



Reinforcement of Agricultural and Environmental  
Research in TFCAs - Zimbabwe

# EU-DREAM PROJECT ICP WORKSHOP REPORT CHIREDZI, BINGA AND MBIRE DISTRICTS

November 2015

A project implemented by 4 partners

This project is funded par the European Union



Cirad  
PO Box 13 78  
Harare - Zimbabwe  
Tel: +263 4 332 487



BIO-HUB TRUST  
Mukuvisi Woodlands  
Harare - Zimbabwe  
Tel: +2634 74 74 22



TREP  
Univ. of Zimbabwe  
Harare- Zimbabwe  
Tel: +263 4 303211



NUST  
P.O. Box AC 939 Ascot  
Bulawayo - Zimbabwe  
Tel: +263 9 282 842



Delegation of the European Union to the  
Republic of Zimbabwe  
1 Norfolk Road, Mt Pleasant Business Park,  
P.O. Box MP 620 Mt Pleasant Harare

## **Table of Contents**

1. Introduction
2. Update on progress made on the DREAM Project since the last ICP meetings
3. Workshop objectives
4. Outputs of the mission
  - i. GLTP TFCA: Rupagwana Training Centre – Chiredzi District
  - ii. KAZA TFCA: Tusimpe Pastoral Centre – Binga District
  - iii. Lower Zambezi/ Mana Pools TFCA: LGDA Lodge – Mbire District
5. Conclusion
6. Workshop evaluation

### **Annexes**

Annex 1 List of Participants

## **Acronyms**

BHT	BIO-HUB Trust
BUSE	Bindura University of Science and Education
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CIRAD	French Agricultural Research for Development Institute
CNRS	National Scientific Research Centre
DA	District Administrator
DLVS	Department of Livestock and Veterinary Services
DRSS	Department of Research and Special Services
EU	European Union
DLVS	Department of Livestock and Veterinary Services
GLTP	Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park
ICP	Innovation and Communication Platform
KAZA	Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Park
LGDA	Lower Guruve Development Association
LZ/MP	Lower Zambezi Mana Pools Trans-frontier Park
NUST	National University of Science and Technology
PWMA	Parks and Wildlife Management Authority
RDC	Rural District Council
TFCA	Trans-frontier Conservation Area

## Introduction

The outputs of Zimbabwean agricultural research have not been adequate to address the old and emerging challenges faced by the sector in general and the small scale farmers living in the remote agro-ecological regions IV and V, which encompass most of the communal areas (75%) and represent almost 50% of the farmland in Zimbabwe. Individuals and institutions involved in agriculture and environmental activities (academic research, extension services, FOs, NGOs, private sector, small-scale farmers) in each trans-frontier conservation area (TFCA) were invited to participate in a regular round of Innovation and Communication Platform (ICP) workshops. ICPs are a concept aiming at fostering the participation of different categories of actors in innovation processes.

This round of ICP workshops came after the completion of selection of 1 MPhil and 1 DPhil student who will understudy the ICP process in the 3 TFCAs covered by the DREAM Project. The students visited all 3 TFCAs. They got to appreciate the current status of the DREAM ICP meetings. 2 french experts and local universities joined the students in different ICP meetings. The immediate thinking was centred on how the current version of the DREAM ICP (TFCA wide meeting bringing together multiple stakeholders including farmers) could be made operational with more activities being further developed at the local level.

Three ICP meetings were successfully held in

- i. GLTP TFCA: Rupagwana Training Centre – Chiredzi District
- ii. KAZA TFCA: Tusimpe Pastoral Centre – Binga District
- iii. Lower Zambezi/ Mana Pools TFCA: LGDA Lodge – Mbire District

## Update on progress made on the DREAM Project since the last ICP meetings

The DREAM local project coordinator gave an update of progress of the DREAM project activities in all 3 TFCAs. He mentioned that since the last ICP meeting which was held in June 2015, an orientation workshop for all DREAM students was held in Harare. The workshop enabled students to share ideas and come up with strategies for their research work. He indicated that in the intervening time from the last ICP meeting, the DREAM project team was finalising signing of contracts by students to enable them to start carrying out research in their study areas. The signing of contracts by students was mostly delayed by adjustments to the EU-DREAM project budget as a result of fluctuating exchange rates between the US dollar and the Euro. The depreciation in the value of the Euro against the US dollar meant that the funds allocated for some project activities were no longer adequate; hence adjustments were necessary, in consultation with EU. Seminars were also conducted to prepare the students on writing scientific papers and conducting scientific research.

- i) *This was followed by a brief re-cap on what the DREAM Project is seeking to achieve and how it intends to do that. This re-cap was done to cater for new participants who might not have attended earlier ICP meetings as this round of ICP meetings was targeting a higher attendance of farmers. The DREAM acronym was unpacked as meaning: Delivering innovation and technology through the reinforcement of agricultural and multidisciplinary research capacity for small-scale farmers in trans-frontier areas (TFCAs). For the DREAM project these are KAZA TFCA, GLTP TFCA and LZ/MP TFCA. The fig below shows the three TFCAs (circled in Red) covered by the DREAM Project.*

The DREAM Project is funded by the European Union (EU) and is implemented by a partnership comprising of CIRAD (Lead agent), BIOHUB Trust (Local NGO), University of Zimbabwe and National University of Science and Technology (NUST). These partners are then supported in various capacities by government departments under the Ministry of Agriculture Mechanisation and Irrigation Development (Department of Research and Special Services (DRSS), Department of Livestock & Veterinary Services (DVLS), and Agritex) and Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate (NPWMA & Forestry Commission) and also Bindura University of Science and Education (BUSE), and National Scientific Research Centre (CNRS) in carrying out various project activities. The government departments and universities will be the main beneficiaries of the project as they will be capacitated through engaging in various researches at either PHD or Master level with an approach that involves local communities (participatory research).

### **Workshop objectives**

It was noted that the purpose of this round of ICP meetings was taking the ICP to the people. As a result, in GLTP TFCA the ICP meeting was held at Rupangwana Training Centre in ward 4, for KAZA TFCA, this was the first time the ICP was to be held in Binga at Tusimpe Pastoral Centre, and then in Mbire District at LGDA Lodge. The objectives of this round of ICP meetings was explained by George as : 1) to introduce the 2 DREAM ICP DPhil and MPhil programs and students in the 3 TFCAs, 2) to run re-cap on discussion of Innovation Communication Platforms, and 3) to discuss the options for operationalization of the ICP in the 3 TFCAs

## ICP Meeting Outputs

### 1. GLTPTFCA ICP Meeting

*Rupangwana Training Centre – Chiredzi District, 11 – 12 November 2015*

#### Introduction

The Chiredzi Rural District Council (RDC) Chairman gave the opening remarks at the ICP workshop held in Rupangwana. He thanked all the workshop participants for coming to Rupangwana with outside temperatures hovering above 38°C. He encouraged everyone to actively participate and come up with the intended workshop objectives. The workshop was graced by Chief Tsovhani (traditional chief), the Chiredzi RDC Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and Council Chairman and councillors. Technical stakeholders included officials from National Parks and Wildlife Management, AGRITEX, DVLS, Forestry Commission, and Environmental Management Authority (EMA) among others. The Chiredzi RDC Council Chairman highlighted that this workshop was for the farmers and encouraged them and all other participants to participate freely and to come up with good ideas, or studies to improve our lives as a result of climate change, which is changing our lives. He implored the students to come up with results that improve the lives of the ordinary person. In closing his remarks he said that it is evident that temperatures are high, conditions are tough for the ordinary farmer and he hoped that the students' work would help the farmers.

Chief Tshovani in brief welcomed everyone to his home. We noted that we once met at Hippo Valley and today we were at Rupangwana. He thanked the DREAM Project for the innovative information they always bring to the people concerning agriculture and natural resources management. He urged the DREAM team and partners to address climate change as they were living in very harsh conditions. He then encouraged everyone to contribute actively.



Fig 1: Chief Tsovhani making welcome remarks

### **Rupangwana ICP participants**

The meeting had a total of 52 participants drawn from different interest groups which included eight (8) farmers, ten (10) Rural District Council (RDC) executives, five (5) Local traditional leadership, one member from a local NGO and the remainder were representatives from government departments. Analysis shows that too many people were attending from one organization or interest group. Two participants had attended all ICP workshops (4 including this one). Reasons given for inconsistent attendance included not being invited to the workshops, lack of transport; some indicated that there were not clear on the benefits to be created out of this initiative.



**Fig 2: Participants from Rupangwana ICP meeting**

### **Re-cap from Soloman (DREAM Student)**

The last ICP meeting was held in Malipati in June 2015. The objective was to introduce the DREAM students to the community members present. This was preparing for the students to undertake field work as the local community members would be aware of the presence of the DREAM project and the students. This was also an opportunity for the stakeholders to know who the students are and what they are going to be studying. Some of the students were getting ready to start data collection.

### **Re-cap from farmers**

DREAM does research especially to farmers with small fields, helping them to improve or innovate on their production systems. The research by the DREAM students seeks to increase understanding of various agriculture and natural resources issues including human-wildlife conflict (HWC) and improved crop production.

#### **Discussion on ICP structure based on November 2014 discussion**

The participants from the Great Limpopo TFCA suggested that their ICP be a formally structured group that is recognised by the Chiredzi RDC and Chiredzi DA's offices. As a result, participants agreed that the ICP be part of the Rural District Development Committee (RDDC) structure as a sub-committee. This had the advantage that the RDDC chairperson is the district DA and hence by adopting a similar structure the ICP will be recognised

as a sub-committee by all district structures. All local level stakeholders in the district would automatically be members of the ICP and the ICP would be flexible enough to allow new members to join. This would include universities and the local farmers who are currently not part of the RDDC structures. The DA was selected to hold the chairperson post for the ICP and the RDC CEO will be the secretariat. This structure allows for sustainability of the ICP after funding period as the DA has a mandate to call for district level meetings and the CEO organises and ensures that all stakeholders are present. At the same time, the CEO will then delegate authority to chair the meetings to the Natural Resources Committee of the RDC. This committee already had a recognised role to facilitate sustainable natural resources management working with various stakeholders in the district. Universities' role was considered very critical in the ICP and they were advised by the participants to come in as technical advisers on research issues and innovations. This would allow them flexibility to carry out various researches in the district. To formalise this whole structure at a simple level without too much technical input, the participants requested that the ICP develops a constitution that spells out the purpose and the structure of the formed ICP. CIRAD through BIOHUB Trust will provide the terms of references (ToRs) of the ICPs such that these would be used at district level to develop the constitution.

#### Questions/ comments

1. The RDDC is the best option. There is no member who is involved in development issues at district level and not part of the RDDC. The Chiredzi RDC is trying to develop an MoU with Great Zimbabwe University. This will enable research issues to be strengthened within the district.
2. Alderman Matsilele noted that the RDDC is a sub-committee of the RDC Act. It is a committee of technocrats – head of government ministries at local level. The District Administrator (DA) is the chairman of the RDDC.
3. RDDC is formed by legislation. The challenge is how to get universities and the farmers to be part of the RDDC, since they are not covered by legislation. However, the interests of the farmers are already covered by the head of departments in the RDDC.

#### Developing ICP structure – *Bernard*

- i. ICP has successes and failures
- ii. Not everyone is able to come to an ICP meeting for various reasons
- iii. We are not completely sure what we get out of these meetings
- iv. We are not ourselves called researchers – we do stuff near to research; that is we do stuff near research and innovation.

The question then was:

- i. We have to clarify to ourselves what we want to do?

This question prompted 4 groups to be co-designed by the facilitator and the workshop participants in plenary. The four group options that came out were:

- a. Having no ICP in the GLTFCA,
- b. Continuing with the DREAM driven approach to ICP (whereby the DREAM project periodically invites stakeholders for meetings to discuss and/or share any research findings by researchers). This was referred to as the business-as-usual approach,
- c. Student-farmer thematic groups. Under this option, small farmers' groups would be created around each student conducting research in the GLTFCA on a specific topic to share progress and results, and



- d. A Ward based ICP of some sort approach, potentially working on all research topics of interest to the farmers of the ward.

A plenary discussion of the four possible Scenarios was conducted to establish the extent to which these can be feasible and made operational. Participants indicated that Scenario 1 was not an option to follow since they agreed that setting up an ICP was necessary for information sharing. They also indicated that it will be necessary and essential for them to continue meeting at district level, hence Scenario 2 was adopted, however with farmers actively participating in sharing results from their local level trials.



Fig 3&4: Participants go into group work

A total of four groups were formed all looking at option 3 and 4. The 4 groups consisted of 2 groups of farmers and 2 groups of technocrats. Each group sought to understand the following key questions:

- How will this group work?
- Who will be in this group?
- What activity or activities will be implemented?
- When and how often to meet?
- What kind of support is required so that activities can be done?

### Feedback from group work

Farmers' responses	Non-farmers' (technocrats) responses
<b>Option 3 – Create small groups with each student on a particular topic</b>	
Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee/ community invites the student to come and make a presentation of their project</li> <li>• Community meets on their own – local innovations</li> <li>• Community to participate actively organising activities e.g., farmer field days and shows</li> <li>• Group to have a calendar of events/ activities within the district</li> <li>• Group to present its findings to local schools</li> <li>• Source any problem issues within our area and then share them with the student researcher</li> <li>• To encourage the RDDC to attach students (from local universities/ colleges) to the group</li> </ul> Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of RDDC district food security and nutrition community member to chair</li> </ul>	Those to be involved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the student</li> <li>• those interested on a particular research topic</li> <li>• identification of a specific topic suitable for a particular area</li> <li>• farmers with interest on different topics</li> <li>• technical experts with interest in the topic join these farmers</li> <li>• the community leaders: headman, councillors, chiefs etc etc</li> </ul> Activities to be done <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• updating of information on problems already raised</li> <li>• sharing of information between the student and the ICP (exchange of ideas)</li> <li>• participation of selection materials</li> <li>• mobilisation of farmers</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any councillor assigned</li> <li>• Farmer representatives from each ward</li> <li>• Local leadership (chief/ headman)</li> </ul> <p>When</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee to meet every 2 months and after every 4 months with student</li> </ul> <p>Where</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee meetings to rotate venues at convenient place</li> </ul> <p>What - resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation</li> <li>• Stationary</li> <li>• Power point projector</li> <li>• Venue fees</li> <li>• Food – minimum 3 days</li> <li>• accommodation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dissemination of results also by ICP and the student</li> <li>• notify the students of any adverse changes even before the scheduled time</li> </ul> <p>Support needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cooperation from both parties i.e. student and ICP</li> <li>• financial resources for the community members participating (where necessary)</li> </ul> <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• easy to manage</li> <li>• more focussed</li> <li>• easy cooperation due to interest focused</li> <li>• in-depth discussion of the topic</li> </ul> <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• member interested in more than one topic</li> <li>• interest is coming from the ICP members student cannot chose their own sites</li> </ul>
<b>Option 4 – Ward committees work on all topics of interest at ward level</b>	
<p>Name of the group: Local research committee</p> <p>Members of the committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each village head to provide 1 interested person to represent the village</li> <li>• Extension workers</li> <li>• Researchers</li> </ul> <p>Activities of the committee</p> <p>Facilitates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication within other groups</li> <li>• Research activities</li> <li>• Monitoring and evaluation</li> <li>• Source opportunities</li> <li>• Writing down the constitution</li> </ul> <p>Communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobilising the group/ community</li> <li>• Meeting schedule</li> <li>• Develop an M.O.U with the local authorities</li> <li>• Awareness campaign</li> </ul> <p>Research activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field demonstrations</li> <li>• Dramas: local communities or schools/ experts</li> </ul> <p>Source opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social networks</li> <li>• Community contributions</li> <li>• Creates income generating projects</li> </ul>	<p>Who will be in the group?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ward councillor to chair the meeting comprising of village heads, government representatives, NGOs working in the ward and business community</li> </ul> <p>How it works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every representative compiles some reports to share with other at the meeting on a monthly basis and other meetings e.g. field days, farmer field schools, demonstrations and shows</li> </ul> <p>Resources needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stationary: books, markers etc</li> <li>• Digitalisation of information for easy communication to DREAM</li> <li>• Smart phones for networking</li> <li>• Funds</li> </ul> <p>What to discuss</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussing common issues on ICP</li> <li>• Updating issues on ICP</li> <li>• Identifying common problems</li> <li>• Sharing innovation</li> <li>• Discussing topics covered by DREAM students</li> </ul> <p>Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report writing</li> <li>• Exchange visits to other farmers</li> <li>• Information dissemination</li> </ul>

### Discussion Rupangwana

Group reports indicated a lot of problems for both farmers and Dream facilitators to propose a clear way forward. It was not immediately clear from the group feedback if participants understood what they were supposed to do. Despite the confusion and problems, the group work managed to indicate that option 4 was probably the best way to ground the ICPs at local level. The argument was that option 4 allows farmers to be actively involved in looking for solutions to solve local problems. It also enhances capacity building among farmers to improve livelihoods in the long term. Important also was the fact that all participants agreed to implement ICP activities at ward level. The TFCA wide ICP meetings will remain as an information sharing platform where farmers will share progress achieved at ward level. Students will also share their progress at this platform. DREAM facilitator also shared with participants the need to conduct a participatory diagnostic process in selected wards. It was highlighted that the process will not be conducted in all wards mainly because of resource

constraints. The wards to be selected will be agreed upon at another level between DREAM ICP students and local authorities. Chiredzi Rural District officials outlined the need for students to get a letter of recommendation from Council. The letter will introduce ICP students to Ward Councilors in which the participatory diagnosis will be conducted.

## **2. KAZA TFCA ICP Meeting**

*Tusimpe Pastoral Centre – Binga District, 15 – 18 June 2015*



***FIG 5: BINGA ASSISTANT DA MAKING THE WELCOME REMARKS***

### **Introduction and Main Issues**

This mission in Binga sought to introduce Susan Marimira and Tembani Mduduzi, the two DREAM ICP DPhil and MPhil students to the KAZA TFCA local level stakeholders. The theme of their studies fall under the Innovation Communication Platforms (ICPs) and their research is expected to add value to the development and operationalization of the ICPs in the 3 TFCAs the DREAM project is working in.



**Fig 6: Tembani and Susan (ICP MPhil and DPhil students) follow ICP meeting proceedings closely**

The concept of ICP as accommodates the carrying of discussion of key issues at TFCA level and this was one such meeting. While this approach offers many stakeholders from the TFCA level to attend such meetings to air their views representation from the farmers has been limited and as such their voices have not been heard. The new thinking brainstormed together with the CIRAD experts (Bernard & Syndhia), DREAM ICP students (Susan & Tembani) and DREAM ICP facilitator (Abbie) sought to find ways to address the lack of input into ICP discussions from the local level (ward or village). Hence the ICP meeting held in Binga, as informed by the one carried out in Rupangwana – Chiredzi sought to discuss with the stakeholders present from the KAZA TFCA how:

- 1) they viewed such a process and whether it was necessary to initiate such a process
- 2) to go about operationalizing such a process, and
- 3) to continue with 'business as usual' i.e., maintain current set-up, if stakeholders are happy

As part of the process in the Binga meeting, the DREAM ICP facilitator opened the discussion by reminding the participants (more of a re-cap) of what the concept of ICP stood for as well as its implementation framework. Earlier discussions from November 2014 ICP meetings were revisited to guide this discussion, see table 1 below.

**Increase understanding of workshop participants on Innovation Communication Platforms (ICPs) – November 2014**

**Innovation**

Innovation is:

- new ideas,
- new ways of doing things,
- can be new breeds of goats,
- new types of seed – pepper to chase elephants or mechanisation of conservation agriculture (CA)
- Innovation can also include new ways to organise.

**When do we need innovation?**

At what time they would need innovation:

- Innovation needed when there was need to improve the current or the existing techniques, when responding to unchosen changes such as climate change or population increase
- These issues result in the need for new ideas not known to be developed and adoption of new techniques practiced elsewhere
- Innovation was also identified as adding value to an already existing situation to improve efficiency or production.

**Communication**

- Described as a process of passing information,
- it's a two way process that allows feedback
- Communication has to be clear and the information focussed dependent on the purpose of the communication
- It is informative, discussion, interactive and there are tools that aid the communication and these are newspapers, name tags, pamphlets, t-shirts and the internet among some not mentioned
- It is important that during communication, people understand each other, engage in debate or meet people.

**Platform**

- Platform as a special place, fora or space where a group of people meet and as in the case of the DREAM workshop, there is a panel of presenters
- The platform has a structure and membership and is brought together by a common purpose
- The purpose of the platform such as the DREAM workshop, was identified as sharing ideas on agriculture and environment specific topics, hence the participants noted that the topic defines the platform
- They also noted that there was need for gender balance including representation of the youth as in the case of Chiredzi were all participants were male
- The participants however noted the importance of gender balance and the role gender plays in the platform such as support in decision making and sharing ideas from both sexes including the youths.

**Activities done by the Innovation Communication Platform (ICP)**

The activities of the platform were described by the participants as:

- share new knowledge/ research results at different levels
  - Policy, Local, Technical, Regional, TFCA, National, and International levels
- Discuss and make work plans {give feedbacks, share ideas}
- Identify issues and problems
- Facilitate networking of various stakeholders at the local level
- Finding solutions to various problems affecting stakeholders at the local level
- Capacity building
  - skills transfer
  - identifying and designing training programmes
- Monitoring and Evaluation – lobbying, advocacy

**Membership of ICP**

In all three sites, the membership of the ICP was identified as follows:

- NPWMA, Forestry Commission, Agritex, Local communities – including farmers, NGOs and CBOs
- Researchers, including universities and research institutions
- Local authorities – local government (RDCs), Veterinary services (DLVS)
- Private sector

After the discussion on ICPs, the facilitator initiated the discussion on how to operationalize the ICP in the KAZA TFCA



Fig 7: Binga ICP meeting participants

**MAJOR OUTCOMES FROM BINGA ICP MEETING**

During the discussion, the farmers indicated that there had been some level of informal discussion amongst themselves with regards to the various issues/ problems they encounter in their daily lives in the agriculture and natural resources management sectors. The one prime example given was that of human-elephant conflict. The farmers noted that during the summer time they have over time agreed on which methods to use to scare elephants away. The use of chilli bricks was explained as an example. One farmer noted that in their area, the farmers are encouraging each other on their own to make at least 120 chilli bricks during the summer season for use during the last 3 months of cropping season when elephants are a menace. One farmer also noted that, if farmers do not have enough amount of chilli to make the 120 bricks they are encouraged to mix the chilli with water and spray it at the edges of their fields. When elephants come and encounter the sprayed edges of the field, they turn away and thereby saving the whole crop from destruction.



**Fig 8: A DPhil student expressing a point during the Binga ICP meeting**

The facilitator then explained to the farmers that, these activities they were carrying out on their own are the innovations that they need to come and present in the current ICP meeting. Their role was further explained that; in this case farmers are the innovators as they are trying out new methods to reduce elephant conflict. Under the ICP, the students are expected to follow behind the farmers “innovators” and research and develop an understanding of the effectiveness of these processes (innovations). Sometimes solutions by the farmers were they work can be turned into best practices but where they do not work the students should be able through their research or study to provide some explanation as to why such innovations don’t work and offer alternative ideas so that farmers can try again.



**Fig 9: Binga assistant DA, Hwange RDC CEO, Council Chairman Binga and Binga RDC CEO**

The facilitator then explained that under the current TFCA wide ICP meetings, the farmers are not having enough time or room for an in-depth discussion of some of their ideas, solutions (innovations) and experiences from the local level. Many issues are usually discussed in a short space of time (1 or 2 days' time). Some of the issues discussed might not be of interest to farmers present e.g., a presentation on fish diseases will not excite a farmer trying to improve their conservation agriculture (CA) yields and practice. So how could these challenges be overcome became a critical issue for the meeting and the options were discussed through group work.

### **GROUP WORK**

3 groups were formed based on 3 options for a possible way forward. The 3 options were:

- I. The 'business-as-usual' scenario – maintain the current set-up of a multi-stakeholder TFCA wide platform with meetings about 6 months apart. ICP meetings will be held over 1 or 2 days with many different presentations from students, other NGOs in the TFCA, and the DREAM project.
- II. From the ground up – build from ward level meetings where farmers have been meeting to discuss various thematic issues based on issues/ problems they meet to discuss. These can be informal groups by farmers or known committee meetings by farmers. The students come to join these meetings
- III. Research led – students call for ward or village level meetings and they bring the agenda of what is to be discussed based on their project; either to collect data or give feedback to the farmers

The participants went into these 3 groups but before this was done – 2 issues were discussed on how the groups were to be formed. 1<sup>st</sup> option was that the workshop participants go into mixed groups and try to have all stakeholder groups present represented in each group, and 2<sup>nd</sup> option was for the 3 groups to be based on stakeholder categories – that is farmers, officials and technical experts. After a brief discussion, the workshop participants chose option 1, where the 3 groups would be composed of various stakeholders.

In each group, they were given 2 questions to look at:

- i. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the option you are looking at?
- ii. What activities do/ will you prepare or have been preparing for the option you are looking at

**FEEDBACK FROM THE 3 GROUPS**



**Fig 10: Group work feedback in Binga**

**Group 1: From option 1; 'Business-as-usual' scenario**

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We come across more experiences to table for discussion during the ICP meeting</li> <li>• The 6 months' time frame in-between meetings is sufficient to ensure/ encourage commitment from stakeholders – too frequent meetings may discourage full participation from all relevant stakeholders</li> <li>• 6 months meetings give students time to cover other areas and gather more information</li> <li>• If there are new innovations discovered, there is sufficient time to test the new innovations before the next ICP meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 6 month time lapse is too long such that other people may end up forgetting what they previously discussed and be fade up</li> <li>• Too much damage may occur over the period without any intervention or discussion with the students</li> <li>• No meetings will be held if students are not there</li> <li>• There is too much content for discussion; there is no in-depth discussion</li> </ul>

What activities do we prepare or have been doing to prepare for this ICP meeting?

- i. Students – have been preparing presentations of their project proposals, progress and training
- ii. RDC/DA's office – have been focusing on logistical issues
- iii. Farmers – Have been involved in information dissemination to other farmers and while waiting for students to come, they are preparing feedback; that is more questions for the students
- iv. Farmers are actively waiting to participate in the students' researches

**Group 2: From option 2; from the ground up - farmers organize ward or village level meetings and students attend these**

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students get first-hand information from a wider participation of farmers facing similar issues</li> <li>• Validation of information at a wider scale unlike current set-up where only 2 or 3 farmers participate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial constraints; if the student does not have means to reach the meetings</li> <li>• Failure to obtain intended information because the community will not be free to express their views – some Tonga communities are very shy</li> </ul>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less time consuming/ financial resources used since farmers will be in their community</li> <li>• Students appreciate context and social environment, as they can actually visit the fields or livestock in discussion</li> <li>• Project ownership by farmers is higher</li> <li>• Sharing of experiences on a wider scale</li> <li>• Capacity building of more numbers of farmers during the meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Language barrier, if student does not speak local language</li> <li>• Cultural concerns – dress code when students are in the field</li> </ul>
---	---

What activities do we prepare as a community?

- i. Date, venue & meeting agenda
- ii. Farmers share the programme before the start of local level meeting with the student and the student also share his/her programme for attending the meeting with the farmers
- iii. Student gets new issues/problems from the farmers to investigate which will be outside the student's project theme
- iv. Share feedback from previous meeting, if student was tasked to do further research on a certain issue/problem of concern to the farmers

**Group 3:** From option 3; research led – students call for ward or village level meetings and discuss their thematic areas

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation of bottom-up approach as issues problems come from farmers</li> <li>• Participatory approach</li> <li>• Home grown – innovation of information</li> <li>• Sustainable way forward – low costs</li> <li>• Sense of collective ownership and responsibility by the farmers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dependent on the presence of the student</li> <li>• Data collection is biased towards the student as the process/ meeting proceeds</li> <li>• Time conflict – i) to the farmer, ii) to the student (work plans) – students need to come at a time the farmers are free</li> <li>• Limited approach – as the students' thematic areas are too specific</li> </ul>

What activities do you expect?

- i. Farmers continue with normal activities
- ii. Group formation targeting areas of interest concerning the student's research area
- iii. feedback

### **DISCUSSION – BINGA**

Based on the plenary session and groups' feedback, it is sufficient to say that the discussion on how to operationalize the ICP in the KAZA TFCA was participatory with farmers coming out in discussions especially on activities they are doing on their own (and plan to continue do so in future). Building from these discussions and activities the farmers are doing on their own, it became evident that at local level, farmers are actively discussing (organizing) on their own and proposing simple innovations that can be further studied by DREAM students (and refined for wider adoption by the community). It also became evident that the TFCA wide multi-stakeholder meeting had some disadvantages as it could not allow for farmers to go in-depth into what they are doing (more time would have been required and adhoc additions to a programme always affect the original work). As a result the option that farmers continue organizing

their own meetings or discussions and then students get to know about these discussions and meetings was important.

The structure of how the students will get to know about these meetings and the modalities for attending the meetings will be studied and discussed through a Participatory Diagnostic and Planning (PDP) study. This ICP meeting also managed to show that unless the local level meetings are driven by the agenda of the farmers, they will end up being too specific to the needs of the students and these meetings will fail to address other issues of importance to the farmers but, not necessarily of importance to the students. Ideally, the farmers will have to develop their own agenda for the meeting and the student will also share her/his agenda for specific information s/he wants to collect as well. The TFCA wide multi-stakeholder meeting will remain as a revolving meeting from district to district as the participants highlighted that the next meeting should be held in Tsholotsho. But, the meeting will need to be structured differently as farmers can also be included on the program/agenda as stakeholders who have innovations that they are doing at local level and they can be given time to discuss these.

### **3. Lower Zambezi/ Mana Pools & ZiMoZa TFCA – ICP Meeting**

*LGDA – MBIRE District, 25 November 2015*

#### **Introduction**

The opening remarks for the Mbire ICP workshop were done by the District Administrator. He started off by thanking all the workshop participants present. He encouraged everyone to learn and contribute, especially the local farmers since the ICP was mainly for their benefit. He encouraged everyone to be free to contribute and have a good day. The workshop was attended by 41 (forty one) participants derived from government departments, Mbire Rural District Council, Non- Governmental Organisations (NGOs), farmers and Dream Project.

Participants were asked if they had attended all the three workshops previously conducted in Hurungwe and Mbire districts. One (1) participant indicated that they had attended all the three workshops, while nine (9) and nineteen (19) participants indicated that they had attended the November 2014 and June 2015 workshops; respectively. The fluctuations and inconsistent participation by stakeholders creates discontinuity in the functioning of the ICP. A number of reasons were cited including work-related and personal commitments; agreement at organizational level to rotate members attending the workshop, among others.

The meeting was officially opened by the Mbire Rural District Council Chief Executive Officer. In his opening remarks he emphasized the need for close cooperation between various stakeholders in order to meaningfully deliver assistance in the district. He also emphasized that the district is facing challenges which include declining agricultural productivity and human-wildlife conflicts. Wildlife was cited as attacking farmers' livestock, transmitting diseases to their livestock, especially foot and mouth disease from buffalos. Tsetse flies were also cited as posing threats to humans and domestic animals. The CEO also highlighted that Mbire district is a newly formed district which is in dire need of both social and economic investments and partners coming into the district were urged to bring in some component of developmental projects/investments.

#### **Re-cap by the farmers**

George went through the re-cap with the workshop participants, whereby they highlighted issues they remembered from the last ICP meeting. The responses from various participants (mainly farmers) were as follows:

- I learnt about the definition of the DREAM logo. It represents agriculture, research, wildlife and us the communities
- I learnt that we have got a good opportunity to select what we would want researched here in Mbire. Unlike other researches done before, for the DREAM researches, we were asked what we wanted to be researched and we are happy to be involved in this project
- I am happy that the researches that are going to be done through DREAM project are targeting improving the livelihoods of farmers and hence as farmers we raised the issues to be researched

- I am happy that the researches that are going to be done will reduce HWC in selected wards. HWC is a big problem for us and we are happy that it is being addressed through research
- I learnt that researchers are going to come and assist us to co-exist, that is wildlife, livestock, our crops, forests and humans
- Farmers should plant bamboo as an alternative source for wood fuel, especially those farmers intending to grow/growing tobacco. The use of bamboo was cited as having potential to reduce pressure on forest resources
- Research topics to be covered by students came from farmers in the two districts, thus DREAM Project's research themes are demand driven and are relevant to farmers and this brings benefits to farmers
- Climate change is negatively affecting farmers. Agricultural productivity is going down because of low and erratic rainfall
- They learnt that miombo woodlands are associated with indigenous fruit trees of different types which are edible and important for local communities.

#### ***ii) Students' research presentations***

Four DREAM students were invited to present their research topics. A presentation on the adoption and effectiveness of Conservation Agriculture (CA) raised a lot of enthusiasm from farmers. Farmers mentioned that they have been practicing CA for many years but adoption is still very low. When free inputs are not distributed it was reported that farmers do not practice CA. Farmers reported that CA is perceived as labour intensive and some of its practices such as use of fodder and plant forage conflicts with traditional practices of animal grazing in the dry season. Livestock is left to feed on maize forage which is required as soil cover under CA practices. It was also stressed that farmers are not following the three complementary principles of CA and this may have influence of the effectiveness of CA hence low adoption levels. It was highlighted that some organisations such as Carbon Green are operating in Mbire to promote CA. NGOs under the Protracted Relief Programme (PRP) also provided training which was facilitated by CIRAD researchers in collaboration with LGDA. However, an assessment of adoption of practices and their effectiveness has not been done.

Farmers and stakeholders alike were also fascinated by a presentation that focused on sorghum intensification and sorghum value chains. Farmers mentioned that due to changing rainfall patterns they are keen to grow sorghum but it is affected by worms at germination stage and by quelea birds at early maturity stage. Farmers indicated that they will be interested to grow sorghum if the existing challenges are looked into. Farmers highlighted the food and income security and nutritive benefits of sorghum.

#### ***iii) Innovation and Communication Platform (ICP)***

After student presentations, a plenary discussion on what constitutes an ICP was facilitated by BIO-HUB Trust facilitator. Few participants could still remember what was discussed hence a re-cap was done by the facilitator. Participants were asked if they had given feedback to their peers and at what forum they had done so. Some farmers mentioned that they had given feedback to other farmers at Ward Development Committee meetings, some said at field shows. Farmers were asked why and what they expect when they come to attend ICP meetings. They mentioned that they come to hear research results from students. This was discussed at length

and DREAM facilitator indicated that farmers should do on-site experiments in trying to look for solutions to problems confronting them and affecting their livelihoods. They are also expected to share ideas amongst themselves on how to solve certain problems. Students will then come in to follow-up on these innovations for further generation of knowledge which can be shared widely. Farmers are therefore innovators and students are researchers.

The facilitator paused a question as to what an ICP is or what it meant to the farmers? In responding, farmers raised sentiments to the effect that ICP is all about sharing ideas and receiving feedback from researchers. Some indicated that ICP is a platform for sharing ideas in various issues ranging from farming and natural resources management. The farmers defined innovation as a new way of doing things. From all the definition attempts by the farmers, it was evident that they have some form of understanding of what constitutes an ICP, however vague they expressed it.

There was a general understanding that the ICP structure was previously discussed in Hurungwe ICP meeting and there was some form of an agreement on its structure. As discussed in that meeting, the structure involved the Rural District Development Committee (RDDC) sub-committee, constituted by technical members from the Rural District Council (RDC), government departments that include AREX from the agriculture and Natural Resources departments. The structure included members from the two districts, i.e. Mbire and Hurungwe.

“As farmers we have our own innovations that we have been practicing to improve our farming activities. Some have not been very successful so we look forward to ICP, to probably help us to improve our own innovations so that they can work better for us. For example, the use of scare crows for quelea birds. The birds are getting used to some scaring techniques and hence are no longer deterred from attacking our sorghum. As we shall continue to meet in ICP meetings we expect to get information from students to solve such problems. In Ward 3, attention to human-wildlife conflicts by responsible authorities seems to be one sided. Authorities seem to be more concerned when incidents of poaching are reported but they don't seem to show as much interest and attention when farmers bring reports of their fields being destroyed by elephants.”

#### ***iv) Operationalizing ICP in Mbire***

Some of the issues raised by farmers as needing attention from the ICP in Mbire are:

1. Quelea birds destroying sorghum
2. Human- wildlife conflict- elephants destroying crops
3. Integrated pest and disease management- Armoured crickets destroying crops
4. Wildlife preying on livestock- Hyenas was cited as a cause for concern in some wards.

In discussing the possible operationalization of ICP in the district, existing group scenarios were discussed. Farmers indicated that they have existing committees in some of their wards. Farmers from ward 15 indicated that they have a veld- fire committee composed of seven (7) members. The committee organise fire awareness and mobilise other members to put out fires in the event of a fire outbreak. Farmers from ward 4 indicated that they have firefighting teams. Although the teams were given

firefighting equipment by Environmental Management Agency (EMA), there were sentiments that the teams are no longer functional. Fires go uncontrolled and the teams are not effective. One farmer shared the following sentiments in as far as the existence of farmer initiatives is concerned:

Having discussed the existing group scenarios, the facilitator then asked the farmers to suggest possible solutions that could make the ICP most effective in Mbire. The following options were presented as possible scenarios to be followed in the district:

- I. Student calls for meeting and meets with the committee. Student has the meeting agenda,
- II. Ward Committee calls for meetings and student is invited to discuss research topic, and
- III. Student visits farmers at household level accompanied by local focal person

***v) Discussion on options – Mbire***

The three options were discussed in a plenary. Farmers raised sentiments that option 2 builds capacity of the local committees through interaction with research at the same time ensuring that meetings can still go on even when the student has completed research and may no longer be attending meetings. It gives room for accessing information from other sources since the agenda of the meetings is formulated by the committee. It was also highlighted that option 3 is not practical as a feedback option but rather more applicable for data collection by the student at the time of doing the research. However, when combined with the first option where the student calls committees for meetings, option 3 can be used as follow up on issues specific to individual farmers hence door to door approach can be used.

Officials mentioned that there are a number of committees in the district. However, the committees are not meeting regularly. Some participants were of the opinion that students can use the existing committees and find ways of making them active. The committees listed include; the Food and Nutrition Committee, Environment Management Committee, Health Committee and Child Protection Committee. These should be meeting every month but are not doing so. The committees are made up of government staff operating in the wards such as AREX, Veterinary Services, Traditional leadership, NGO staff, Safari Operators, Zimbabwe Republic Police, Resource Monitors, ward Councillor. Composition varies depending on thematic area.

**WAY FORWARD – MBIRE**

In giving the way forward, the DREAM project coordinator mentioned that the project team will now have to synthesise all the contributions from the meeting and further action on the ICP will be determined by the results of the analysis as well as further consultations in the form of a participatory diagnosis to be conducted soon. The 2 ICP students will conduct the process in selected wards that will be collectively agreed upon by district officials. It was suggested that the issue of wards in which diagnosis will be done should be discussed with local authorities to provide a basis for developing a ward selection criteria.

Some of the participants highlighted that it is not advisable to continue burdening the community with more subcommittees but there has to be a best way of incorporating ICP into the existing community framework, without compromising its expected outputs as well as its distinct identity as a platform.

The DREAM project coordinator indicated that the other 2 TFCA districts in GLTP and KAZA TFCAs had already expressed their sentiments in similar meetings with regards to operationalizing ICPs and the Lower Zambezi/ Mana Pools has also followed suit

with their own options. A course of action will be agreed after considering input from all the 3 TFCAs with regards to ICP-going forward.

## **Conclusion**

This round of ICP workshops came after the completion of selection of DREAM MPhil and DPhil students who will carry out various researches in the 3 TFCAs the DREAM Project will be trying to address issues of improving agriculture productivity and improved natural resources management. These students have been attending the ICP meetings and they have got to appreciate the current status of the DREAM ICP meetings. Thinking is centred on how the current version of the DREAM ICP (TFCA wide meeting bringing together multiple stakeholders including farmers) could be made operational with more activities being further developed at the local level. As a result three ICP meetings were successfully held in: 1) GLTP TFCA: Rupagwana Training Centre – Chiredzi District, 2) KAZA TFCA: Tusimpe Pastoral Centre – Binga District, and 3) Lower Zambezi/ Mana Pools TFCA: LGDA Lodge – Mbire District.

The objectives of this round of ICP meetings was: 1) to introduce the 2 DREAM ICP DPhil and MPhil programs and students in the 3 TFCAs, 2) to run re-cap on discussion of Innovation Communication Platforms, and 3) to discuss the options for operationalization of the ICP in the 3 TFCAs

Group work and plenary discussions carried out during the fieldwork indicated that there was scope and potential to develop or operationalize the ICPs at local level. A combination of 2 or 3 options identified by the various stakeholders can be employed where necessary. The current TFCA wide ICP meeting bringing together multiple stakeholders can remain as a very important reporting platform. However, innovations can be found at the local level where farmers are trying out new ways of protecting their crops or improving the yield of their crops. As a result the local level ICPs can work in combination with the TFCA wide ICP meeting. There is still a lot of information that needs to be understood with regards how the local level stakeholders will be organized – the role of the local level facilitators – and how they will link with the DREAM Project and the students. The 2 students brought in to study the ICPs will provide a lot of knowledge into how the ICP can be made operational at the local level. A diagnostic study will be carried out to further inform how the ICP will operate at the local level.

## Evaluation of workshop

After the Binga and Mbire workshops, the participants were given cards and asked two questions. The answers to the questions were to be written on the cards. The first question was:

- i. What I liked about the workshop?
- ii. What I did not like about the workshop?

Binga RDC	
What I liked about the workshop	What I did not like about the workshop
Workshop was participatory and well attended by ladies	Can be held at village level. Number of days can be increased
I like the workshop because it takes my word to the authorities	Too short a notice for participants to come. Workshop needs 2 days
	The workshop needs to be started from ward level, where the majority of farmers are present with more information. That will help the students with their researches
I like the workshop because it gave feedback on what DREAM Project is doing. the workshop was participatory, sharing ideas, indicating innovative ideas	The handouts were limited from the presenters. The presentations were rather fast and difficult to catch-up when taking notes
Free environment for participants. No dominance by one person or group of persons. Fair representation of farmers in relation to the overall attendance	Make an effort to have participation from all districts, Tsholotsho was not present
The workshop included all the targeted participants	Next time improve on time
I liked the presentations by students	Time management was critical
Cross pollination of ideas	
	In future make files of previous meetings. Issue of improved time management
I liked information sharing. Open interaction among the participants. Detailed level of discussion	Make program 2 days
Presentation from students and participation by all	Hwange stakeholders need to be incorporated into this forum
I learn more about how to prevent animals from fields	You must invite many farmers because these issues concern farmers
The workshop was participatory, where grassroots, scientific, and different departments disseminated information	Time management was poor. Venue should be in a place to accommodate more farmers
It is a good platform to share information	Time management was very poor, maybe spread the workshop over 2 days
The most important thing is that farmers must not wait for students but must work own-their-on and discuss their problems	
The objective of the workshop was clear and did not stray. Facilitators and students were very clear in elaborating issues	There is need to increase number of days for the meeting, or to reduce items to be done in one day
The participation was good and presentable. The house-keeping and meals logistics was better compared to previous meeting	
Active participation by the farmers though males dominated both in attendance and participation. I liked the presentation by SNV/NUST/CAFOD. Food was good and adequate	All districts should participate – Tsholotsho was absent. Water was limited
This workshop was great to me. Knowledge of ICP	
I liked participation by all. Good and well researched presentations. Well organised. Observation of protocol	Need for gender balance especially farmers
Workshop includes all stakeholders, farmers on the ground and addressing issues coming from farmers on the ground. It brought fundis from different institutions to the workshop	More participation of female farmers



The workshop had clear objectives and introduced a new concept of ICP. The workshop venue was well chosen and participatory	On improvements, there is need for back-up power to be on standby
Presentation from the DREAM team was pleasing. Total participation in the workshop by all	To increase the number of farmers with regards to gender balance
I liked the way the workshop was facilitated. Update of the students, where they are now	Issue of handouts – they must be provided to participants
I liked the collaboration of DREAM project, academic institutions to engage the communities in an endeavour to undertake research	
The workshop assists us to solve our problems on agriculture production	We need to keep time to complete programme
The meeting was informative and an eye opener especially on the fact that community members need to feed researchers with information that needs to be researched	Availing handouts for the participants
Bringing together of different stakeholders	
I am happy that I have learnt about how to minimize the problem of rats	
The workshop was participatory which means there was communication	Provide handouts for topics covered
Ideas on how to solve problems faced by farmers before being told what to do by the students. The environment was friendly	
The facilitation was good	
Different models to be used in the project	
The workshop facilitators were good	
ICP was good as an approach to development	The program of the day was not followed as per plan
I liked listening to the presentation of researchers by MPhil and DPhil students	In future increase participation by other stakeholders – have at least a presentation by one of the farmers

<b>Mbire RDC</b>	
What I liked about the workshop	What I did not like about the workshop
The workshop was informative and all the facilitators were friendly	The workshop could improve on time, one day was too short
The project is people driven and its going forward, I like that	The local authorities present must not instil fear among the farmers who will be trying to raise their issues – or personalise issues with the farmers
There was a free environment to participate for everyone	The discussion on ICP could have been done through group work. More information would have come out from the groups
Community members were at the venue on time. All participants contributed freely. Students and farmers participated equally. Mbire RDC local leadership's presence appreciated. Farmers were serious about the discussions	Time for group discussions should be allocated so that participants have time to share ideas effectively. Students should have time to interact with farmers – meet and greet session the night before the workshop starts. Time allocated for workshop is too short – needs 2 days
Good bedding and food to farmers. Good ICP facilitators and good students.	
Information was well shared between facilitator and participants. ICP should be cascaded to ward or village levels. Workshop was active from start to finish. Participants were more active as compared with last ICP meeting in June	
The facilitators were excellent and their voices were fairly audible. Presentations were straight to the point and relevant.	Time management was poor, hence the need for a time keeper. Stray talk should be reduced between participants
Workshop managed to shed light on what is ICP. I understood a lot on CA and can teach others. DREAM project team was organised in the manner their questions were structured and they were very polite	

Fair time management. Good food	Power point presentations can be helpful. It could have been better to engage ICP experts on facilitation to guide discussions
Presentation of topics by facilitators and the facilitation was good	Workshop materials such as books and pens were not adequate
I liked the participation of participants	Should increase workshop time to 2 days
Well organised workshop but time was too little	Increase the duration of the workshop
Excellent facilitation	Need slides or workshop hand-outs
Participatory approach, where farmers were contributing significantly. Good attendance especially by farmers	It was hot
The food was good and enough. Participants were freely making contributions. Good resting places	Dirty bathing water in the morning
I liked the sharing of ideas between students and farmers	I was not happy to hear that CA is not being well received by the farmers
It was a farmer driven workshop and farmers were given enough time to talk. Presentations by students were clear and well understood	
I liked openness and objective discussions which are constructive for re-structuring the ICP	Some farmers were not participating
I was happy with the participatory methods used in enabling the participants to come up with the ICP structure they prefer as this builds ownership among community members	I was not happy with some community responses that show high dependency
I like the facilitation. ICP improved when Jiri facilitated	
Good presentation of programme by facilitators. Everyone was free to share ideas	Time management – workshop started a little bit late
The workshop was good with active participation. ICP discussion was excellent and very interesting	Need for electricity during workshop
The facilitators are good. Participants were free to discuss. The food was good.	Time keeping was poor
The workshop was well organised. It was very open to everyone. It helped me to understand more about ICP.	LGDA food is not enough for us.
I liked the new knowledge I acquired on armoured crickets. As farmers we are free to actively participate in the ICP meetings	The days of the workshop were little
I like the passion of the students to help us address our problems	It is very hot in the workshop venue
The students will come into our villages to carry out research, we will be waiting for them	I was not happy because we did not manage to get a solution for quelea birds
I have liked understanding about CA as it enables us to get higher yields	
I liked good food, free workshop environment and the facilitators are good	
The workshop had good discussions and giving knowledge to the farmers	Small printout will be helpful
I liked the ICP programme. everyone was freely participating	
The workshop was good and we have added a lot of new knowledge	One day was too short for the workshop

## Annex 1: List of Participants

### Chiredzi Participants List

Full Name	Organisation	Position	Contact Details
Majoti T.T	Chiredzi RDC	Student	773045620
Makombe F	Chiredzi RDC	Student	773952910
Munyah H	Chiredzi RDC	Student	775433565
Makuyana P	Chiredzi RDC	Student	775632694
Mathe S	CIRAD	Resecher	<a href="mailto:syndhia.mathe@cirad.fr">syndhia.mathe@cirad.fr</a>
Chauke Velemo		Farmer	772292749
Kupika Tension	Ward 1	Farmer	775133598
Babi Siwana	Ward 11	Farmer	779359352
Bizeki Adamuson	Veterinary Servies	Officer	773048728
Felix. H. Mundau	Ward 22	Chief Tshovani	772631352
Chirizele Hahlan	Ward 22	Nduna	774903827
Alfred Murhaho	Ward 4	Headman	772901332
Mugwira Obey	Agritex	AEW	778586356
Muguyaka K	Mins of Youth	Youth Officer	778277298
Muna Shumirai	Agritex	AEW	776166539
Chauke MT	Chiredzi RDC	Councillor	772406648
Matsilele I	Chiredzi RDC	CEO	772409570
Matsilele E I	Chiredzi RDC	Council chair	773443363
Murawu M	Chiredzi RDC	Councillor	773443362
Choga T	Chiredzi RDC	Officer	777678991
T.David		Head Rupangwana	773460269
James John		Headman	776110068
Inocent M		Headman	773460269
Chauke Fadzai	Ward 15	Farmer	775514095
Luka Tomu	Ward 15		
Mboneni B	Ward 14	Councillor	782184500
Tembani M	Forestry Commission	Dream Student	773759768
Kutakana V	Commtech	Field Officer	772770441
Haurovi J	Ward 32	Farmer	774348248
M Chauke	Ward 9	Councillor	778025939
Makondo D	Ward 8	Councillor	774172262
B. Triomphe	CIRAD	Reseacher	
Marimira. S	UZ	Reseacher	771464335
Makwagudze K	Veterinary Servies	Vet officer	772269638
Jiri A	BHT	Officer	737923541
Zanamwe C	Chiredzi RDC	Dream Student	774172444
Solomon Bande	UZ	Dream Student	773572526
Pomerayi Mutete	Forestry Commission	Dream Student	772880584
Cephas Mlambo	Agritex	Dream Student	772521042
Dambamuromo Edward	Agritex	AEW	775737820
Gezani JC	Ward 8	Farmer	772257375

Mapanga V	EMA	Officer	775508533
Chauke Charles	Ward 13	Resource monitor	774891434
Paul Ingwani	Ward 4	Farmer	777535843
Panganai Murebwa	Ward 26	Farmer	771897537
Hlamba Hawabiwa	Ward 2	Farmer	7754145266
Manyama Lucia	LPD Ward 4	LEW	773427956
Mpofu Evious	Zimparks	Area Manager	772572069
Mukamuri.B	CASS UZ	Lecturer	772112774
Chiweshe N	CIRAD	Research assistant	772496980
George Mapuvire	BHT	Director	
Letween Mutasa	BHT	Assistant	773049959
Lawrance Moyo	MDT	Chairperson	773952929

### Binga Participants List

Full Name	Organisation	Position	Contact Details
Mleya Mapenzi	Nabusenga	Farmer	771957666
Joseph Munsaka	NAG	Farmer	779995230
Japhet Muleya	Manjolo	Farmer	779687510
Nketa Dlamini	Dream	Student	782080073
Hlengisiwe Ncube	Dream	Student	772463195
Lovelater Sebele	Dream	Student	771032339
Sitokozile Sibanda	Dream	Student	772211399
Lameck Mutanga	Binga RDC	CAMPFIRE Manager	772509364
Abbie Jiri	Biohub	Officer	737923541
Muleya P DC	DAs office- Binga	Adminsation assistant	713641950
Phindile Ncube	Hwange RDC	CEO	772897842
T. Mugoriya	Hwange Rural Development	DA	752047681
Tatenda Tunhira	DAs office- Binga	Intern	775668379
Mugande Kainos	Parks	Wildlife Officer	774008669
Siakwenga M	Caritas Hwange	Programme Manager	777605509
Peter Nkala	SNV-IDS-NUST	Director	774759531
Herbert Muleya	Veterinary	VEA	713551164
Joseph T.Dakwa	Forestry Commission	Forester	779487033
Nyashadzashe Ngere	Forestry Commission	Forester	779016641
Pearce	Forestry Commission		714831544
Mudimba Phinias	EMA	DEO	773507343
Mleya J	Binga RDC	Councillor	773721217
Shaluza Netha		Farmer	714750183
P.M. Mumpande	KMTC	Manager	772457717
L.Mindimba	Samende	Farmer	775559879
Mwembe R	Dream	Student	773671840
Makwara Ncube		Farmer	771469989

P. Sibanda	Agritex	AES	775233953
Kenias Chigwagwa	Chinga Co-operation	Farmer	716008181
Chiweshe N	CIRAD	Researcher	772496980
Ncube I	Hwange	Farmer	783421726
Crispen Ndazi	Hwange	Farmer	776579201
Vincent Nyoni	World Vision - Hwange	Farmer	774007772
Thandiwe Sibanda	Dream	Student	775576199
Cherly .T. Mabika	Dream	Student	779697519
Pretty Moyo	Sinakoma	Farmer	774979917
Rosaria Nkosa	Hwange	Farmer	782355604
Zimhlophe Ndlovu	Agritex	DAEO	776446751
S. Marimira	Dream	Student	771464335
M.Tembani	Dream	Student	772434651
Joshua Muzamba	Binga RDC	CEO	772933081
Letween Mutasa	BIO-HUB	Assistant	773049959
George Mapuvire	CIRAD/ BIO-HUB	Local Projects Co-ordinator	

### Mbire Participants list

FULL NAME	ORGANISATION	POSITION	CONTACT DETAILS
Charles Gunsaru	ZFU Farmers	Chairperson	778326909
Ishmael Chaukura	Mbire RDC	NRA Chairperson	773050629
Tarcisius Mahuni	Mbire RDC	Campfire Co-ordinator	783588882
Olga Kupika	DREAM	student	778099634
Tembani Mduduzi	DREAM	student	773759768
Fungai Gamu	DREAM	student	772363395
Wilmot Chikurunhe	DREAM	student	772521332
ChimusimbeEdwin	Ward 2	Farmer	775813400
Susan Marimira	DREAM	student	771464335
Stephen Mtinta	Ward 17	Farmer	774962481
Svikai Jehwe	Ward 4	Farmer	782090368
Chariot Chiguta	Ward 12	Farmer	775971186
Evelyn Mazuru	Ward 14	Farmer	774798676
Grace Stephen	Ward 3	Farmer	779393632
Edmore Chimimba	Ward 17	Farmer	772574072
Pikitali Kajengo	Ward 11	Farmer	774806954
Shaw Mwinga	Ward 9	Farmer	775768172
Joseph Musara	DREAM	student	775546202
Noah Kaponda	Ward 15	Farmer	774295802
Mbangu Kaponda	Ward 6	Farmer	773795230
Charles Bombo	Ward 15	Farmer	771602794
Kawanza Kauriro	Ward 15	Farmer	777262575
S . Matete	Ward 15	Farmer	771665477

Shame Honde	Ward 15	Farmer	779941072
Samupanya Mavis	Tsetse Control	Human Resource Assistant	777106168
Tatenda Gotore	DREAM	student	773756837
Ronald Mazuru	Mbire RDC	Attachee	773624859
Peter Rambanapasi	VET	VEW	773617720
Tendekayi Kazembe	AGRITEX	Extension Officer	779040017
Luckmore Wasiri	Ward 15	Farmer	778711077
Barbara Chiponda	Ward 7	Councillor	779066131
Sekai Janga	LGDA	Programs Co-ordinator	779500978
George Nyarumwe	Das Office	DAO	771294497
Richard Chipfawa	Rural Development	DA	773035379
Mhako C	Ward 16	Farmer	778736596
Robson Chidongo	Mbire RDC	Council Chairperson	778561630
C.N. Majaya	Mbire RDC	CEO	773294521
D. Kahumwe	DDF	District Co-ordinator	777928026
George Mapuvire	Biohub/ Cirad	Project Co-ordinator	
Abbie Jiri	Biohub	Projects Officer	
Letween Mutasa	Biohub	Assistant	773049959