Query the database to find out how many analyses have been done before
        pgClient.query('SELECT ofa_month, ofa_year, count(*) AS result FROM zaf.tbl_ofa_analysis GROUP
BY ofa_year, ofa_month ORDER BY ofa_year, ofa_month;', function(err, result) {
            if(err) {
                return console.error('error retrieving analyses', err);
            }
            // Success
            var months = ['January', 'February', 'March', 'April', 'May', 'June', 'July', 'August',
'September', 'October', 'November', 'December']
            console.log('\nYour existing analysis are:');
            console.log('OFA Month | OFA Year |   results\n-----+-----+-----');
            for (i = 0; i < result.rowCount; i++) {
                var pad_month = '';
                var pad_result = '';
                for (j = 0; j < 9 - (months[result.rows[i].ofa_month - 1]).length; j++) pad_month+= ' ';
                for (j = 0; j < 10 - (' ' + result.rows[i].result).length; j++) pad_result += ' ';
                console.log(months[result.rows[i].ofa_month - 1] + pad_month + ' | ' +
result.rows[i].ofa_year + ' | ' + pad_result + result.rows[i].result);
            }
            console.log('-----+-----+-----');
            // Get the month and year of the analysis
            ask('Which month and year of analysis do you want to assign to these spreadsheets?\nType it
in as numbers representing M-YYYY (e.g. 9-2013 or 11-2015) ', /\d{1,2}-\d{4}/, function(cancel,
analysisMonth) {
                if (!cancel) {
                    var d = new Date(), check = false, deleteOnly = false;
                    var ofa = analysisMonth.split('-');
                    // Force to current month and year if supplied values are out of range
                    if (ofa[0] * 1 > 12) ofa[0]= 12;
                    if (ofa[0] * 1 < 1) ofa[0] = 1;
                    if (new Date(ofa[1], ofa[0]-1, 1) > d || ofa[1] * 1 < 1980 ) {
                        ofa[0] = d.getMonth() + 1;
                        ofa[1] = d.getFullYear();
                    }
                }
            });
        }
    });
}

```

```

        console.log('Analysis reset to ' + ofa[0] + '-' + ofa[1] + '; it cannot be ahead
of time or before 1980.');
    }
    for (i = 0; i < result.rowCount; i++) {
        if (ofa[0] == result.rows[i].ofa_month && ofa[1] == result.rows[i].ofa_year) {
            var check = true;
            break;
        }
    }
    if (check) {
        ask('This analysis already exists. Delete only (yes - just delete / no - delete
and\nreinsert data)?', ./+, function(cancel, justDel) {
            if (!cancel) {
                if (justDel.toUpperCase() == 'Y' || justDel.toUpperCase() == 'YES')
deleteOnly = true
                ask('Are you REALLY sure you want to delete all your previous data for ' +
months[ofa[0] - 1] + ' ' + ofa[1] + '\n(yes - proceed / no - quit before affecting anything)?', ./+,
function(cancel, confirm) {
                    if (!cancel) {
                        if (confirm.toUpperCase() == 'Y' || confirm.toUpperCase() == 'YES') {
                            // Call the loadTable function
                            loadTable(pgClient, ofa, deleteOnly);
                        } else {
                            pgClient.end();
                            process.exit();
                        }
                    }
                })
            });
        });
    }
}

/* Deletes previous record for the same analysis date and uploads the current analysis results
 * collected from the spreadsheets.
 *
 * @param pgClient {Object}. Required. Postgres client connection object must be passed.
 * @param ofa {Array} Required. Two elements with numbers representing month ofa[0] ('1' = January)
 * and year ofa[1].
 */

```

```

    * @param deleteOnly {Boolean}. Optional. TRUE when data for analysis are deleted but not
reinserted.

    * Default FALSE.

    *

    */

function loadTable(pgClient, ofa, deleteOnly) {
    // Query to first delete existing data in zaf.tbl_ofa_analysis for the desired month and year
    pgClient.query('DELETE FROM zaf.tbl_ofa_analysis WHERE ofa_year = ' + ofa[1] + ' AND ofa_month =
' + ofa[0] + ';', function(err, result) {
        if(err) {
            return console.error('error running DELETE query', err);
        }
        // Success. Output is something like DELETE: 1168 rows affected
        console.log(result.command + ': ' + result.rowCount + ' rows affected');

        // Query to insert the new data using the SQL string above
        if (!deleteOnly) {
            // Create the INSERT SQL String
            var sqlString = 'INSERT INTO zaf.tbl_ofa_analysis (ofa_year, ofa_month, lz_code, wg_code, '
+ 'lz_affected, wg_affected, threshold, deficit) VALUES \n';
            // Read the config files containing info on analysis spreadsheets and deficits.
            // Read the config file for the spreadsheet structure
            fs.readFile("./config_spreadsheets.json", function(err, sSheetData) {
                if (err) {
                    console.log("LZ and spreadsheet config file missing or corrupt.");
                    return;
                }
                // Success. Read the config file for thresholds
                fs.readFile("./config_deficits.json", function(err, deficitsData) {
                    if (err) {
                        console.log("Deficits config file missing or corrupt.");
                        return;
                    }
                    // Success. Parse the files and pass (sic!) them on to the readSpreadSheets function
                    sqlString = readSpreadSheets(sqlString, JSON.parse(sSheetData.toString()),
JSON.parse(deficitsData.toString()), ofa);
                    pgClient.query(sqlString, function(err, result) {
                        if(err) {
                            return console.error('error running INSERT query', err);
                        }
                        // Success. Output is something like INSERT: 1168 rows affected
                        console.log(result.command + ': ' + result.rowCount + ' rows affected');
                        getDbTime(pgClient);
                    });
                });
            });
        } else {
            getDbTime(pgClient);
        }
    });
}

```

```

        }
    });
}

/*
 * Read all the spreadsheet values and load them into an object, as well as creating an SQL INSERT
 * values query string for loading the spreadsheet outputs into a Postgres table.
 *
 * @param sqlString {string} Required. First part of SQL string to which the results from the
 * spreadsheet reads are appended in correct syntax and returned.
 * @param ofa {Array} Required. Two elements with numbers representing month ofa[0] ('1' = January)
 * and year ofa[1].
 *
 */
function readSpreadSheets(sqlString, lzAbbrevs, deficits, ofa) {
    console.log('Reading spreadsheets...');
    // Object with the LZ affectedness groupings.
    var lzAffected = {
        normal : {
            code : 0,
            ext : "_0"
        },
        drought : {
            code: 1,
            ext : "_1"
        }
    };
    // Object with the wealth group affectedness groupings.
    var wgAffected = {
        grants : "",
        noGrants : "_nogrants"
    }

    // Variable for storing outcomes
    var outcome = {};
    // 'name' is the LZ abbrev name in the spreadsheet file name, 'code' is the LZ code (for the DB
    // table), 'wgs' array contains objects with worksheet numbers (in the spreadsheet) and WG IDs from
    // tbl_wgs in each LZ analysis.
    for (var i = 0; i < lzAbbrevs.length; i++) {
        for (var subLz in lzAffected) {
            for (var subWG in wgAffected) {
                // Get the workbook
                var workbook = XLSX.readFile('./spreadsheets/' + lzAbbrevs[i].name +
lzAffected[subLz].ext + wgAffected[subWG] + '.xlsx');
                process.stdout.write('./spreadsheets/' + lzAbbrevs[i].name + lzAffected[subLz].ext +

```

```

        wgAffected[subWG] + '.xlsx\n');

    // Get the worksheet and assign it to a variable
    for (var j = 0; j < lzAbbrevs[i].wgs.length; j++) {
        var sheet_name = workbook.SheetNames[lzAbbrevs[i].wgs[j].sheet];
        var worksheet = workbook.Sheets[sheet_name];
        //reset the outcome object
        outcome = {};
        // Find desired cell
        for (var thres in deficits) {
            var desired_cell = worksheet[deficits[thres].cell];
            // Get the value
            var desired_value = desired_cell.v;
            if (thres === 'food') {
                outcome[thres] = Math.round(desired_value * 100, 0) + '%';
            } else {
                outcome[thres] = Math.round(desired_value, 0);
            };

            sqlString += '(' + ofa[1] + ', ' + ofa[0] + ', ' + lzAbbrevs[i].code + ', ' +
(lzAbbrevs[i].wgs[j].wg) + ', \u0027' + subLz + '\u0027, \u0027' + subWG + '\u0027, \u0027' +
deficits[thres].descr + '\u0027, ' + desired_value + '),\n';
        }
    }
}

// Query SQL string for inserting data into zaf.tbl_ofa_analysis postgres table
sqlString = sqlString.substring(0, sqlString.length - 2) + '\n';
return sqlString
}

/*
 * Get the database time. Simple routine to throw out the time on the Database when the update
 * (INSERT or DELETE) is finished.
 *
 * @param pgClient {Object}. Required. Postgres client connection object must be passed.
 *
 */
function getDbTime(pgClient) {
    // Query to get a time stamp from the DB(!) for the succesful completion of the work
    pgClient.query('SELECT NOW() AS "theTime"', function(err, result) {
        if(err) {
            return console.error('error running query', err);
        }
        // Success. Output is something like Tue Jun 21 2016 10:12:47 GMT+0200 (SAST)
    })
}

```

```

        console.log(result.rows[0].theTime);
        // end client session*/
        pgClient.end();
        process.exit();
    });

}

/*
 * Callers for getting user inputs for connecting to the database. Upon entry of credentials, the
 * `connectDB` function is called with the a client object for connecting to the database. No
 * authentication/authorisation at this stage.
 *
 */
// Get the DB user name
ask('\nYou may need account credentials to connect to Postgres. However, if you\\ndownloaded the
database dump file from GitHub, you may ignore the user name\\nand password below (skip by pressing
ENTER twice)\n\nPostgres user name', /.+|\s/, function(cancel, user_name) {
    if (!cancel) {
        // Get the DB password
        getPassword('Postgres password', function(cancel, password) {
            // pass the user name and password as a connection string onto Postgres in the main data
            // processing function
            if (!cancel) {
                var client = new pg.Client('postgres://' + user_name + ':' + password +
'@localhost:5432/albers_ea');

                // Go through to selecting the month and year of analysis
                connectDB(client);
            }
        });
    }
});

```

Appendix D

List of PostgreSQL/PostGIS queries and how to run them

These queries will run on PostgreSQL version 9.3 or newer (www.postgresql.org and www.postgis.net). The required data will need to be imported into PostgreSQL/PostGIS, which is available in the DB folder (a completed dataset from this query is available).

buffer_rs.sql - query for creating a polygon or set of polygons that is the drought affected area

The output is the drought hazard layer, called zaf.rs_vci_16_01_buffer, which covers all the red and dark orange sections on the chosen vegetation condition index image, which will have been vectorised. The query can be called from the command line:

```
$ psql -d albers_ea -f buffer_rs.sql
```

crop_specs.sql - query for determining problem specs for affected vs unaffected regions by breaking down averages

The output is a table, zaf.prob_specs, that contains a list of agricultural regions and provinces and their breakdowns for problem specifications, depending on the ‘normal’ conditions and reported data from the Crop Estimates Committee (CEC).. This query can be run from the command line:

```
$ psql -d albers_ea -f crop_specs.sql -v analysis=4-2016
```

Note: the -v switch must be applied for the query to run properly.

hazard_analysis.sql - Query for assigning drought hazard conditions to enumeration small areas (ESAs)

The output is a new table, zaf.demog_sas_ofa, which contains all the enumeration small areas and their geometries, for every complete analysis (October 2015 in Limpopo Province and April 2016 national). The query can be called from the command line:

```
$ psql -d albers_ea -f hazard_analysis.sql -v analysis=4-2016
```

Note: the -v switch must be applied for the query to run properly. It will start running and it takes a long time (> 2 hours) because of the spatial operations involved.

hazard_outcomes.sql - Query for assigning drought hazard conditions to enumeration small areas (ESAs)

The output is a new table zaf.tbl_ofa_outcomes, that contains a list of enumeration small areas (ESAs), wealth groups, thresholds and affected population sections (wg_affected) for pivoting. The query can be called from the command line:

```
$ psql -d albers_ea -f hazard_outcomes.sql -v analysis=4-2016
```

Note: the -v switch must be applied for the query to run properly.

Appendix E

List of commodities in the Food Poverty Line

Table 18: Commodities and their prices in 2011

Item	Price (cents)
Aerated cold drinks	131
Fresh full cream milk	96
Large eggs	219
Poultry (incl heads and feet)	280
Beef and veal (incl heads and feet)	594
Boerewors	452
Canned pilchards	360
Mealie meal/Maize flour	44
Brown bread	101
White bread	116
Rice	98
Edible oils (eg cooking oils)	157
Potatoes	85
Tomatoes fresh	150
Onions	76
Bananas	70
Cabbage fresh	65
Burger	543
Powder soup	540
Brown sugar	194
White sugar	194
Atchaar	467
Whiteners (Cremora, Ellis Brown)	277

Appendix F

Populations and deficits at municipality level for all four thresholds

Table 19: Analysis outcomes by municipality, district and province

Row Labels	Sum of population with a food deficit	Sum of deficit maize eq (MT)	Sum of population with an FPL deficit	Sum of FPL deficit in ZAR	Sum of population with an LBPL deficit	Sum of LBPL deficit in ZAR	Sum of population with a UBPL deficit	Sum of UBPL deficit in ZAR
Eastern Cape	588,606	61,104	588,606	1,074,977,708	2,311,857	4,771,695,802	3,403,718	17,130,019,769
Alfred Nzo								
Matatiele	28,679	3,187	28,679	47,684,053	95,156	199,933,797	160,168	753,414,846
Mbizana	41,435	4,929	41,435	93,968,049	189,835	402,881,800	252,740	1,342,755,863
Ntabankulu	18,636	2,197	18,636	38,507,493	76,432	162,541,530	110,976	563,842,037
Umwimvubu	26,949	3,202	26,949	60,314,321	121,201	257,793,955	164,977	867,709,430
Amathole								
Amahlathi	13,920	1,371	13,920	22,572,651	40,029	94,183,768	62,821	314,345,326
Great Kei	3,711	224	3,711	4,314,450	8,952	21,051,651	12,671	69,494,163
Mbhazhe	35,079	3,623	35,079	61,157,369	140,947	269,655,026	191,564	982,256,810
Mnquma	32,608	3,381	32,608	57,165,274	128,799	251,253,692	186,092	933,683,640
Ngquhwa	9,767	1,070	9,767	17,219,670	31,778	72,629,193	53,183	255,985,002
Nkonkobe	12,948	1,324	12,948	20,940,845	39,480	90,440,503	69,847	328,812,880
Nxuba	629	40	629	742,667	1,604	3,764,031	2,777	13,610,685
Buffalo City								
Buffalo City	44,806	4,090	44,806	67,889,480	135,403	322,571,332	277,301	1,238,821,743
Cacadu								
Baviaans	577	33	577	640,086	1,466	3,251,007	1,935	10,935,796
Blue Crane Route	1,964	134	1,964	2,528,396	3,967	10,983,086	5,968	32,465,989
Camdeboo	854	50	854	926,216	2,499	5,259,163	4,201	20,689,600
Ikwezi	474	32	474	622,802	804	2,452,064	804	5,737,724
Kou-Kamma	539	10	539	187,480	3,107	4,053,470	5,397	24,834,093
Kouga	1,890	110	1,890	1,804,321	7,362	13,570,059	15,728	67,740,400
Makana	2,507	171	2,507	2,890,712	7,734	16,915,299	16,985	73,639,117
Ndlambe	616	30	616	493,932	2,681	4,467,794	5,375	23,612,989
Sundays River Valley	1,951	118	1,951	2,103,178	6,023	12,502,187	11,314	52,493,455
Chris Hani								
Emalahleni	6,805	301	6,805	5,726,520	26,096	43,613,600	40,972	202,523,979
Engcobo	21,027	2,485	21,027	49,566,892	102,576	213,221,402	128,781	704,614,856
Inkwanca	760	51	760	940,117	1,773	4,463,447	2,971	15,017,047
Intsika Yethu	21,511	2,237	21,511	41,445,004	94,634	181,506,066	126,527	662,706,179
Inxuba Yethemba	2,612	176	2,612	3,376,892	5,040	14,271,349	6,838	39,660,349
Lukanji	7,926	736	7,926	11,731,079	28,266	56,474,032	47,004	222,095,295
Sakhisizwe	4,983	526	4,983	10,546,567	24,408	45,635,644	28,751	161,208,013
Tsolwana	3,760	376	3,760	6,002,258	11,959	25,922,863	18,152	90,040,314
Joe Gqabi								
Elundini	15,508	1,899	15,508	32,739,066	60,391	137,256,703	94,241	467,207,890
Gariep	1,140	76	1,140	1,497,881	1,933	5,897,384	1,933	13,799,622
Maletswai	2,009	144	2,009	2,533,853	5,021	12,586,817	10,370	47,042,260
Senqu	16,868	2,103	16,868	43,005,175	80,330	187,488,588	106,018	574,055,286
Nelson Mandela Bay								
Nelson Mandela Bay	21,457	1,567	21,457	25,522,737	67,685	150,825,388	163,635	681,061,588
O.R. Tambo								
King Sabata Dalindyebo	47,879	5,065	47,879	90,568,478	197,653	400,499,558	272,744	1,406,294,768
Mhlontlo	26,289	3,039	26,289	59,523,604	124,749	255,394,849	157,386	857,083,715
Ngquza Hill	39,649	4,169	39,649	79,411,341	185,534	340,673,509	224,671	1,232,324,870
Nyandeni	43,900	4,619	43,900	73,042,912	160,356	325,535,235	239,979	1,174,916,782
Port St Johns	23,984	2,210	23,984	33,123,888	88,194	148,274,965	119,921	601,485,367
Free State	102,946	8,962	102,946	150,563,075	264,120	667,988,403	506,271	2,366,277,220
Fezile Dabi								
Mafube	1,565	109	1,565	2,006,913	3,424	9,137,021	5,879	29,591,742
Metsimaholo	1,753	123	1,753	2,137,568	4,730	11,234,007	9,915	44,361,949
Moqhaba	6,040	412	6,040	7,814,112	11,938	33,498,653	17,270	96,400,021
Ngwathe	2,435	164	2,435	3,179,423	4,430	12,995,570	5,380	33,582,443
Lejweleputswa								
Masilonyana	1,850	125	1,850	2,420,690	3,349	9,872,507	4,073	25,444,408
Matjhabeng	9,966	740	9,966	12,507,529	27,153	65,944,130	62,579	268,764,271
Nala	1,984	134	1,984	2,602,318	3,526	10,503,192	4,070	26,341,659
Tokologo	1,295	86	1,295	1,649,786	2,606	7,144,183	3,648	20,642,005
Tswelopele	2,044	138	2,044	2,675,856	3,714	10,933,549	4,560	28,313,853
Mangaung								
Mangaung	21,551	1,584	21,551	26,787,913	58,957	141,332,475	140,635	594,270,704
Thabo Mofutsanyane								
Dihlabeng	5,116	340	5,116	6,624,775	9,430	27,245,016	11,073	70,437,248
Maluti a Phofung	31,814	3,971	31,814	60,279,857	100,306	243,302,045	196,088	889,196,726
Mantsopa	1,786	119	1,786	2,338,096	3,067	9,236,237	3,586	23,092,217
Nketoana	2,313	151	2,313	2,892,386	4,877	12,873,247	6,847	38,468,127
Phumelela	2,542	167	2,542	3,086,724	6,117	14,991,444	10,288	51,659,395
Setsoto	3,433	235	3,433	4,480,413	6,526	18,778,964	8,944	51,747,690
Xhariep								

Row Labels	Sum of population with a food deficit	Sum of deficit maize eq (MT)	Sum of population with an FPL deficit	Sum of FPL deficit in ZAR	Sum of population with an LBPL deficit	Sum of LBPL deficit in ZAR	Sum of population with a UBPL deficit	Sum of UBPL deficit in ZAR
Kopanong	1,838	123	1,838	2,408,949	3,190	9,594,834	3,333	23,068,564
Letsemeng	1,501	98	1,501	1,875,194	3,178	8,368,679	4,501	25,148,474
Mohokare	1,336	89	1,336	1,761,352	2,272	6,934,709	2,272	16,226,918
Naledi	784	52	784	1,033,219	1,330	4,067,941	1,330	9,518,804
Gauteng	352,955	26,087	352,955	436,536,551	1,004,648	2,376,515,067	2,348,543	9,988,422,398
City of Johannesburg	97,988	7,379	97,988	122,130,613	281,617	668,611,599	678,897	2,849,598,213
City of Johannesburg	98,774	7,238	98,774	121,766,334	279,742	660,851,757	644,272	2,757,971,065
Ekurhuleni	84,428	6,333	84,428	103,888,837	251,510	584,639,117	613,000	2,554,230,950
Sedibeng								
Emfuleni	20,494	1,518	20,494	25,150,537	60,156	140,116,242	143,122	602,947,546
Lesedi	2,366	146	2,366	2,489,187	8,072	16,147,837	16,790	73,902,098
Midvaal	4,717	277	4,717	5,011,322	14,545	29,872,330	26,396	124,380,995
West Rand								
Merafong City	11,072	826	11,072	13,837,089	30,893	74,199,716	72,588	308,547,584
Mogale City	14,971	1,055	14,971	19,227,574	33,230	88,419,424	59,942	293,622,255
Randfontein	8,065	565	8,065	10,400,775	17,272	46,796,641	29,678	149,577,331
Westonaria	10,080	749	10,080	12,634,283	27,611	66,860,406	63,858	273,644,360
KwaZulu-Natal	1,766,923	129,689	1,799,426	2,979,042,673	4,513,510	10,683,152,361	6,029,906	34,011,923,331
Amajuba								
Dannhauser	13,790	1,570	13,790	33,043,900	80,526	143,206,899	82,566	478,771,878
Emadlengeni	2,575	167	2,575	3,431,373	10,381	19,184,187	15,123	77,245,262
Newcastle	17,575	1,863	17,575	37,878,388	92,190	166,086,128	104,156	573,368,278
Ethewini								
eThekwin	209,945	13,867	222,100	379,511,159	746,497	1,727,229,365	1,323,023	6,426,512,315
Harry Gwala								
Greater Kokstad	1,925	112	1,925	2,361,632	4,927	11,129,162	7,523	39,727,298
Ingwe	85,401	7,172	85,401	138,701,833	87,665	337,354,965	96,199	729,991,250
Kwa Sani	690	47	690	1,193,547	2,977	6,201,216	4,376	23,725,128
Ubuhlabezwe	70,396	5,806	70,702	115,477,751	81,733	294,989,061	93,275	673,126,015
Umzimkhulu	140,322	12,516	140,322	236,500,167	148,645	569,711,357	162,848	1,227,382,657
iLembe								
KwaDukuza	19,646	1,288	19,802	24,753,623	55,543	128,284,611	112,965	512,752,626
Mandeni	20,216	1,098	21,851	43,803,171	85,924	168,247,412	102,041	583,801,603
Maphumulo	20,689	1,448	22,440	46,140,226	85,212	191,914,527	102,294	607,768,252
Ndwedwe	22,683	1,242	26,033	62,461,080	116,128	248,140,712	138,131	818,272,850
Ugu								
Ezingoleni	21,623	1,227	21,761	31,863,771	40,748	91,638,012	42,280	264,820,297
Hibiscus Coast	60,846	3,136	61,168	86,071,272	125,389	260,269,897	135,223	806,212,799
Umdoni	25,977	2,135	25,977	41,124,095	30,848	106,506,899	38,514	258,664,122
UMuziwabantu	43,848	3,068	43,930	71,251,631	70,209	189,894,772	73,301	488,739,576
Umzumbe	89,109	6,236	89,695	140,505,588	135,454	377,467,891	143,644	966,390,535
Vulamehlo	37,523	2,809	38,529	66,869,107	66,478	193,818,252	75,274	504,284,550
Umgungundlovu								
Impendle	10,563	577	10,563	13,150,290	17,630	53,657,626	26,535	162,376,297
Mkhambathini	11,460	640	12,415	23,644,534	40,879	91,978,678	50,676	299,622,852
Mpofana	2,001	99	2,001	2,151,312	6,074	11,868,240	9,008	47,287,739
Richmond	12,852	842	13,006	21,047,406	25,027	68,521,904	30,490	196,208,452
The Msunduzi	85,302	6,515	88,629	154,666,670	206,942	557,789,151	333,503	1,777,353,967
uMngeni	3,415	198	3,632	5,671,136	14,764	30,596,708	25,973	125,413,921
uMshwathi	6,452	316	7,052	12,974,870	33,905	70,683,207	65,929	317,016,807
Umkhanyakude								
Hlabisa	10,584	1,209	10,584	24,854,614	51,537	95,526,163	67,667	356,802,116
Jozini	59,634	4,026	59,723	78,040,198	128,750	308,788,037	171,798	1,009,828,854
Mtubatuba	22,459	2,587	22,459	58,716,147	126,036	229,696,532	149,345	798,248,534
The Big 5 False Bay	5,297	515	5,354	7,349,924	10,765	26,563,006	24,215	126,138,390
Umhlabuyalingana	51,764	2,847	54,669	90,241,276	142,350	358,903,328	163,589	1,054,589,266
Umfzinyathi								
Endumeni	2,451	161	2,451	3,079,399	7,900	15,735,145	14,812	67,672,115
Msinga	28,608	2,911	28,608	57,264,122	139,407	240,317,998	155,252	851,664,596
Nqutu	27,383	2,708	27,383	53,921,087	135,060	225,668,316	139,915	788,746,475
Umvoti	14,336	914	15,520	30,486,936	58,016	128,247,381	75,140	429,662,188
Uthukela								
Emnambithi/Ladysmith	22,134	2,188	22,134	46,801,294	84,056	179,809,748	110,666	577,149,159
Imbabazane	43,873	2,492	43,873	55,846,369	58,147	192,747,229	98,818	549,822,254
Indaka	13,673	1,614	13,673	33,717,265	81,475	145,139,282	83,501	482,047,559
Okhahlamba	25,810	1,955	25,810	46,858,388	62,305	175,419,479	91,899	521,610,844
Umtshezi	9,117	666	9,117	13,220,458	21,562	55,247,894	37,877	184,878,776
Uthungulu								
Mfolozi	22,299	1,566	22,299	31,958,842	63,577	106,129,753	94,147	485,980,505
Mthonjaneni	15,050	917	15,141	19,175,272	27,686	73,597,917	34,922	221,765,873
Nkandla	61,658	3,293	61,986	77,985,828	115,653	303,457,349	118,855	817,503,177
Ntambanana	20,247	1,386	20,277	27,987,504	46,439	110,138,447	66,779	379,544,675
uMhlathuze	40,176	2,330	40,508	62,879,909	132,092	212,641,543	159,117	850,820,674
uMlalazi	59,536	3,779	60,243	85,154,392	141,020	325,689,842	176,754	1,056,281,293
Zululand								

Row Labels	Sum of population with a food deficit	Sum of deficit maize eq (MT)	Sum of population with an FPL deficit	Sum of FPL deficit in ZAR	Sum of population with an LBPL deficit	Sum of LBPL deficit in ZAR	Sum of population with a UBPL deficit	Sum of UBPL deficit in ZAR
Abaqulusi	24,910	2,517	24,910	52,341,671	106,290	217,083,650	118,267	678,452,541
eDumbe	14,504	1,294	14,504	28,202,605	30,137	88,728,030	55,801	253,454,897
Nongoma	34,774	3,366	34,774	60,157,383	110,647	226,548,590	172,334	910,416,961
Ulundi	79,753	4,572	79,793	97,243,021	139,970	371,477,447	161,621	1,066,882,086
UPhongolo	20,069	1,879	20,069	39,309,233	79,938	153,479,414	91,945	505,122,196
Limpopo Capricorn	490,543	57,060	490,543	1,066,014,623	2,065,161	4,320,963,534	3,488,656	16,873,295,770
Aganang	20,118	2,897	20,118	62,914,140	100,288	225,969,931	101,919	685,853,384
Blouberg	17,253	2,424	17,253	52,200,268	88,707	191,892,178	107,610	654,304,285
Lepele-Nkumpi	7,918	866	7,918	10,132,820	28,606	39,920,177	152,337	520,694,278
Molemole	15,927	1,822	15,927	38,763,163	59,781	142,607,984	60,344	410,488,325
Polokwane	48,411	5,672	48,411	95,345,134	189,610	360,580,251	305,228	1,518,912,630
Greater Sekhukhune								
Elias Motsoaledi	22,265	2,255	22,265	37,120,907	95,242	156,803,010	163,379	761,952,310
Ephraim Mogale	11,386	998	11,386	16,853,208	42,526	77,501,196	70,838	345,813,625
Fetakgomo	4,944	522	4,944	6,429,356	16,398	24,513,011	71,477	253,950,816
Greater Tubatse	4,772	466	4,772	5,666,739	17,980	26,337,505	247,628	771,006,688
Makhuduthamaga	16,502	1,868	16,502	21,404,433	60,099	81,337,368	218,601	796,231,190
Mopani								
Ba-Phalaborwa	12,853	1,555	12,853	24,763,627	40,067	99,451,785	72,496	341,852,458
Greater Giyani	40,068	4,842	40,068	88,663,032	150,068	368,303,086	204,464	1,120,439,047
Greater Letaba	27,234	3,401	27,234	65,309,592	123,896	281,442,887	175,202	911,879,507
Greater Tzaneen	47,955	5,678	47,955	90,526,683	198,933	378,795,933	283,609	1,425,300,579
Maruleng	13,452	1,477	13,452	17,236,036	48,556	67,077,619	68,227	329,172,715
Vhembe								
Makhado	57,000	7,040	57,000	148,157,535	270,476	611,914,011	393,029	2,024,095,601
Musina	4,330	272	4,330	5,307,327	9,178	23,687,863	11,641	69,182,086
Mutale	12,040	1,208	12,040	24,447,051	60,261	103,440,619	69,298	386,329,429
Thulamela	53,372	5,761	53,372	128,818,583	245,303	568,429,299	427,093	1,892,736,661
Waterberg								
Bela-Bela	3,221	227	3,221	4,283,627	8,957	20,622,912	15,065	75,573,692
Lephala	8,773	981	8,773	20,345,231	38,527	81,797,590	57,012	309,512,408
Modimolle	2,226	145	2,226	2,587,461	6,210	14,033,215	11,973	55,474,205
Mogalakwena	30,281	4,113	30,281	88,675,964	143,955	322,822,645	157,273	1,015,485,480
Mookgopong	780	37	780	700,598	2,770	4,958,929	4,546	22,193,057
Thabazimbi	7,462	532	7,462	9,362,108	18,767	46,722,528	38,367	174,861,316
Mpumalanga Ehlanzeni	357,777	37,900	357,777	671,195,776	1,255,144	2,936,190,483	2,045,696	10,076,232,825
Bushbuckridge	73,579	9,578	73,579	173,164,864	302,388	729,112,066	468,094	2,349,303,645
Mbombela	65,100	7,884	65,100	121,417,120	200,237	490,959,232	385,312	1,764,310,113
Nkomazi	60,259	5,884	60,259	104,405,090	169,857	431,636,458	254,500	1,334,680,421
Thaba Chweu	4,346	313	4,346	5,762,621	19,111	30,088,606	27,474	138,035,536
Umjindi	1,899	128	1,899	1,965,756	6,865	12,484,707	12,754	57,405,503
Gert Sibande								
Albert Luthuli	23,998	2,602	23,998	39,315,895	73,889	169,011,337	138,638	632,735,151
Dipaleseng	1,504	105	1,504	1,721,282	4,904	10,524,704	11,393	48,041,234
Govan Mbeki	1,553	88	1,553	1,563,922	5,225	10,163,683	9,779	45,110,072
Lekwa	2,526	142	2,526	2,417,099	9,445	17,504,378	18,996	84,209,274
Mkhondo	14,996	917	14,996	18,665,867	43,609	97,711,088	71,144	362,845,441
Msukaligwa	5,221	325	5,221	5,336,069	19,220	37,253,162	42,412	180,955,234
Pixley Ka Seme	2,033	108	2,033	3,675,549	11,467	24,071,251	18,819	98,538,487
Nkangala								
Dr JS Moroka	43,600	4,030	43,600	78,254,624	148,398	324,830,941	185,252	1,032,189,496
Emakhazeni	908	44	908	725,896	3,970	6,596,444	7,946	34,907,289
Emalahleni	15,613	1,135	15,613	18,803,594	46,879	106,908,111	110,298	465,607,776
Steve Tshwete	5,419	348	5,419	5,730,681	19,122	38,201,522	42,453	181,265,444
Thembisile	33,750	4,213	33,750	87,295,075	163,497	388,321,033	226,984	1,206,065,264
Victor Khanye	1,473	58	1,473	974,774	7,061	10,811,760	13,448	60,027,446
North West Bojanala	336,226	34,668	336,226	652,102,973	1,249,674	2,851,366,812	1,801,186	9,365,714,569
Kgetlengrivier	5,869	410	5,869	7,527,319	12,854	34,323,050	22,412	111,830,730
Madibeng	57,272	6,473	57,272	131,445,438	235,897	569,617,187	310,802	1,703,008,971
Moretele	26,518	3,254	26,518	63,335,965	124,578	270,621,960	165,415	884,146,521
Moses Kotane	34,618	4,103	34,618	72,225,266	142,408	306,648,258	209,390	1,059,806,331
Rustenburg	45,921	4,491	45,921	81,875,457	154,835	378,303,809	278,440	1,318,219,429
Dr Kenneth Kaunda								
City of Matlosana	6,534	433	6,534	8,155,265	14,314	37,194,466	22,029	117,117,161
Maquassi Hills	4,203	285	4,203	5,427,976	8,279	23,212,064	11,699	66,178,137
Tlokwe City Council	5,560	378	5,560	6,906,683	13,144	33,109,703	23,365	114,404,785
Ventersdorp	8,464	570	8,464	11,114,870	14,918	44,657,196	16,820	110,638,728
Dr Ruth Segomotsi Mompati								
Greater Taung	25,695	2,820	25,695	40,697,869	80,321	173,075,655	140,209	646,829,128
Kagisano/Molopo	15,410	1,788	15,410	31,337,319	52,580	130,168,483	83,484	418,305,426
Lekwa-Teemane	3,102	228	3,102	3,923,713	8,084	20,036,527	17,816	78,331,372
Mamusa	2,702	189	2,702	3,458,884	5,975	15,875,742	10,589	52,349,973
Naledi	3,437	230	3,437	4,205,891	8,323	20,502,775	14,621	71,789,532
Ngaka Modiri Molema								
Ditsobotla	10,204	826	10,204	16,276,437	36,822	80,307,495	54,035	280,422,563

Row Labels	Sum of population with a food deficit	Sum of deficit maize eq (MT)	Sum of population with an FPL deficit	Sum of FPL deficit in ZAR	Sum of population with an LBPL deficit	Sum of LBPL deficit in ZAR	Sum of population with a UBPL deficit	Sum of UBPL deficit in ZAR
Mafikeng	34,938	3,737	34,938	75,082,190	152,327	323,734,835	189,654	1,051,960,596
Ramotshere Moiloa	16,235	1,751	16,235	35,479,018	74,390	157,174,001	94,105	516,981,850
Ratlou	15,649	1,571	15,649	31,427,580	69,112	132,895,149	79,260	454,160,227
Tswaing	13,895	1,130	13,895	22,199,833	40,513	99,908,457	57,041	309,233,108
Northern Cape	177,314	12,778	177,314	234,940,381	399,567	1,015,768,406	534,993	3,046,323,683
Frances Baard								
Dikgatlong	7,100	451	7,100	8,882,160	13,923	37,803,352	15,744	101,359,820
Magareng	5,132	341	5,132	6,711,243	8,906	26,718,469	9,096	63,864,848
Phokwane	4,823	334	4,823	4,600,246	19,591	31,038,303	32,034	148,808,402
Sol Plaatjie	51,867	3,437	51,867	67,678,403	90,598	270,313,307	93,077	650,069,434
John Taolo Gaetsewe								
Ga-Segonyana	16,679	1,830	16,679	29,218,421	45,084	115,478,245	79,149	382,805,732
Gamagara	9,826	657	9,826	12,931,315	16,677	50,912,539	16,677	119,133,126
Joe Morolong	14,853	1,822	14,853	27,988,917	44,610	110,660,827	84,088	389,239,784
Namakwa								
Hantam	1,435	61	1,435	1,204,319	5,238	8,969,359	7,954	40,241,746
Kamiesberg	1,135	66	1,135	1,290,477	2,762	6,340,997	3,572	20,576,740
Karoo Hoogland	1,285	70	1,285	1,381,111	3,438	7,336,211	4,658	25,812,754
Khi-Ma	1,701	103	1,701	2,024,204	3,765	9,292,964	4,614	27,771,922
Nama Khoi	8,413	545	8,413	10,731,532	15,734	44,434,874	17,136	113,918,315
Richtersveld	269	8	269	150,409	1,277	1,835,339	2,077	9,956,113
Pixley ka Seme								
Emthanjeni	8,971	592	8,971	11,649,738	15,881	46,853,920	16,515	114,131,712
Kareeberg	2,474	163	2,474	3,213,170	4,380	12,922,365	4,554	31,474,809
Renosterberg	2,527	169	2,527	3,327,828	4,290	13,102,159	4,290	30,658,483
Siyancuma	3,650	192	3,650	3,783,594	10,389	21,221,678	14,456	78,463,127
Siyathemba	1,500	63	1,500	1,249,777	5,516	9,396,776	8,393	42,373,321
Thembelihle	1,441	73	1,441	1,439,357	4,316	8,487,849	6,130	32,707,862
Ubuntu	1,100	40	1,100	784,441	4,598	7,197,457	7,236	35,554,637
Umsobomvu	4,567	284	4,567	5,599,980	9,438	24,591,065	11,073	69,123,634
Z.F Mgawu								
!Kheis	2,929	186	2,929	3,653,114	5,792	15,628,384	6,593	42,242,013
//Khara Hais	8,094	394	8,094	7,761,942	25,578	48,415,821	37,047	194,608,951
Kai !Garib	6,843	374	6,843	7,370,223	18,342	39,158,139	24,858	137,809,315
Kgatelopele	4,366	292	4,366	5,749,579	7,410	22,636,961	7,410	52,969,503
Mier	1,484	98	1,484	1,935,270	2,583	7,715,986	2,645	18,494,717
Tsantsabane	2,850	134	2,850	2,629,612	9,451	17,305,059	13,917	72,152,864
Western Cape	709,691	52,600	709,691	864,660,857	2,135,754	4,910,843,053	5,146,630	21,527,836,623
Cape Winelands								
Breede Valley	19,908	1,398	19,908	23,458,585	60,445	134,990,335	136,459	585,605,226
Drakenstein	35,948	2,627	35,948	43,818,656	105,623	244,451,335	246,370	1,046,565,133
Langeberg	8,528	561	8,528	9,185,623	29,913	60,559,112	67,893	287,472,253
Stellenbosch	13,052	858	13,052	14,344,844	43,354	89,985,006	95,209	410,315,011
Witzenberg	11,473	781	11,473	13,051,158	36,701	78,747,262	82,107	352,126,719
Central Karoo								
Beaufort West	8,298	616	8,298	10,164,479	24,536	56,965,874	58,805	246,824,741
Laingsburg	1,370	99	1,370	1,674,596	3,906	9,137,956	8,856	38,118,202
Prince Albert	1,887	127	1,887	2,196,222	5,537	12,346,619	11,554	51,398,177
City of Cape Town								
City of Cape Town	479,152	36,370	479,152	593,484,341	1,429,017	3,338,613,834	3,537,565	14,652,342,517
Eden								
Bitou	5,224	370	5,224	6,026,480	17,085	36,872,537	40,448	169,358,075
George	24,221	1,783	24,221	29,256,046	73,997	168,271,981	178,097	744,291,379
Hessequa	3,329	215	3,329	3,513,703	11,882	23,643,341	26,681	113,183,292
Kannaland	1,359	70	1,359	1,214,971	5,296	9,394,790	10,326	46,193,827
Knysna	9,800	733	9,800	11,918,283	30,206	68,869,121	74,267	307,654,213
Mossel Bay	11,277	832	11,277	13,642,338	34,323	78,260,367	82,889	345,871,930
Oudtshoorn	13,000	938	13,000	15,377,872	40,827	90,686,980	97,037	406,746,155
Overberg								
Cape Agulhas	4,298	305	4,298	5,180,545	12,393	28,580,625	27,611	119,626,636
Overstrand	7,239	540	7,239	8,785,356	22,259	50,743,046	54,675	226,560,798
Swellendam	4,901	344	4,901	5,741,718	15,125	33,479,665	34,366	146,913,979
Theewaterskloof	9,284	657	9,284	10,911,111	28,804	63,849,582	66,473	282,239,408
West Coast								
Berggrivier	3,673	210	3,673	4,037,809	9,878	21,447,234	14,610	77,275,245
Cederberg	2,981	171	2,981	3,080,006	9,614	19,170,841	17,632	82,365,326
Matzikama	6,568	415	6,568	7,153,362	21,098	43,773,898	43,200	192,287,298
Saldanha Bay	15,037	1,093	15,037	18,125,108	45,165	103,018,592	106,054	448,260,523
Swartland	7,884	487	7,884	9,317,647	18,770	44,983,122	27,446	148,240,560
Grand Total	4,882,981	420,848	4,915,484	8,130,034,617	15,199,435	34,534,483,922	25,305,599	124,386,046,186

