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Executive Summary

This is the Final Technical Report for a grant titled ‘Strengthening Community Land Rights and Responses to Involuntary Displacements Caused by Development Projects in Zimbabwe’ that was provided by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) to the Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association (ZELA). The overall objective of the project was to contribute to strengthening land tenure and related rights of communities in cases of development projects and large-scale land acquisitions, through contribution to reform of national legal, policy and institutional practices, as well as improved awareness and responses of communities. The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe adopted an open policy on Public, Private Partnerships alongside a wide array of investment incentives to promote domestic and foreign direct investment in agriculture, mining, infrastructure and energy. Under this policy, private and state-owned – local and international – agribusiness enterprises are expected to respond to rising commodity prices in mining and the strategic need to achieve food and energy security.

This development has resulted in an increase in large scale investments in rural communities of Zimbabwe. Recent examples of large-scale investments in post independent Zimbabwe in the rural areas include among others the Green Fuel Ethanol Project in Chisumbanje, Marange Diamond Mining and the Nuanetsi Ranch. Despite this inflow of investment in rural communities, there are concerns among stakeholders over the likely negative impacts on local people’s livelihoods, access to farming land, productivity, income levels, food security and access to social services.

Against this background, ZELA in collaboration with the Ministry of Lands, Agriculture, Water, Climate and Rural Resettlement (formerly called the Ministry of Agriculture Mechanisation and Irrigation Development) with the financial support from the IDRC has been working on a research project on Impacts of Large-Scale Developments on livelihoods of smallholder farmers in Manicaland and Masvingo from 2016 April to August 2019. The purpose of the research was to understand the business models being used by investors in working with communities and how the large-scale investments are impacting communities.

Key findings from the research were that local level coordination of large-scale investment decisions and government intervention is an important component of the vertical logic required to guarantee a positive impact of large-scale investments on the communities around the investment. Impact of large-scale investments in the agricultural sector can be two pronged, whose net effect can be negative or positive depending on the investment model. Large scale investments deliver benefits or outputs to communities. However, this is dependent on the mix of the benefits, the adequacy of each of them and how they are collectively delivered and utilised by the communities.
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The research problem
The benefits of large-scale investments in the agricultural sector in Zimbabwe are evident and well understood in terms of direct foreign currency injection, fiscal revenue, and increased output of strategic commodities, employment generation, development linkages and technology transfers. However, at the local level there remains a huge grey area, which is the subject of considerable debate. While the impacts of large-scale investments such as the construction of the Kariba dam in 1957 are well documented, little is known about how large-scale investments such as The Green Fuel in Chisumbanje and Tongaat Hullet in Chiredzi impacted on the livelihoods of surroundings communities. Given the increase in the number of large-scale investments driven by Foreign Direct Investments (FDI), it is interesting to note how the current projects are impacting surrounding communities. This information is very critical if the country is going learn to from current large scale projects and inform decisions on future projects. The study assessed the impact of large-scale investments in the agricultural sector in Zimbabwe on livelihoods of smallholder farmers’ livelihoods. The study focused on identifying benefits that large-scale investments deliver to the surrounding communities.

Further, the research also assessed whether they have translated to better standards of living of the surrounding rural communities in which they are located, and whether such benefits have had the same impact within and between communities, investments and stakeholders. The establishment of development projects in communal areas is also ranked as the second largest category that leads to relocations worldwide after disaster-induced relocations. Communities are largely relocated to a different residential community with little or no consideration of their Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (EESCRs) as enshrined in the Constitution of Zimbabwe. Against this background, a desktop legal research was conducted to unpack the various pieces of legislation and policies in Zimbabwe that have a direct or indirect bearing on the relocation of communities because of developmental projects.
Synthesis of research results and development outcomes

Research Title: The impact of large scale investments on the livelihoods of smallholder farming communities: The cases of Green Fuels and Tongaat Hullet Zimbabwe

Large scale agriculture investment supply chain

Zimbabwe has key institutional infrastructure for promoting responsible large-scale agriculture investments in the form of equity and non-equity joint ventures and public-private partnerships. The Constitution of Zimbabwe, the Zimbabwe Agenda for Socio-Economic Transformation (ZIMASSET), 10-Point Plan of Economic Growth (2016), Zimbabwe Investment Authority Act, Environmental Management Act, Indigenisation and Economic Empowerment Act and the Zimbabwe Agriculture Investment Plan (ZAIP) reflect a great deal of the domestication of the key principles of responsible investment outlined in the FAO Principles for Responsible Investment in the Agriculture and Food Systems. The Investment Handbook and the Special Economic Zones Act spell out a complete package of incentives available for companies in and outside Special Economic Zones.

There is clear investment flow process at the national level through the Zimbabwe Investment Authority and the Ministry of Economic Planning and Investment Promotion. However, such a clear coordination system is missing at the provincial and district levels. Investments are bypassing provincial and district administration offices who are only approached to resolve conflicts between communities and investors.

Tongaat Hullet Zimbabwe case study

Investment Design and Value Chain Structure Tongaat Hullet Zimbabwe operations comprise sugarcane production on 29,000 ha and sugar milling at Hippo Valley and Triangle Estates. The company has a combined annual crushing capacity of approximately 4.8 million MT and installed raw sugar production capacity of about 640,000 MT per season. There is a potential to increase production capacity to about 700,000 MT. The operations also include sugar refining at Triangle with total refined sugar installed capacity of 140,000 MT per year.

Value Chain Coordination Mechanism

The sugarcane value chain is coordinated through public private partnerships, out grower schemes and government policy. Tongaat Hullet Limited owns 50.35% of Hippo Valley Estates and 100% of Triangle limited, who supply cane to the processing plant. Private independent shareholders of Hippo Valley Estate constitute 35% of the issued share capital. The other 65% is owned by other investors who are Old Mutual Zimbabwe Holdings (14.85%), National Social Security Authority (5.84%), Mining Industry Pension Fund (1.03%) and the Catering Industry Pension Fund (0.4%). The partnerships span from production through processing to marketing through the Zimbabwe Sugar Sales (ZSS) which is owned by Tongaat Hullet. Tongaat Hullet has an out-grower scheme with 16,000 ha and comprising of 813 out-grower farmers. These farmers were resettled in 1982 under the A1 and A2 models. Other farmers were also resettled through government’s Fast Track Land and Resettlement programme in 2000. The company provides inputs and buys all the cane produced by these farmers. This arrangement is necessitated by an agreement known as the Division of Proceeds (DoP) at a ratio of 23:77 in favour of farmers. The DoP is negotiated between farmers and the ZSS. Farmers have four sugar associations – Zimbabwe Sugar Association, Zimbabwe Sugar Commercial Farmers Union and Zimbabwe Sugar Development Association, and Zimbabwe Cane Farmers Association. However, the Sugar Act only recognizes the ZSA to which Triangle
and Hippo Valley are also members. The Ministry of Industry and Commerce has an approval influence of the DoP. The out growers can supply up to 46% of the mill’s requirements. If the out-grower is increased to 37,000 ha as per the company’s vision, this contribution will increase to about 59%.

**Sampling, data collection and data analysis**

The research used a mixed methods approach to address the objectives of the study using a case study approach. Green Fuel and Tongaat Hullet were purposively selected as representative of large-scale land-based investments in Zimbabwe to improve our understanding of impacts of large scale investments in Zimbabwe. In the areas surrounding Green Fuels, wards 26, 27 and 28 were randomly chosen for the study. In the areas around Tongaat Hullet, the following wards were chosen: wards 18, 19, 21, 27, 28 and 31. Stratified sampling was then used to get a sample size of 59 households for the study. Data collection was done using a household questionnaire, focus group discussions and key informant interviews. Quantitative data collection using the household questionnaire was performed using Kobo Collect software. Data analysis for quantitative data was done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). All data collected using Focus Group Discussions and key informants was done using thematic content analysis.

**Household Demography**

The study interviewed a total of 591 respondents comprising 72% male headed households and 28% female-headed households. The average household size is 6 members. The average age of the respondents was 49 years. There were more female-headed households had primary and non-formal education compared to their male counterparts. The later had more secondary, university and vocational training education. Thirty four percent (34.2%) and 46.8% of male-headed households had primary and secondary education respectively compared to 46.4% and 29% of the female headed households with primary and secondary education respectively.

**Benefits Analysis**

The investment benefited about directly benefitted about 55% of the surrounding households while 45% benefitted indirectly. Those who benefitted directly benefitted through employment (contract and permanent employment) at the farm and the mill, dryland and irrigated land, market for agriculture and non-agricultural produce. Public benefits included access to all-weather roads, water sources and banking services. Communities also benefitted publicly programs that include rehabilitation of the Buffalo Range airport, construction and rehabilitation of schools and clinics, CSC cattle scheme, mosquito spraying programs and provision of transport for school children.

**Impact of the Investment**

**Irrigated Land Ownership**

There was a significant relationship between the size of irrigated land owned and beneficiary status. About 89.8% of beneficiaries own irrigated land of more than 6 ha against 0%, 2.5% and 97.5% of non-beneficiary owning more than 6 ha, 3-6 ha and less than 2 ha respectively. Hence more beneficiaries own large pieces of irrigated land. This irrigated land ownership pattern was influenced by Government’s land and resettlement initiatives in 1982 and 2000.

**Crop Production and Productivity**

The overall productivity increased as a result of the investment, this was not across farming sectors. The productivity for maize (dryland) was higher for beneficiaries – A2 (2.6 t/ha), Old
settlers (0.8 t/ha) – than for nonbeneficiaries. The cereal productivity (irrigated) improved for the old resettlement beneficiaries but decreased drastically for the A2 farmers and non-beneficiary A1 farmers. While the investment improved maize and sugar beans productivity, there is need for interventions to improve sugarcane productivity.

Livestock Production and Productivity
Beneficiary households owned more livestock before and after the project. However, livestock ownership for all classes decreased for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, except for pigs for non-beneficiaries. The reduction in indigenous chicken from an average of 13 to 11 for non-beneficiaries and 23 to 16 for beneficiaries was as a result of an outbreak of new castle disease.

Average Household Income
The results show that about 94% of beneficiary households had an income >US$6 000 while 98.7% of nonbeneficiaries are below the US$3 000 average income category. This evidence suggests that the large scale investments increased the income of surrounding communities.

Access to Primary Education
The investment project reduced both male and female child’s access to primary education from male-headed households from 90% to 89% and from 94% to 83% respectively. The impact is opposite to that on children from female-headed households where male child’s access improved from 63% to 72% and that of the female child improved from 65% to 81%. For both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, both female and male children from male-headed households had better access to primary education than their female and male children from female-headed households. The study concluded that female-headed households’ ability to send their children to primary school improved as a result of the investment project. The improvement is more pronounced for the female child where they are almost like their counterpart.

Access to Secondary Education
Access to secondary education for female children from both male and female headed households improved from 34% to 37% and from 32% to 54% respectively. Male children from both male and female-headed households were impacted negatively as access to secondary education reduced from 91% to 79% and 62% to 33% respectively. Male children go to work at the mill or farm in order to help fend for the family. There was also, a low secondary school attendance for female children from both male and female-headed households under both non beneficiary and beneficiary households. This was partly due to households’ preference to send male children to school ahead of female children. Dropout rates for female children is high as a result of polygamous marriages.

Water, Health and Diseases
The main source of water for beneficiary households was borehole (34.3%), while other important sources were public tap (16.4%), protected well (15.6%) and water canal (21.1%). The main source of water for nonbeneficiary households was also borehole (49.6%) followed by water canal (34.3%). In aggregate, a higher percentage of beneficiary households (68.8%) used safer water sources than non-beneficiary households (59.9%). The exposure to unsafe water was lower for beneficiary households (31.7%) than non-beneficiary households (40%). However, both households used water canal as the second most common source. The water from the canal was regarded not safe for human consumption.
Food Availability
The study used food availability and food consumption score (FCS) indicators to measure the food security of beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. There were 67% of beneficiary households with enough food to meet family needs compared to 35% for non-beneficiaries. Among those that had some months of deficit, 77.4% were non-beneficiaries compared to 32.6% for beneficiary households. The results suggest that beneficiaries of the investment are better off than non-beneficiaries.

Food Security
There were more non-beneficiaries with poor (27.4%) to borderline (29%) FCS compared to 4.3% and 16.8% for beneficiaries. Among those with acceptable FSC, beneficiary households represent 51.2% of the population compared to 48.8% for non-beneficiaries. The analysis of individual benefits showed that not all benefits translated to food security. Sixty percent (60%) of households under all the various benefits had borderline and acceptable FCS. However, more non-beneficiary households (72.6%) had borderline and acceptable FSC under employed at farm permanent (60%) and renting irrigated land (65.6%). This result questions the adequacy of wages and productivity of irrigated land. Within the FCS category, resettled households (50%) and those with market for agriculture produce (42.4%) had the highest proportions with acceptable FCS whilst non-beneficiary households (91.6%) and renting irrigation (80%) had the highest proportions of those with poor FCS. This suggests that the investment project improved the food security of the surrounding community.

The case of Green Fuels
Green Fuels Investment Model and the Value Chain Structure There are two core estates measuring 6 000ha and 3 500ha at Chisumbanje and Middle Sabi. On these estates, Macdom Investments and Rating Investments are conducting sugarcane production under irrigation. The company is working with an out grower scheme on 650ha of land. This out grower scheme comprises of 116 small-scale farmers on 400 ha and 125 War Veterans on 250 ha. In addition to producing ethanol at Chisumbanje, the Green Fuels plant produces about 18 kW of electricity. The electricity produced at Green Fuels is to power the plant with the surplus being transferred onto the national electricity grid. Investment Value Chain Coordination Mechanism The Green Fuel value chain is coordinated through public-private equity partnerships, out grower scheme and government policy. As highlighted earlier on, Green Fuels owns both Macdom Investments and Rating Investments which are producing sugarcane in Chisumbanje and Middle Sabi. Green Fuel ferries and processes the sugarcane produced from the two estates into ethanol at a plant processing plant in Chisumbanje. Under the Green Fuel model, Macdom Investments developed land, established an irrigated sugarcane crop, maintains the crop and land. The company also conducts any related works and purchases sugarcane from settlers at a price of US$4/T assuming an average yield of 150 MT/ha. The Government policy on mandatory blending of fuel is also a key coordination mechanism for the Green fuels value chain.

Household Demography
The study interviewed a total of 638 respondent households comprising of 60.2% male headed households and 39.8% female-headed households. These households had an average membership size of 6 members. The average age of the respondents was 45 years. About 42% of the household heads attained primary education, 38% secondary school and 19% had no
formal education. At least 14.5% had primary education, 37.5% had secondary education, 19.4% had non-formal education, 1.1% vocational training, and 0.5% adult education.

**Investment Impact Analysis**

**Dryland Ownership**

The average dryland holding for beneficiaries before and after the investment project reduced from 8.3 ha to 1.3 ha, while that for non-beneficiaries decreased from 5 ha to 3.5 ha. This was statistically significant at 5% statistical level of significance. About 54.5% of households owning equal or less than 2 ha of dryland are beneficiaries compared to 45.5% for non-beneficiaries. A high proportion of non-beneficiaries own more dryland under areas greater than 2 ha than beneficiaries. The non-beneficiary households represent about 71.7% of households with 2 – 4.9 ha, 68% with 5 – 9 ha and 67% with dryland of more than 10 ha. This result is explained by the fact that most beneficiaries had their dryland incorporated into the core estate.

**Irrigated Land Ownership**

Beneficiary households own more irrigated land than non-beneficiary households. Non-beneficiaries represent about 63% households owning equal or less than 0.1 ha of irrigated plots as compared to about 37% for beneficiaries. Beneficiaries represent about 85.5%, 71.4% and 100% of households that own between 0.2 – 0.5 ha, 0.6 – 3.0 ha and 3.1 – 6.0 ha of irrigated plots. The investor allocated 0.5 ha of irrigation plots to some households that had their dryland area incorporated into the core estate while some households were still waiting for to be allocated the promised irrigation plots. The schemes were being under-utilised as the men consider these small sizes to be for women and too small to sustain a household’s livelihood. Smallholder farmers indicated that they preferred to have dryland rather than irrigated land. This is because irrigation requires purchase of inputs which they said they cannot not afford as the investor was no longer providing inputs.

**Crop Production and Productivity**

The investment has settler sugarcane production on the core estate, where Macdom does everything and pays farmers for raw cane produced at a yield of 120 t/ha. On their own, the settlers were only able to reach a yield of 65 t/ha against. The Green fuels project drastically reduced smallholder farmers’ production of cotton by dispossessing them of their dryland. Further, the Green Fuels investment enabled the introduction of maize and sugar beans production on irrigated plots. The average yields for maize, cotton and sugar beans remain below the respective crops’ potential average yields – not less than 5 t/ha for maize under irrigation and up to 2 t/ha for sugar beans and cotton. Beneficiary households with a ready market for agricultural produce had the highest average maize yield. There was no improvement for those renting irrigation, while there was a decrease for those owning irrigation. Hence access to irrigation did not impact positively to average maize productivity as would have been expected. The investment did not follow-up to complement irrigation with input support. The investment however, impacted positively on maize productivity through ready market for produce suggesting a better paying market that enabled the farmers to access inputs. Cotton average yields for non-beneficiaries (0.5 t/ha) were the same as for beneficiaries renting irrigated land (0.5 t/ha). The average yield for beneficiary households of permanent and contract employment at mill (0.3 and 0.3 t/ha) and farm (0.3 and 0.2 t/ha), and displaced from dryland (0.3 t/ha) and owning irrigated land (0.2 t/ha) are lower than non-beneficiary households. Most benefits from the investment thus impacted negatively on the average cotton productivity in Chisumbanje area in spite of the contract arrangements by COTTCO. Sugar beans productivity increased from 0.2 t/ha for the non-beneficiaries to 1.6 t/ha for the displaced
who were allocated 0.5 ha irrigation plots. There was no ready market for sugar beans. The investment impacted positively on the average sugar beans production through irrigation. The study concluded that crop productivity vary between beneficiary status and among beneficiary households across different enterprise and benefits enjoyed by households. There is limited knowledge and skills transfer for both non-project crops (sugarcane) and non-project crops (sugar beans cotton and maize).

Livestock Production
There was a reduction in the numbers of cattle owned by both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. Beneficiary households own slightly more cattle than non-beneficiaries. The greatest decrease was experienced in pig production for beneficiaries from owning an average of 12 pigs to 1 pig.

Income and Expenditure
About 98.2% of beneficiary households and 99.2% of non-beneficiary households were in the income category of less than US$3 000 suggesting a limited positive impact on income by the investment. Within the US$3 000 income categories, there was a larger proportion of non-beneficiary households spending less or equal to US$3 000 (57.0%) than beneficiary households (43.0%). At the higher income category of US$3 001 to US$6000 (63%) there is a larger proportion of beneficiary households (62.5%) than non-beneficiary households (37.5%). Hence the study concluded a positive income impact. The general feeling among farmers was that they had more money when they were growing cotton than currently when they have irrigated land.

Access to Primary Education
About 25% of beneficiary households had children not attending school compared to 30% for non-beneficiary households. The key reasons for not attending school were mainly lack of money for fees, illness, not interested in school and no birth certificate. The benefits from the investment did not translate into higher access to primary and secondary education.

Access to Secondary Education
Over 60% of beneficiary households were able to send their male children to secondary under each benefit showing an improvement in the percentage of households who are sending their male child to secondary than primary school. The farmers who were displaced from their dryland constituted a larger proportion of households who are not able to send 1, 2 and 3 of their male children to secondary school. As for the female child, the benefits enabled more households to send all their female children to secondary school. The study concluded that not all investment project benefits will improve access to education.

Water Health and Diseases
Exposure to unsafe water was high among non-beneficiary households (19.1%) compared to beneficiary households (4.7%). Water availability all year round was a challenge with 30.8% of beneficiary households and 28.2% of non-beneficiaries indicated that water in their areas was not available at all times. This resulted in some households drinking effluent waste from the mill, which they called “danda water.” The danda water bodies were causing water borne diseases such as malaria and dysentery. The study established fifty three percent (53.3%) of the non-beneficiaries indicated that they did not treat their water before drinking compared to only 0.4% for beneficiary households that did not treat their drinking.
Food Availability
There were more beneficiary households (86.4%) who experienced food shortages than non-beneficiary households (85.4%). This implies a marginal negative effect of 1% by the investment on food security. The breakdown of individual benefits by food availability established that permanent employment at the mill and contract at the farm had a positive effect on food availability. All the other benefits – contract employment at the mill (92.2%), permanent employment at farm (88.9%), ready market for small projects, renting irrigation (100%), displaced from farmland (90.3%) and owning irrigated land (88.9%) – had more households that experienced food shortages than non-beneficiaries (85.4%).

Food Security
About 47.8% of beneficiary households had unacceptable FCS compared to 50.6% for non-beneficiary households. Of those with unacceptable FCS (28), about 58.1% are non-beneficiaries while 41.9% are beneficiaries. This position contradicts the finding based on food availability. The breakdown of benefits by FCS showed that the key benefits that drove food security were permanent employment at the mill, permanent and contract employment at the farm, and renting irrigation. These had more borderline and acceptable FCS.

Conclusion and recommendations
This study sought to understand the impact of large scale investments on the livelihoods of smallholder farming communities. The study concludes that an investment can either have positive or negative benefits to a community. This is dependent on the investment model, how it is implemented and government policy. We therefore recommend the following:

1. Intensified government coordination to ensure compliance, responsible investments and minimize negative impacts and maximise positive impacts
2. Need for collaboration between government and investor to achieve more include models that respond to demand for land by increasing out-grower contribution
3. Review of Sugar Act which only recognize one sugar association
4. Designing of community programmes that benefits youth and women
5. Provision of extension and specialist services such as irrigation services and market linkages
6. Need for further research to ascertain water quality, viability of sugar cane in terms of area, yield and pricing.
### Table 1: Impact of investment on selected variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacted variables/Indicators</th>
<th>TONGAAT HULLET</th>
<th>CHISUMBANJE/Green Fuels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community Programmes         | • Built 22 schools and 2 hospitals  
                              • There is a stringent environmental programme for spraying mosquitos around the radius | • Rehabilitation of schools affected by storm (7 schools have already been rehabilitated), building toilets in schools  
                              • Drilling boreholes  
                              • Drip irrigation for St Peters hospital  
                              • Deeding program for malnourished children at St Peters hospital and a technology Centre for internet and computer skills training |
| Income                       | Investment project improving and widening sources of income | Some farmers no longer have income sources |
| Food Security                 | Beneficiaries have a High Food Consumption Score (FCS) | Beneficiaries have a poor FCS.  
                              Households disposed of dryland farming land and allocated dryland 12 kms away from homesteads and 0.5Ha irrigated land, some households still not allocated. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacted Variables/Indicators</th>
<th>TONGAAT HULLET</th>
<th>CHISUMBANJE/Green Fuels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Benefits by Age              | Chi square tests\(^1\) show that there is a significant relationship between the type of benefit and the age of the household head.  
  • There is need for some projects to be extended to other age categories.  
  • There is high demand for irrigated land by youths, that is why they are renting. | • The chi-square results show that there is a significant relationship between the type of benefit and the age of household head.  
  • The benefits are skewed to the youths and adults. Adults enjoy the most benefits.  
  • There is need for projects to ascertain that the 65+ age also benefits. |

Benefits by Food Consumption Score

• Most of the Farmers with acceptable diets indicated that they benefitted through a ready market either for agriculture produce or small projects.  
  • The statistical test shows that there is a significant relationship between the type of benefit and the FCS category. | • The negative benefit which influences a household food security status is displacement from land. 62.5% of the households displaced have a poor food security status.  
  • Also, to note is owning irrigated land is not a guarantee that the household’s food security status will improve. There is also need for technical (extension) and financial support (inputs) so that the project can be sustainable. |

\(^1\) See The impact of large-scale investments on the livelihoods of small-holder farmer, ZELA, 2017, p6, 7, 17, 21, 43.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacted variables/ Indicators</th>
<th>TONGAAT HULLET</th>
<th>CHISUMBANJE/Green Fuels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education: None Attendance</td>
<td>The benefit of renting irrigated land has the highest percentages of none attendance of school compared to other benefits.</td>
<td>The benefit of displaced from land has the highest percentages of none attendance of school compared to other benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Primary and Secondary Schools</td>
<td>• Beneficiaries are closer to schools than non-beneficiaries; • This is expected as Tongaat Hullet built schools in the district.</td>
<td>• The proximity of beneficiary households to the secondary is not attributed to the project as the investment project did not build any schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Sources</td>
<td>The most utilised water sources are borehole water and canal water.</td>
<td>The most utilised water sources are borehole water, protected well and unprotected well respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Availability</td>
<td>Over 90% indicated that water is always available for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries</td>
<td>28.2% of non-beneficiaries and 30.8% of beneficiaries indicated that water is not available all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Treatment</td>
<td>Over 50% indicated that they do not treat the water for both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. Those who had water treatment tablets are 10% for beneficiaries and 3% for non-beneficiaries</td>
<td>53.3% of non-beneficiaries and 4% of beneficiaries indicated that they do not treat the water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the study findings, the following was recommended:

Overall:

• In terms of Government involvement in investments, M&E is key to ensure compliance, responsible investment and minimise negative impact;
• Improvement of coordination of investments;
• Review of the Sugar Act which is now outdated;
• Increase out-grower contribution to the plant;
• Programmes should be designed in such a way that they also benefit the youths and elderly;
• Community share trusts need to be tailor made to specific investments;
• Socio cultural issues to be considered - men not utilising 0.5Ha irrigation plots.

Specifically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chisumbanje</td>
<td>• Location of core estate - Avoid dispossession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensure promises are delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Spraying programmes for mosquitoes - EMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Input packs (for food security)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongaat</td>
<td>• Pricing and Division of Proceeds (DoP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Land Ownership (A1, A2, Old Resettlement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Input packs (for food security)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project outcomes generally align with the planned outcomes, and there was not significant deviation from the project proposal. A significant factor in the overall success of the project was a thorough project planning phase, including a detailed explanation of activities and their intended outputs and how they would feed into the outcomes. Another important element of the project design was to work in partnership with the Ministry of Lands, Agriculture, Water, Climate and Rural Resettlement which gave ZELA access to primary sources of information needed for the resource and the government buy in of the research project, research results and recommendations. As one of the focus on the importance of communicating the research
findings to various stakeholders at various levels, this led to wide dissemination of research findings, identification of a diverse set of opportunities for future research and improved capacities of a wide range of stakeholders such as organisations, educational institutions and individuals on the study’s subject matter.

Outcomes achieved throughout the project are included in Table 3. A description of the elements of the project design which contributed to the outcome and the lessons learned are included alongside each outcome.

**Table 3: Projected outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>WHAT CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>LESSONS LEARNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved and informed ways of community responses to involuntary displacements in investment venture areas by government</td>
<td>Capacity of the project stakeholders especially the community of small-scale farmers and communalities living in mining operations was strengthened through land rights related trainings. The involvement of the ZELA staff in training locally based rights groups such as the Platform for Youth and Community Development (PYCD) supported by the IDRC project created awareness to strategically resist forced and unfair dislocations using the law. Petitions to relevant authorities and court cases were filed to resist forced relocations as a result of the trainings. The PYCD has been leading in advocating for fair relocation procedures and have conducted human rights trainings and approached government officials through letters and physical meetings to advocate for farmers land rights. (<a href="https://advancedbiofuelsusa.info/chipinge-villagers-sue-greenfuel-to-stop-seizure-of-communal-land/">See https://advancedbiofuelsusa.info/chipinge-villagers-sue-greenfuel-to-stop-seizure-of-communal-land/</a>).</td>
<td>-The project built the capacity of small-scale farmers and communities living in mining operations on their land rights and how to deal with involuntary displacements and how to enforce their rights and this will continue long after project completion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also Appendix 1 for one of the letters written to the Ministry of Agriculture to account for land related issues. Communities in Arda-Transau also...
mobilised and took legal action through the courts to demand compensation for lost land and property as a result of involuntary displacements from the Marange Diamond Fields after they had received land rights trainings from ZELA under the IDRC Project. The communities are now more aware of their rights than before and can articulate them well and are now able to demand accountability. (https://www.newsday.co.zw/2019/01/arda-transau-community-activist-threatened-over-compensation-demands/). The stories of strategic resistance has spread and have influenced various other communities that faced the same predicament such as in Vhimba (See https://www.newsday.co.zw/2018/11/court-stops-chimanimani-farmers-eviction/), Chimanimani, Domboshava (See https://www.businesshumanrights.org/en/zimbabwe-local-community-opposes-chinese-company-aihua-jianyes-quarry-mining-project-due-to-environmental-impacts-company-denies-allegations). and Chivi (See http://www.radiovop.com/chivi-villagers-plan-demo-against-murowa-diamonds/).

Development of a Community Guide on Development Induced Displacement and Resettlement in Zimbabwe under the project have given communities a tool to use for their refresher trainings and refer to when faced with involuntary displacements. Communities in Chimanimani who face evictions have been trained using the guide and are using the guide to advocate for fair relocation processes.
After the Chisumbanje conflicts, the 2009-2013 Zimbabwe’s government of national unity established the District Ethanol Project Implementation Committee (DEPIC) to facilitate communication among the local community, government and Green Fuels so as to deal with land related conflicts. The ZELA trained members of DEPIC mainly community members and traditional leaders succeeded in amplifying the voices of the communities that were affected by dislocations and that also faced possibilities of dislocations. DEPIC was disbanded in 2013 immediately after the general elections as politically, it was perceived as a threat to economic development and attacking some individuals in the political circles. However, through advocacy and relations built by ZELA the PYCD and traditional leaders towards the end of 2018 and beginning of 2019 convinced the Minister of State to order the reinstatement of DEPIC. At the close of the project period, DEPIC had resumed its duties. (See https://www.thezimbabwean.co/2017/07/traditional-leaders-chisumbanje-endorse-pyd-continue-lobbying-resuscitation-depic/).

| Improved awareness on the impacts of large-scale land acquisitions on communities (with attention to vulnerable groups) | The research on **Impact of large-scale investments on the livelihoods of small holder farming communities** unearthed the realities that the small-scale farmers face when large scale investments come in their areas. It successfully documented the impacts paying attention to vulnerable groups such as women, children, youth and people with disabilities. Sharing the research with a wider audience can promote improved practices.

- More collaboration and lesson sharing can promote improved practices.

- Recognizing the importance of... |
groups i.e. women, children and youths) by the general populace and government within the different investment areas in Zimbabwe. Stakeholder groups at various platforms, national, regional and international levels contributed to raising awareness on the impacts of large-scale investments on community’s most vulnerable groups. At national level, the research was shared with government departments, parliament of Zimbabwe, the civil society organisations and 3 local universities. The research was also shared at several regional platforms such as the Alternative Mining Indaba and academic forums. Internationally, the research results were shared through presentations by ZELA officers at Business and Human Rights Forums. The research managed to mainstream the impacts of large-scale investments on vulnerable groups of the society such as women, youth and people with disabilities (PWD). This was displayed by the PYCD Director as he shared the impact of large-scale investments on vulnerable groups after the ZELA research had exposed such. The Director of PYCD contributed to the Transparency International Zimbabwe’s report the results that had been unearthed by ZELA’s research under the IDRC Project. (See vulnerable group specific impacts documentation at [http://wire.farmradio.fm/en/farmer-stories/2018/05/zimbabweghana-land-corruption-affects-women-farmers-most-news-deeply-17308](http://wire.farmradio.fm/en/farmer-stories/2018/05/zimbabweghana-land-corruption-affects-women-farmers-most-news-deeply-17308).)

ZELA’s study also influenced other local Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in Zimbabwe such as the Transparency International Zimbabwe and Centre for Conflict Management and Transformation (CCMT) to develop interests in land communicating research findings from the start can result in better dissemination of new knowledge.
rights issues. They have gone to do their own studies focusing on dislocations from different perspectives. See [http://www.ccmt.org.zw/publications/](http://www.ccmt.org.zw/publications/).

In the academic circles, the plan to engage only 2 local universities with an objective of sharing results ended up with the conception of ZELA student Chapters at 3 universities in Zimbabwe including Midlands State University, Great Zimbabwe University and Zimbabwe Ezekiel Guti University. Furthermore, ZELA’s work also influenced research initiatives in tertiary institutions. The Midlands State University established a multi-disciplinary research hub in Masvingo for the purposes of gathering scientific data on interactions between communities and investors focusing on Tokwe-Mukosi dam as a result of the research study. (See [https://www.newsday.co.zw/2018/01/msu-sets-tokwe-mukosi-research-hub/](https://www.newsday.co.zw/2018/01/msu-sets-tokwe-mukosi-research-hub/)). The MSU in September 2018 held a multi-disciplinary conference dubbed Dams, Society and the Environment in Zimbabwe, which seek to bring scholars to discuss the impact of water bodies on community development. One of the major themes that was discussed was the issue of displacements as a result of these developments. (See [https://www.newsday.co.zw/2018/06/msu-to-host-conference-on-dams/](https://www.newsday.co.zw/2018/06/msu-to-host-conference-on-dams/)). ZELA was represented and it presented at the conference a paper that was inspired by the project study. The research also influenced Lenin Tinashe Chisaira, a ZELA officer to write a masters dissertation with the University College Cork of Ireland on the research study which attracted
a lot of attention in Europe. (See 
student-demonstrates-how-big-business-is-
exploiting-climate-change-to-relocate-entire-
zimbabwean-communities.html).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhanced understanding of the gaps in the current laws and policies governing community rights to land and their impacts to communities by Government of Zimbabwe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The research on <strong>Legal, policy and institutional frameworks for community land rights in the wake of developmental projects in Zimbabwe: Challenges and way forward</strong>, successfully identified gaps within the Zimbabwe land rights governing laws. Dissemination of research results and recommendations on various local, national and regional platforms informed an understanding to the platforms of the gaps in existence within the laws and stimulated discussions on how such gaps can be addressed. The Land Commission has currently been on a land audit exercise to address some of the identified gaps. Zimbabwe between 2013-2017 was implementing the Zimbabwe Agricultural Investments Plan (ZAIP 1) which seek to facilitate sustainable increase in production, productivity and competitiveness of Zimbabwean agriculture through building capacity of farmers and institutions, improving the quantity and quality of public, private and development partner investment and policy alignment. After ZELA’s research, the Ministry of Agriculture has acknowledged that there is need to rethink the strategy (ZAIP 1) and is in the process of coming up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and policy reforms that are linked to land rights take time to be considered by African governments. Identifying champions within parliament and the parliamentary portfolio committee to champion the causes proved fruitful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with ZAIP 2 which they have strongly acknowledged ZELA’s research as a key informer and influencer of the new policy which is currently before parliament for approval. This was made possible by the development of a policy brief which emanated from the research. See Appendix 2 – Policy Brief

| Informed structural reforms and realignment of land related laws to the new constitution by government of Zimbabwe | Our work with Parliament was instrumental to the resourcing of the Land Commission, which received the second highest funding from the treasury for all independent commissions after the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission (ZEC) in the 2018 national budget. Traditionally, mineral rights superseded the farmer’s rights to land under the Mines and Minerals Act (MMA). ZELA’s advocacy work, through informed research unearthed the evil in this law which was used to relocate and dislocate farmers of their land thereby weakening small scale farmers rights to land as was witnessed in the Marange Diamonds Field. ZELA advocated for the amendment of the MMA and pushed for respect of farmer’s rights. Dislocated communities in Arda-Transau were capacitated on the MMA and the proposed amendment and they participated in the consultations which were conducted by the Ministry of Mines and requested for the law to respect small scale farmers and communal land dwellers rights. As a result, President Mnangagwa rejected the Mines and Minerals Amendment Bill (MMAB) citing the conflict of farmers rights clashing with mineral rights as a potential inconsistency with the law. (See Identifying champions within parliament, engaging policy makers and the parliamentary portfolio committees to champion the causes informed by the study research proved fruitful. |
In 2019, ZELA Petitioned Parliament citing a number of concerns including the rate of irresponsible investment within the mining sector; shortcomings in the Mines and Minerals Act and its misalignment with the Constitution of Zimbabwe; Limited consultative processes on investments that affect communities through prior informed consent or failure to carry out due diligence on impacts of mining; and failure by some mining companies to carry out Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), informed displacements, pollution of rivers and lack of rehabilitation. (See [https://www.newsday.co.zw/2019/05/zela-demands-urgent-alignment-of-environmental-laws/](https://www.newsday.co.zw/2019/05/zela-demands-urgent-alignment-of-environmental-laws/)). Parliament requested to hear ZELA and a meeting was convened where ZELA raised its issues and a declaration was agreed on and timelines on dealing with issues raised. (See [https://www.herald.co.zw/parly-sets-october-for-mines-amendment-bill-resubmission/](https://www.herald.co.zw/parly-sets-october-for-mines-amendment-bill-resubmission/)).

**Enhanced research skills for ZELA staff members on research methods, techniques and designs**

ZELA officers managed to practically and successfully use research data collection tools whilst compiling data for the research study. They also trained the enumerators for the study on research methods and techniques. The team of numerators comprised of Agritex Officers, PYCD and community members.

The training demystified that research is only for the educated personnel.
Methodology

This research adopted a mixed methods approach to address the objectives of the study using a case study approach. Green Fuels Ethanol Project in Chisumbanje and Tongaat Hullet in Chiredzi were identified as case studies of recent large-scale investments in Zimbabwe that can adequately improve our understanding of how large-scale investments impact communities’ livelihoods. These two large scale investments were deemed representative investment models as they all are land based and involve investments along the whole sugarcane value chain, hence, allow for comprehensive lessons to be drawn for future investment decisions and coordination. Under each case, the study used a mixed method design that combines quantitative and qualitative data collection approaches. The quantitative method included a cross sectional survey of farming households surrounding the Green Fuels (wards 27, 27 and 28) and Tongaat Hullet (wards 18, 19, 21, 27, 28 and 31). Stratified sampling strategy was used to get a sample of 591 households. During the survey, 501 respondent household were interviewed.

Quantitative data that was collected through the cross-sectional household survey questionnaire was complemented with qualitative data from key informant and focus group discussions. The key informants that were interviewed include village heads, agricultural extension officers, rural district council officers, traditional leaders, local councillors, district administrators, DEPIC representatives and local community based organisations representatives. Focus group discussions were conducted with village heads, women and men separately. Secondary data obtained through literature review of policy documents, published articles and reports from development partners were used to compliment the findings. The quantitative data collection was done using the Kobo collect software. Qualitative data from focus group discussions (FGDS) and Key informant interviews was collected through electronic recording with high frequent recorders. Quantitative data analysis was imported into the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) version 22. Univariate analysis and analysis of variance were conducted on specific variables such as food consumption score, dietary diversity scores. The qualitative data analysis was done using thematic content analysis. Direct quotes are used to make inferences on the quantitative findings and to give qualitative explanations to the quantitative results.
Project Activities, Management and Implementation

Table 4 summarizes the activities that were undertaken during the project, the timeline for each activity, and the involvement from the research team members. The timelines for implementation changed from those that had been proposed in the project proposal as a result of several challenges that were unforeseen. For instance, accessing Chisumbanje one of the targeted communities was a challenge as ZELA was first denied political greenlight.

Another significant change in the project implementation was the change of project coordinators. However, the lead researcher did not change. Mukasiri Sibanda was appointed to take over as the project before a newly recruited Project Officer Darlington Chidarara took over the project in April 2018. Although this resulted in slight glitches on the project, the new project officer provided a fresh perspective, from his experience as a law lecturer lecturing property and land law. This strengthened the project objectives and plans. For example, the plans to engage local universities concretised due to his history with the other universities. The engagements with universities ended up birthing the idea of student chapters of ZELA contributing to sustainability of the project as the students were provoked to engage in similar research works as the IDRC funded ZELA research. In addition, his contribution and public relations skills ended up making the local authorities easing up to ZELA’s engagements which made sharing of research results in research areas materialise without much

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TIMELINE OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>TEAM MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Attend two international conferences to share research results | 2018 | Mukasiri Sibanda  
Nyaradzo Mutonhori  
Lenin Tinashe Chisaira |
| 2. Hold a project inception meeting | August 2016 | Mutuso Dhlwayo  
Tafadzwa Dhlakama  
Byron Zamasiya  
The then Ministry of Agriculture, Mechanization and Irrigation Development (MAMID) represented by the Director Mr Clemence Bwenje and others. |
| 3. Facilitate in-house researcher’s refresher training on research methods | June 2016 | Byron Zamasiya  
Tafadzwa Dhlakama and the ZELA staff members. |
| 4. Conduct 2 research sensitisation meetings in the 2 | August 2016 (Manicaland)  
April 2018 (Chipinge) | Darlington Chidarara  
Tafadzwa Dhlakama  
Nyaradzo Mutonhori |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Areas and with Different Stakeholders</th>
<th>May 2018 (Manicaland)</th>
<th>MLAWCRR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hold 2 Research Validation Meetings</td>
<td>May 2017 (Harare) October 2017 (Bulawayo)</td>
<td>Mutuso Dhliwayo Tafadzwa Dhlakama Byron Zamasiya MAMID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Research on the Nature of Development Induced Involuntary Displacements in the 2 Case Study Areas</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>Mutuso Dhliwayo Tafadzwa Dhlakama Grace Nkomo-Nicholas Clemence Bwenje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Research Brief</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Grace Nkomo-Nicholas Tafadzwa Dhlakama Darlington Chidarara Byron Zamasiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Policy Brief</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Grace Nkomo-Nicholas Tafadzwa Dhlakama Darlington Chidarara Byron Zamasiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold a Publication/Research Report Media Launch Event</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Tafadzwa Dhlakama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold 2 Seminars with Legislators to Share Research Progress and Research Findings</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td>Mutuso Dhliwayo Tafadzwa Dhlakama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with Government Representatives to Share Research Results and Recommendations</td>
<td>August 2018 July 2019</td>
<td>Darlington Chidarara Tafadzwa Dhlakama Byron Zamasiya MLAWCRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold 1 Research Seminar with Civil Society Organizations to Share Research Findings and Recommendations (Validation)</td>
<td>May 2017 (Harare) October 2017 (Bulawayo)</td>
<td>Tafadzwa Dhlakama Byron Zamasiya MLAWCRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate 2 Community Meetings in the 2 Case Study Areas to Share Research Findings and Research Results</td>
<td>August 2016 (Manicaland)</td>
<td>Tafadzwa Dhlakama Byron Zamasiya Nyaradzo Mutomhori MLAWCRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold 2 Training Meetings for Community-Based Researchers</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>Tafadzwa Dhlakama Byron Zamasiya Simba Mandota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold 2 Events at Local Universities to Share Research Results</td>
<td>May 2018 (Great Zimbabwe University) June 2018 (Zimbabwe Ezekiel Guti University)</td>
<td>Darlington Chidarara Tafadzwa Dhlakama Dr James Tsabora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2019 (Environmental Law Associations)</td>
<td>2019 Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Develop a community guide to displacement and resettlement</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Byron Zamasiya Darlington Chidarara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Hold 4 training meetings on community rights to land in the context development (Arda &amp; Chisumbanje)</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Darlington Chidarara Nyaradzo Mutonhori Joshua Machinga Tafadzwa Dhlakama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Project end of year review meeting</td>
<td>2016,2017,2018</td>
<td>ZELA Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Evaluation – End of project</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>Dorothy Mushayavanhu (Consultant) Yanano Mugarisanwa Joshua Machinga Darlington Chidarara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Outputs

Table 4 summarizes the project outputs. Key project technical documents, pictures and other outputs are included in Appendices 1-11 of this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ACTIVITY</th>
<th>EXPECTED OUTPUT</th>
<th>DETAILS OF COMPLETED OUTPUT</th>
<th>MAJOR FINDINGS/RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hold a project inception meeting</td>
<td>Project stakeholders including government representatives; community representatives; legislators and civil society organisations are aware of and input into the proposed project and research design</td>
<td>Meeting was conducted with representatives from the targeted groups in Harare on 12th of August 2016. Stakeholders were guided of the agenda through programme and brief concept note that had been distributed to the delegates prior to the meeting. 41 out of the 50 targeted participants attended. Workshop report was produced. See Picture of</td>
<td>The involvement of the MAMID resulted in impact and a by-in by government departments form the inception of the project. The message of the proposed research was welcomed by the attending stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Project Objective 1: *To map the extent and nature of development induced large scale land acquisitions and analyse the gaps and provisions within the current legal regime with respect to land tenure and related rights of communities in the face of development projects and large-scale land acquisitions by 2017*
<p>| 2. Facilitate in-house researcher’s refresher training on research methods | Key members of the research team have strengthened research skills | 15 out of the 18 ZELA staff members were trained on research methods so as to strengthen all ZELA staff (programming and non-programming) on research skills. The training sought to improve staff’s understanding of both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. Workshop report was produced. | The finance and admin members of staff were attending a research training for the first time. For programmes unit, desktop research and field research is part of their work but this training provided the opportunity enhance their skills in both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. The acquired skills were later applied in the project research. Publication of <strong>Research and Publication Guidelines. See Appendix 4.</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Hold 2 training meetings for community-based researchers</th>
<th>Community members that will partner in the research have improved research skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the 22nd of July 2016, ZELA staff members facilitated a training meeting for Community Based Organisations (CBOs) of Chisumbanje and Arda Transau. The objective of the training was to empower community members that would partner with ZELA in implementing the research to have improved research skills. On the 20th of December 2016, the ZELA staff members tested the data collection tool.</td>
<td>The trained participants later worked with ZELA as enumerators and data collectors for the research project. The data collection tool was successfully used for the research project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tools in Domboshawa. The pre-test was done by ZELA staff members and some enumerators that were going to assist ZELA in collecting the data in the field once the data collection commenced in January 2017. The main objective of the pretest was to actually get a sense of the practicality of the designed data collection tools. The training also sought to orient the lead enumerators on the use of electronic data collection tool, kobo collect. See Appendix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. <strong>Engage a consultant to facilitate the development of a policy engagement strategy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Key stakeholders take up and implement specific actions around the research results and recommendations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Policy briefs emanating from the research were developed and shared with the relevant government ministries and members of the parliament and relevant parliamentary portfolio committees. See Appendix 6 – Policy Engagement Strategy produced</strong></th>
<th><strong>Resulted in the Ministry of Agriculture and Government of Zimbabwe taking recommendations from the research as key in formulation of ZAIP 2.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**5. <strong>Conduct research sensitisation meetings in the 2 case study areas and with different stakeholders</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community members that will constitute the main research respondents have improved knowledge of the proposed research</strong></td>
<td><strong>On the 29th of August 2016, ZELA staff members accompanied the Ministry of Agriculture officials and went to a provincial</strong></td>
<td><strong>Clearance by the provincial government and by in by the communities to proceed with research.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. Conduct action oriented and community based participatory research on the nature of development induced involuntary displacement in the 2 case study areas | - Research report on the impact of development induced involuntary displacement on local communities particularly with respect to loss of land rights  
- Map of cases (and potential cases) of development induced involuntary displacement in Zimbabwe | ZELA conducted and published the research on Impact of large-scale investments on the livelihoods of small holder farming communities. See Appendix 7. | -Research publication |
### 7. Develop a research brief

- A research brief summarising key research results, findings and recommendations

| Policy briefs emanating from the research were developed and shared with the relevant government ministries and members of the parliament and relevant parliamentary portfolio committees |
| Resulted in the development of 2 policy briefs as explained above. |

### 8. Conduct research on the gaps and provisions within the current land and land related laws and policies

<p>| Research report on the legal and policy framework and gaps within the same with respect to community |
| ZELA conducted a desktop research and published a comprehensive analysis of the current land and land related laws and policy entitled: <strong>Legal, policy</strong> and |
| An extensive analysis of Zimbabwe’s current laws related to land and recommendations were produced. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional frameworks for community land rights</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>In the wake of developmental Projects in Zimbabwe: Challenges and way forward.</strong> See Appendix 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Develop a policy brief</strong></td>
<td>A policy brief aimed at providing guidance to the legal and reform process</td>
<td>A legal policy brief was produced emanating from the legal analysis research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Hold a publication/research report media launch event</strong></td>
<td>-At least 30 media representatives and other stakeholders attend the launch event</td>
<td>Members of the media were invited and attended the launch of the event. Journalists were also trained by ZELA in collaboration with the Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Journalists Forum (ZPJF) to improve coverage on mining, environmental and large-scale investments related issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project objective 2:**

*To improve communities’ awareness of community land rights and responses to their rights in the context of displacement by 2017*

11. Facilitate 2 community meetings in the 2 case study areas to share research findings and research results

- Community representatives in the case study research areas have improved knowledge of research results
- Community representatives in the case study research areas begin to use the research results to advocate for legal, policy and practice reform

Two community meetings were held on the 9th and 11th of August 2017 in Manicaland and Masvingo respectively.

Workshop reports were produced.

Increased knowledge on the research results.
12. Develop a community guide to displacement and resettlement

- Documentation of community rights in the context of development induced development

A handbook entitled **Community Guide on Development Induced Displacement and Resettlement in Zimbabwe** was produced and published. See Appendix 9.

A simplified tool for the communities to understand their land rights and defend their human rights and land rights during forced evictions.

13. Hold 4 training meetings on community rights to land in the context of development induced displacement

- Community members in the research target areas have improved knowledge of their rights and how they can respond to cases of development induced displacement

Trainings were conducted with communities from Chisumanje, Arda-Transau by ZELA working together with PYCD.

- Increased knowledge for communities on their rights to land in the context of development induced displacement.
- Increased capacity to enforce rights by trained communities.

**Project Objective 3**

*To influence the re-alignment of land related laws to the new Constitution and improved community awareness and responses about their rights by 2017*

14. Hold 2 seminars with legislators to

- At least 40 legislators have improved awareness of the

On 1 June 2017 at Cresta Lodge in Harare,

- Informed discussions on the need for research based agricultural investments which can then
<p>| share research progress and research findings | ZELA conducted a research results dissemination meeting which was attended by government representatives, members of parliament and civic society. The objective was to share the results of the project study. On 2 August 2019, ZELA in collaboration with the MLAWCRR conducted a National Agricultural Investments Forum which had as its main objectives to share the research study results and discuss influence other sectors like mining and energy and infrastructure projects. | influence other sectors like mining and energy and infrastructure projects. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Engage with government representatives to share research results and recommendations</td>
<td>Government representatives have improved knowledge of the research</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Hold 1 research seminar with civil society</td>
<td>-At least 30 civil society representatives provide</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| organisations to share research findings and recommendations | input into the on-going research  
-Civil society representatives have improved knowledge of the research results and recommendations and begin to take action to advocate for legal and policy reform | 17. Hold 2 events at the local universities to share research results  
-Improved knowledge of the research results by academia  
-Establishment of potential research linkages with local universities | 2 events were held at local universities with law and other faculties to share research results with the Great Zimbabwe University (May 2018) and Zimbabwe Ezekiel Guti University (June 2018). A Youth Symposium for 3 ZELA established  
Strengthened understanding of university students on research results and issues on land rights and large-scale investments. |
University based Student Environmental Law Associations was also conducted by ZELA on the 18\textsuperscript{th} AND 19\textsuperscript{th} of July 2019 to further stimulate debate and training on issues to do with land and large-scale investments and climate change. Workshop reports were produced. See Appendix 11 – Picture of participants following procedures at GZU.

See Appendix 12 – Picture of participants at the ZEGU guest lecture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. Update the ZELA website and share research findings on email list servs and various media platforms</th>
<th>-Improved public knowledge of the research project; research findings and recommendations</th>
<th>Research results, progress and successes of the project were constantly shared via the ZELA website, social media and via mails and newspaper articles.</th>
<th>Documentation of project results.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Attend three international conferences to share research results</td>
<td>-Improved public knowledge of the research project; research findings and recommendations</td>
<td>ZELA managed to share research results at various regional and international platforms. These include the Geneva Conference on Business and Human Rights in November 2018. Nyaradzo Mutonhori of ZELA participated at the binding treaty negotiations on BHR where she shared</td>
<td>-Successful sharing of research results on regional and international platforms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
research findings in her presentations on development induced displacements.

| 20. Evaluation – End of project | A report assessing the overall implementation of the project | ZELA engaged an independent consultant to conduct end of project evaluation for the purposes of monitoring, evaluation and learning. | A report was produced with assessment and recommendations. The report has been attached separately from the Final Technical Report. |
Problems and Challenges

After the national inception meeting, despite the by-in from the MAMID ZELA suffered resistance and was denied access to the proposed study area. Officials from the local government alleged that the proposed study areas of Chisumbanje and Arda Transau were labelled as highly sensitive politically. ZELA was informed that the office of the president had to clear the project first before access could be granted by provincial officials. This was so despite reiterating the permission had been granted by the permanent secretary in the ministry of agriculture. After negotiations with various political offices permission was eventually granted. This delayed the project kicking off. The resistance did not fade however and at times, the research team was barred from conducting workshops on human and land rights. Increased visibility and building of relations with some government officials in the study area ended up easing up the tension. At the close of the project, ZELA had attained good work relations with most government officials including the District Administrator’s office and the Member of Parliament.

Another challenge that ZELA faced was that the project officer who was in charge of the project left ZELA. This caused a lull in project implementation pending the recruitment of a new officer. The changing political landscape after the removal of Mugabe in November 2017, saw the changing of office bearers. This entailed cultivating new relations with these office bearers. Eager to open Zimbabwe for business, the new dispensation appeared to offer better socio-economic development prospects including engagement with the international community and civil society organisations. Successful implementation of this project was hinged on engaging government to ensure policy and practice reforms that safeguards community land rights in the face of huge mining and agriculture projects. Unfortunately, after the 2018 general elections, the volatile political context that ensued following the controversial presidential election results that resulted in delayed establishment of the 9th session of Parliament as well as the new cabinet, the project suffered massive set-backs. This slowed down project implementation.

Another challenge that the project faced were the protests in January 2019. The protests forced the Zimbabwean government to implement a curfew and to shut down the whole country’s internet services. Resultantly, there were two weeks of implied “stay away” until the situation stabilised This had a bearing on ZELA’s work especially in relation to mobilisation of targeted communities, government officials and other key decision makers to implement the project.
In March 2019, Cyclone Idai, a tropical cyclone, ravaged the Manicaland province where the IDRC project was being implemented and parts of Masvingo Province, leaving more than 500 people dead, thousands left homeless and scores injured. The cyclone greatly affected the project areas and therefore it also affected implementation of the project for the months March to April 2019. As adaptive programming and decision making, ZELA responded to the disaster (with internally raised and institutionalised supported resources) to support communities affected in the areas of operation. It was observed that the priorities of government and other key stakeholders during the period of predicaments shifted to disaster response hence this made their engagements impossible. After return to normalcy, the project was successfully completed.

**Administration Reflection and Recommendations**

- The lack of a clear communication strategy may have limited the extent to which the project was visible. There is room for improvement on visibility to amplify the work and reach larger audiences.

- The project could have benefited more from exchange and learning visits (during implementation stage) so that knowledge and experiences are shared among partners for improved implementation. Sharing of research results during the course of the project with other partners implementing similar projects was a noble idea. It could have been amplified through implementing partners field visits and better interaction so as to build stronger relations and learning opportunities between the implementing partners.
Appendix 1 – PYCD letter to the Ministry of Lands

20 July 2019
Ministry Lands, Agriculture, water Climate and Rural Resettlement
Ngungunyana Building
No.1 Borrowdale Road
Private Bag 7701
Causeway
Harare

Ref: Requisition for information relating to the current evictions in Chipinge district

Dear Sir/Madam

I write on behalf of the Platform for Youth and Community Development (PYCD) to represent the communities of Munyokwere, Middle Sabi, ZESA Parks and Wildlife and Chipangayi Farms in Chipinge.

PYCD has been requested by the above-mentioned communities to engage with your office to seek clarifications and further details in view of the recent evictions that started in April 2019. The evictions have resulted in the following concerns,

a. Close to three thousand villagers (3000) in Chipinge district have received letters from the Ministry on a 7 days’ notice to vacate their areas of residence. The letters were quoting section 3 of the Gazetted land (Consequential Provisions) Act Chapter 20:28 (Gazetted Land Act)

b. That some of the villagers have been traumatised and confused by the eviction order considering that they have been in occupation of the land for a long period and as such, have built their livelihood on the designated land. The villagers have built houses and they have minor children attending school as well as disabled persons among them.

c. That the communities have nowhere to go, they do not have an alternative accommodation as such, the move by the ministry would reduce them to wanderers which we submit is against the spirit of the new constitution.

d. That the state despite demand of request for offer letters has either failed or neglected to provide these aforementioned villagers with security of tenure.

We therefore write to seek audience with your office on their behalf with the hope of finding an amicable solution taking into account that the situation at hand involves disabled persons, children and women who are among the most vulnerable members of society. Our letter seeks clarifications on the motivations of the evictions in view of the constitutional provisions that stipulates that the
Ministry can only evict villagers when there is an alternative place for them to be resettled as well that the Ministry must be in possession of a court order before the evictions are carried out.

Platform for Youth and Community Development Trust (PYCD) is a non-profit making community based organisation headquartered in Chipinge district. We exist to mobilise and empower communities in Manicaland Province through lobbying and advocacy, capacity building to promote social transformation and sustainability in Zimbabwe.

Yours Sincerely

Chris Madzvuku
PYCD Director (+263 773 010 331)
Research and Publication Guidelines

These guidelines provide a general outline of what shall be followed by authors in conducting research and preparing research papers for informing policy or for public consumption. The guidelines are not an end in themselves, but they address the common issues in research.

1.1 What constitute a good research paper?

A good research paper has the following features;

- Proper and clear title
- An abstract
- A good introduction
- A clearly articulated problem
- A well research literature review
- A clear methodology
- A concise result section
- Discusses the research findings
- Answers research objectives
- Gives recommendations based on the findings, discussion and conclusion
- Is written concisely and chronologically
- Well referenced with recent and relevant literature
- Has no editorial and grammatical errors

1.2 The structure of a good research paper

1.2.1 The title page

The title page contains a brief title of the research, names of authors and their affiliations. Affiliations should be provided with numerical superscripts just after the author’s name. The name and contact details (telephone, physical address and email address) of the corresponding
author should be given also in full. It should be noted that no abbreviations are allowed in the research title.

1.2.2 The abstract
An abstract open with the research rationale and gives a summary of the most important findings and conclusions. It is normally less than one page. In writing an abstract, the authors should not use abbreviations and sweeping statements. The common features of an abstract are;

- Rationale
- Study site
- Aims and objectives
- Methods of data collection
- Major findings
- Implication of study

1.2.3 Key words
4-6 key words should be provided for indexing purposes.

1.2.4 The introduction
The introduction sets the research in motion by stimulating the reader’s interest and providing important background information that is necessary for the reader to understand the rest of the paper. In introduces the reader to the research issue to be addressed and what gap exists that the author(s) intend to address. This section also gives a background to the research and discusses previous research on the research problem at hand. The authors have to explain what the research will address, why and how it will do so. This section has to be concise, well-structured and shall include all information that is necessary to understand the research. The style of writing is normally from general to specific. In most cases, this section is written in using present tense.

1.2.5 The literature review
The literature section gives an overview of existing research work on the subject matter. This section demonstrates the authors’ understanding of research problem, theory and previous research gaps. Key considerations in doing literature reviewing are acknowledging other author
for the information that you use; correct referencing, consistent referencing, correctly phrasing sentences and brevity. Authors should guard against lack of brevity for instance;

Table 1: Example of brevity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What to avoid</th>
<th>Correct use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conduct an investigation into</td>
<td>investigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a large (small) number of</td>
<td>many (few)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in view of the fact that</td>
<td>because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at this (that) moment in time</td>
<td>now (then)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the exception of</td>
<td>except</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>despite the fact that</td>
<td>although</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if we assume that</td>
<td>if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a sufficient number of</td>
<td>enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during the time that</td>
<td>while</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.6 Methodology

This section describes the study sites, research approach, data collection methods and analytical approaches. Authors should state the research methods used by the study and why. They should further describe the data collection methods that address the specific objectives. Reasons should be given on why a particular data collection approach is used over another. If sampling is used, authors should clearly explain and justify how the sampling units were selected. The authors should also state how the data collected through the different approaches will be analyzed and presented. There is also need for the authors to acknowledge the weakness inherent in the different approaches used in data collection and analysis. Key considerations in the methodology section are that the methodology should be replicable by another researcher, consistencies in names, explaining equations and explaining uncommon acronyms.

1.2.7 The results

This is a very important section where authors present the key results of the research without interpreting their meaning. It is a rule of thumb that authors should write this section with brevity, accuracy and clarity. Results are presented in a chronological way so that they can tell a story. Care should be taken prior to presenting results and a decision must be made on whether the results will be presented as text, tables or graphs/figures. If tables or graphs are used in
presenting the results, they must be numbered logically and correctly labelled with captions. The authors must summarize the results under each table or figure. If statistical analysis methods were used, original p-values must be presented for all primary analysis. Authors must remember to present results that are relevant to the research.

1.2.8 The discussion
This is the most important part of a research paper where the authors state interpretations, opinions and implications of findings. They link the results to the questions posed in the introduction and explain how the findings support the answers and how the answers fit in existing body of knowledge. In this section, it is pertinent for the author(s) to demonstrate their ability to think critically about an issue, to develop creative solutions to problems based upon a logical synthesis of the findings, and to formulate a deeper, more profound understanding of the research problem under investigation. The authors need to be very concise and my use sub headings to speak to the findings.

Key issues in the discussion section
- Authors should provide a commentary of the results and not restate the results
- Authors should stick to the research problem and not to bring in side issues as these will obscure your messages.
- Authors should support answers to the research questions with results
- Authors should use present tense in the discussion section
- Authors should discuss all variables used in the model regardless of whether or not they are significant or insignificant.
- Authors should discuss and evaluate conflicting explanations of results.
- Authors should provide citations in support of research findings
- Authors should also discuss potential limitations with respect to the results
- Authors should suggest future areas of study
- Authors should not be wordy/verbose

1.2.9 The conclusion
In this section, the authors have to reintroduce the work and briefly state the major results and points of discussion. This section is closed by stating how the current research contributes to the overall field of study.
1.2.10 Recommendations
This is the section where recommendations derived from the conclusions are stated. The recommendations have to be specific and should categorically assign responsibilities to different actors. In the case of policy research, the recommendations have to be actionable. A key point to watch is that there is NO need to bring in recommendations that are foreign to the study.

1.2.11 Acknowledgements
In this section, the authors provide a brief statement of acknowledging any efforts from any participants, colleagues and consultants who made the work possible. The people who appear in this section are not included as authors of the research paper. Acknowledgements should describe how the people contributed. The people who appear in the acknowledgements section should be aware of it. Furthermore, the authors should also acknowledge the sources of funding for the research work. However, the authors must strictly adhere to the rules and regulations in the grant agreement.

1.2.12 Referencing
Referencing is a key component of research papers. Reference lists are created to allow readers to locate original sources themselves. All references that have been cited in the text have to appear in the reference section. The references should be well considered, so that they contain all sources in the field as well as previous studies that support or motivate the present work. For in text referencing of legal instruments, footnotes can be adopted. However, all other referencing should be done following the Harvard Referencing System. Each citation in a reference list includes various pieces of information including the:

1. Name of the author(s)
2. Year published
3. Title
4. City published
5. Publisher
6. Pages used

Havard Referencing system for various types of information sources
In text citations
For in text citations, put author’s last name and then year source was published. This is normally done at the end of a sentence.

**In-Text Citations for One Author**

The author’s last name and the year that the source was published are placed in the parentheses.

For one author;

(Author’s surname, year published)

Two or three others

(First author’s surname, second author’s surname and third author’s surname, year published)

More than three authors;

(First author’s surname et al., year published)

**When author’s name is not there**

(Title of article, year published)

**REFERENCE TO A JOURNAL PAPER:**

**Print journal**


**Electronic journal**


**REFERENCE TO A BOOK**

Last name, First initial. (Year published). *Title*. Edition. (Only include the edition if it is not the first edition) City published: Publisher, Page(s).

Last name, First initial. and Last name, First initial. (Year published). *Title*. City: Publisher, Page(s).

**REFERENCING BOOK CHAPTERS**


**REFERENCING A DISSERTATION**
Last name, First initial. (Year published). Dissertation title. Academic Level of the Author. Name of University, College, or Institution.

REFERENCING COURT CASES
Case name [Year published] Report abbreviation Volume number (Name or abbreviation of court); First page of court case.

REFERENCING PATENTS
Last name, First initial. OR Corporate Author (Year published). Title or Description of Patent. Patent number.

REFERENCE TO ORGANIZATION AS AUTHOR
Name of organization, year published

REFERENCING PRESS RELEASES
Corporate Author, (Year published). Title. Corporate Author, (Year published). Title. [online] Available at: URL [Accessed Day Mo. Year].

REFERENCING GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS
Government Agency OR Last name, First Initial., (Year published). Title of Document or Article. City published: Publisher, Page(s).

REFERENCING BLOGS

REFERENCING CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
Last name, First initial. (Conference Year). Title of Paper or Proceedings. In: Name or Title of Conference. [online] City: Publisher of the Proceedings, pages. Available at: URL [Accessed Day Mo. Year].

REFERENCING STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS
For intext referencing, authors should use footnotes.
REFERENCING A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE
Last name, First initial. (Year published). Article title. *Newspaper*, Page(s).

Print Magazine
Last name, First initial. (Year published). Article title. *Magazine*, (Volume), Page(s).

REFERENCING REPORTS
Last name, First Initial. OR Corporate Author (Year published). Title. [online] City published: Publisher, Pages used. Available at: URL [Accessed Day Mo. Year].

1.2.13 Authorship
Authorship should be discussed in face to face meetings and consensus should be reached before the research commences. The authors have to agree on who should be treated as an author. In most cases, authors are those individuals who have made a significant contribution to the writing of a paper. The order of the authors should be a joint decision by the co-authors. Usually, the order of authors is based on the level of contribution in descending order. In some instances, it is worth to acknowledge those individuals who have made contributions to the research but do not merit them to be included as authors. It may be prudent to follow the following guidelines when choosing and author.
An author is someone who has made;
• substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data;
• drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and
• final approval of the version to be published.

If these conditions are not met, then one cannot be classified as an author. It should be noted that development of data collection tools, conducting the data collection or supervising the research or organizing field work does not justify authorship.
1.2.14 Ethical considerations for researchers

There are number of issues that authors and contributors should give due cognizance to when doing research. These issues include;

- Seeking informed consent. This shall be done when working on researches involving human subjects. Institutional clearance from Medicines Control Authority of Zimbabwe and the Research Council of Zimbabwe should be sought to ensure that the research is not against public interest and that it is allowed by legislation.
- Presenting an accurate account of research performed and an objective discussion of its significance.
- The research work should contain sufficient detail that lead to logical conclusions and recommendations.
- Care should be taken to ensure that all references that have been used to guide the paper shall be.

1.2.15 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a serious academic crime. It occurs when authors take or reproduce information without fully acknowledging the source/s. When doing research, it is of utmost importance to reference all information or data that has been taken from other sources. As such authors and contributors need to be cite all data sources and text. If an article is based on prior work, the article shall reference the prior work properly. A rule of thumb in publishing is that an original research paper cannot contain previously published data in any form without a proper citation. Authors and contributors should note that is not permissible to publish work that is a translation of a previously published paper.

1.2.16 Quality control

Once the draft paper has been produced by the authors, the quality control process will come in before the paper is made publicly available. Internally, the authors can nominate someone who does not have a conflict of interest to review the draft paper. The internal reviewer should use a review form which has space for noting the comments. The review should address the language and adhere to the general guidelines for writing research papers. Once the authors have incorporated the comments from the internal reviewer, they should send back the paper with the revised suggestions. A second level of reviewing is to nominate at least two external reviewers who are experts in the subject matter to work on the draft paper. The reviewing
process should be done with the aid of a review sheet. External reviewers are normally given three weeks at most to submit their comments. Beyond three weeks, the organization can decide to look for a different set of reviewers.

1.2.17 References


Appendix 5 - Picture of ZELA staff testing the tool kit

Tafadzwa Dhlakama of ZELA and participant

Appendix 6 – Policy Engagement Strategy
STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR ZIMBABWE ENVIRONMENTAL LAW ASSOCIATION (ZELA)

DEVELOPED BY

OZIAS MOMBO
1. Introduction
This report presents Zimbabwe Environment Law Association (ZELA)’s proposed engagement strategy under the International Development Research Centre funded project on Land Rights. The engagement strategy is a response by ZELA in its work in addressing socio-legal issues emanating from relocations induced by large scale investments in Zimbabwe’s communal areas. The engagement strategy outlines ZELA’s road map in selecting stakeholders to work with, how to work with the stakeholders and the progress markers. While it may not be feasible to achieve a revised relocation policy, this strategy’s overall objective is to initiate discussions among stakeholders on the relocation policy.

Background
Zimbabwe is among several other developing countries who are aiming to boost economic growth and socioeconomic development through attracting Foreign Direct Investment (FDI). The majority of the investors target the energy and mining sectors. Evidence shows that investors in the energy and mining sectors are largely from China and Russia. Investors from these countries are alleged to have poor human and environmental rights records. Although investments in these sectors are considered as strategic and in line with the Zimbabwe’s economic development blue print the Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation (ZimAsset), they have the potential of displacing communities in rural areas such as was the case with Chiadzwa diamond mining, Chisumbanje Ethanol project, Murowa Diamonds, Nuanetsi Ranch among others.

Although Zimbabwe has witnessed a number of relocations of people from smallholder communities due to large scale investments, the Marange and Chisumbanje cases save as a precursor to the negatives of being unprepared as a country in terms of managing Foreign Direct Investment. It is alleged that farmers in Chisumbanje had their land seized without notice. The Ethanol investor made commitments to the farmers among them the provision of 0.25 hectares of land for crop production under irrigation. However, the investor is said to be failing to provide clean water for irrigation. This development has severed relationships between the investor and the communities whose land was taken. In Marange area, communal farmers were relocated to ARDA Transau following the discovery of alluvial diamonds. The relocations were done without free and prior informed consent of the affected communities. These two cases precipitate the need for discussions among policy makers to improve the policy on relocation induced by large-scale investment. In the absence of a such a policy and
in the presence of a policy but without fair implementation, it is highly likely that usufructuary rights of communal farmers will be violated. Moreover, the forced relocation of farmers may result in them failing to access basic amenities such as health and education services. However, to kick-start discussions towards the development of a policy on relocation, there is need for the Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association to develop a stakeholder engagement strategy. The stakeholder engagement strategy is a plan that guides the process of engaging key stakeholders for the realisation of policy objectives.

Investment in Zimbabwe’s is guided by a number of legislations. However, the legislations are specific to each sector. In the mineral resources sector, legislation that guides investment in this sector include the Zimbabwe Investment Act, Indigenous and Economic Empowerment Act, Mines and Minerals Amendment Bill, Zimbabwe Mining Development Corporation (ZMDC) Act, Mineral Marketing Corporation of Zimbabwe Act, Gold Trade Act, Precious Stones Trade Act and Base Minerals Export Control. These legislations provide the guidance on shareholding and how these investments are handled. Unfortunately, these regulations do not discuss issues of relocation induced by large scale investments.

**Governance of communal Lands in Zimbabwe**

Communal Land in Zimbabwe is managed under the Communal Lands Act. The Act vests all the rights of the land in the President of Zimbabwe. He is the one who grants the land use rights in the form of a permit, consent or as prescribed by the Communal Lands Act. The President of the State has power to permit the occupation and utilisation of communal land in accordance with the Communal Land Act. The President or Minister can revoke or constrain the land rights of the users if there is a violation in relation to the terms specified by the permit or in accordance with the act. Although communal farmers can use their land for agricultural production, Section 72 of Zimbabwe’s constitution does not consider communal land as agricultural land. This means that the communal people can only use the land for different purposes but cannot own it as is the case with agricultural land.

The President of the State and the Minister of Local Government or Rural Development are in charge of delegating the traditional leaders working in tandem with the local authorities Rural District Councils (RDCs) on administering and use of land in accordance with the terms stipulated in the act. The Communal Land Act, grants authority to both the traditional leadership such as the chiefs, headman or village heads and local authorities from the RDCs.
However, the Communal Land Act does not clarify the roles and responsibilities of both parties in administering the communal areas such as the RDC or chiefs. The Traditional Leaders Act is the one that stipulates roles and responsibilities of the traditional leadership concerning land in their area. The Act states that the role of the Chiefs is to promote cultural values, uphold traditional family life, and oversee the collection of levies, taxes and rates owed to the RDCs. The Chiefs are also responsible for ensuring that Communal Land is distributed and used in an environmentally sustainable manner. The traditional leaders are required to keep a record of the inhabitants within their area and the land certificates or permits granted. The RDCs derive their roles and responsibilities from the Rural District Councils Act (Chapter 29:13). Rural District Councils have the legitimate power from the RDC Act to allocate land to qualified persons on behalf of the State. The RDCs and traditional leaders work together to administer the communal lands. In practice, local authorities override the functions and authority of the traditional leaders.

This narrative shows that in the event of strategic decisions on investment targeting communal areas that may result in forced relocation; the communities cannot refuse to vacate the communal lands, as they do not own it. However, in the process of relocation, the principles that apply to private land can also apply. These principles are enshrined in section 71 subsection 3c of the Constitution of Zimbabwe. This section states that there is need to give reasonable notice of intention to acquire the land to everyone whose interest or right to the property is affected. Section 74 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe also buttresses this by stating that no persons can be evicted from their home without order of the court made after considering all the relevant options.

**Unpacking ZELA’s stakeholder engagement strategy for the Land rights project**

Stakeholder engagement is a process of engaging stakeholders to achieve a set of desired outcomes. Its purpose is to initiate and sustain constructive relationships overtime by creating shared value through engagement. The building blocks of a stakeholder engagement strategy are setting objectives/vision, stakeholder mapping, preparation, engagement plan and action planning. In the context of ZELA, this engagement strategy is a roadmap for selecting stakeholders, choosing strategies of engaging them and setting targets for the process. ZELA’s overall objective of pursuing this strategy is to initiate discussions on establishing/strengthening the relocation policy induced by large scale investment projects. Although, it will be ideal for ZELA to push for a relocation policy, the project time frame may
not allow the realisation of such a higher-level objective. The engagement strategy is ZELA’s
gives guidance in terms of relationship building with stakeholders. The engagement starts with
reaching out to stakeholders making them aware of the project, collaborating in the research
processes and sharing of results.

1.2 Setting the vision for the strategy
In the context of the Land rights project, ZELA’s vision is to see a future in which large scale
investors engage communities, respect their rights and honour commitments during the
relocation processes induced by large scale investments. ZELA acknowledges that section 72
of the Constitution of Zimbabwe does not recognise communal land as agricultural land but
the organisation is of the understanding that principles of justice set aside for handling
agricultural land and property rights can also be adapted in handling relocations in communal
areas.

In this engagement strategy, key questions that the ZELA needs to ask itself are;

(i) What is the organisation’s priority in engaging stakeholders in this phase?
In this regard, ZELA is responding to emerging challenges on the ground that have seen
communities from Manicaland Province relocated following the discovery of alluvial
diamonds in Marange area. The second persuasion comes from the “forced takeover” of
communal lands from residents of Chisumbanje communal areas as a result of the
establishment of the Ethanol Project in Chisumbanje area. ZELA’s priority is to stimulate
discussions among policy makers on the relocation policy induced by large scale investments
in both mining and agriculture sectors.

(ii) What does ZELA want to see happening at the end of the engagement?
In setting its vision, ZELA builds on the lessons learnt and its successes in hosting mining
Indabas at provincial and national levels. Since 2008, ZELA has been engaging stakeholders
in the mining value chain through mining indabas. These platforms have seen communities
impacted by mining activities, legislators, rural district councils, mining companies,
government ministries and agencies coming together to discuss issues affecting communities.
Based on its rapport with strategic stakeholders (ministries, portfolio committees) and

2 These rights include free and prior informed consent, access to food and water, access to shelter, access to education
experience in convening engagement platforms, ZELA should tap on those synergies in implementing the current engagement strategy. In the long term, ZELA seeks to see a Zimbabwe, where large scale investors respect rights of communities prior, during and after relocation processes.

1.3 Stakeholder mapping

In general, stakeholder mapping focuses on identifying who to engage with in order to achieve the specific objectives of this engagement strategy. The process identifies the key stakeholders, their location and their interest in a policy on relocation of communal people because of large-scale agricultural or mining investments. Ideally, stakeholder mapping has to be conducted through collective efforts of research, debate and discussion drawing from multiple perspectives to determine a key list of stakeholders across an entire spectrum. A key issue to address during stakeholder mapping is to identify who has an interest in the policy today and tomorrow. This implies that the list of stakeholders is not static. ZELA already has a good working relationship with government ministries, agencies and civil society and community-based organisations with which it has been working work. While these stakeholders may be useful for ZELA’s work, for the purposes of achieving the overall objective of the engagement strategy, there is need for the organisation to use filters in selecting who to work with.

The key processes involved in stakeholder mapping are;

- Identifying who the stakeholders are. They could be groups, organisations or individuals or communities
- Analysing the perspectives and relevance of each stakeholder in the relocation processes
- Mapping the vision relative to objectives and stakeholders

Prioritising through ranking stakeholders’ relevance and identities

Although power analysis is an important addition to the criteria used for stakeholder mapping, that approach was deliberately left out as it required prior in-depth knowledge of the stakeholders.

1.3.1 Identifying the critical stakeholders

The first step in stakeholder mapping is identify the stakeholders who have an interest in the relocation policy induced by large-scale investments. The identification process is done
through brainstorming a list of stakeholders who may have an interest in relocation process induced by large scale investments in the mining and agriculture sectors. The process yields a long list of stakeholders that needs to be screened based on various criteria. At this point, the list that is drawn up is not static as it depends on the environment (business, political, economic and social). Some organisations may change opinions and decide to be part of the important stakeholders while others may tire off. A typical example is ZELA’s work on monitoring revenue flows from mining companies to rural district councils. The important stakeholders are community members where the mining companies are Community Share Ownership Trusts.

For instance, the list of stakeholders who are critical for a stakeholder engagement strategy for a service delivery project in a particular district would be brainstormed as follows;

- Service providers such as rural district council, clinics, hospitals, department of roads and schools.
- Community members receiving services (water, roads, health, education)
- Community Based Organisations
- Other organisations working on service delivery issues
- Community monitors
- residents’ representatives

This list of stakeholders represents the core team that should be assembled for purposes of engagement on services delivery issues in a particular district. While this list may not be exhaustive, some of the stakeholders maybe added or drop out as the engagement unfolds.

Following the preceding example, the list of stakeholders for ZELA’s Land Rights project would be as follows;

- Affected Communities from Marange and Chisumbanje
- Traditional leadership (village heads, Headmen and traditional leaders)
- Elected leadership (councillors, Members of Parliament)
- Civil Society Organisations (Community Based Organisations, Faith Based Organisations, Special Interest Groups i.e war veterans, National NGOs, development partners, Human Rights Defenders)
• Government ministries and agencies (Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Lands; Ministry of Local Government; Ministry of Rural Development Agriculture and Rural Development Authority (ARDA), Judiciary Services (Judges, magistrates); Rural District Councils; District Administrators; Provincial Administrators; Ministry of Health and Child Care, Ministry of Environment, Members of Parliament, Zimbabwe Investment Authority, Parliamentary Portfolio Committee on Lands;
  • Investors, academia

1.3.2 Analyzing the stakeholders
In developing this strategy, it is important to conduct further analysis of the stakeholders to better understand their relevance, perspective and then prioritise stakeholders based on the relative usefulness to the discussions on relocation processes. This can be done based on four issues, that is, their counsel (level of expertise, information), legitimacy (how legitimate is their claim for engagement), influence (who can they influence; willingness to engage) and lastly necessity of involvement (is it necessary to engage them? The purpose of doing further analysis of the stakeholders is to filter the stakeholders which ZELA should engage for the achievement of the engagement strategy’s objectives. There are various criteria that can be employed to conduct the analysis. While the list is not exhaustive, this strategy uses the following;

1.3.2.1 Stakeholder classification based on Relative usefulness
This approach uses four pillars namely contribution, legitimacy, willingness to engage, influence and necessity of involvement.

**Contribution:** Does the stakeholder have information, counsel, or expertise on the issue that could be helpful to the ZELA?

**Legitimacy:** How legitimate is the stakeholder’s claim for engagement?

**Willingness to engage:** How willing is the stakeholder to engage with ZELA?

**Influence:** How much influence does the stakeholder have? Particular attention should be paid to who they can influence for instance affected communities, government ministries & agencies, CSOs, RDCs, investors, etc.
**Necessity of involvement:** Is this someone who could derail or delegitimize the process if they are not included in the engagement?

These questions are asked about each of the listed stakeholders that were identified during the brainstorming session. As the stakeholders are being asked, information from this exercise is then used to fill-up the chart on relative usefulness.

**Table 1: Stakeholders Analysis based on relative usefulness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Legitimacy</th>
<th>Willingness to Engage</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Necessity of Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Lands</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Rural Development</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Rural Development Authority</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Mines and Minerals Development</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural District Councils</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected communities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Organisations (CBOs)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors in agriculture and mining</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. The ratings on relative usefulness are subjective

Results in Table 11 show the classification of stakeholders based on relative usefulness. The results show that in terms of contribution, the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Lands and affected communities are the main contributors in this strategy. On the whole, the results show
that the key members for this engagement are Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Lands, Rural District Councils, affected communities and community-based organisations.

1.3.2.2 Criticality of support and level of support

This approach places stakeholders on any of the four quadrants based on criticality of support and level of support. The strategy results in four groups namely lower priority, opponents, champions and allies. What is of importance is that although most of the stakeholders are important for ZELA’s work, not all the stakeholders are important for the relocation processes. Based on the criticality of support approach, a stakeholder’s position has implications on the approach in the engagement strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opponents</th>
<th>Champions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competing CSOs</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Investors</td>
<td>Affected communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Companies</td>
<td>Community based Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large scale investors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower priority</th>
<th>Allies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe Investment Authority</td>
<td>Independent Journalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary Services</td>
<td>Sympathetic CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Mines and Minerals Development</td>
<td>Other Community Based Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDA</td>
<td>Special Interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parliamentary Portfolio Committees (Mines and Energy; land and Resettlement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Champions-This group is highly critical and offers higher level of support for the relocation processes. By all means possible, ZELA should make frantic efforts to engage this group of
stakeholders. Efforts should be directed towards ensuring that the pool of champions is increased. In the case of this engagement strategy, the champions include representatives of affected communities, Ministries of Agriculture and Ministry of Lands. Allies - groups that are supportive of your issue but offer critically low levels of support. The strategy of dealing with such groups is to engage them with less intensity. In the context of this strategy, allies may include other CSOs working on human rights, human rights defenders, development partners, independent Journalists, sympathetic CSOs, other Community Based Organisations, special Interest groups and Parliamentary Portfolio Committees (Mines and Energy; land and Resettlement).

Opponents- groups of stakeholders who are very critical of ZELA’s work and unsupportive. The strategy for ZELA is to minimise their numbers in the engagement strategy as they might derail the whole engagement process. This could be the case where there are other stakeholders who benefited clandestinely from the relocation process or from the seizure of communal farms. In the long term and subject to the availability of resources, it may be important for ZELA to engage. This will be critical as ZELA is known to forge relationships with its opponents. From this stakeholder mapping, opponents may include groups such as NGOs resident in affected districts Competing CSOs, existing Investors, mining Companies, large scale investors, traditional Leaders, district Administrators, but compete with ZELA for space and resources, legislators or other political figureheads.

1.3.2.3 Expertise and willingness to engage

This approach helps to identify the tactics that can be used to engage each of the stakeholders based on their expertise and willingness to engage.

Table 2: Expertise and willingness to engage

---

3Competing CBOs refer to those that compete with ZELA for space and resources using unorthodox tactics
Table 2 shows the classification of stakeholders based on level of expertise in with regards to the relocation processes and willingness to engage in the development of a new policy. The criterion groups the stakeholders into four district quadrants. This classification is key as it helps ZELA to identify whom they should prioritise in their engagement processes. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Willingness to engage, High Expertise (LW, HE)</th>
<th>High Willingness to engage, High Expertise, (HW, HE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Human Rights Bodies, Judiciary Services (Judges, magistrates); Zimbabwe Human Rights Lawyers Members of Parliament</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Lands and Resettlement; Ministry of Local Government; Ministry of Rural Development Authority (ARDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Willingness to engage, Low Expertise (LE, LW)</td>
<td>High Willingness to engage, Low Expertise, (HW,LE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural District Councils; District Administrators; Provincial Administrators; Special Interest Groups for instance War Veterans</td>
<td>Community Based Organisations (CBOs); Zimbabwe Investment Authority;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Chiefs; Academia; Ministry of Health and Child Care Ministry of Environment Members of Parliament Investors (Mining and Energy)</td>
<td>Parliamentary Portfolio Committee Lands; Village Heads, Traditional Chiefs; Women and Land Transparent International Zimbabwe Ministry of Roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
classification also helps to identify the tactics/methods that ZELA should use when interacting with these different and distinct stakeholders.

1.3.2.4 Influence and level of interaction

This strategy involves several stakeholders. They are grouped according to the level of interaction and the level of influence. This implies that their inclusion in the engagement strategy will make ZELA achieve its desired outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sphere of Control</th>
<th>Sphere of Influence</th>
<th>Sphere of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>Government Departments</td>
<td>SADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Children</td>
<td>- Min of Agriculture</td>
<td>AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adults</td>
<td>- Min of Mines</td>
<td>Kimberly Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vulnerable members like Disabled, chronically ill</td>
<td>- EMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gate Keepers (Traditional, Political and religious leaders)</td>
<td>- Forestry Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Judiciary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Police-VFU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Private sector-companies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Min of Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Civic organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Advocates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the different methods of classifying stakeholders, the main stakeholders are the affected communal

1.3.4 Prioritizing stakeholders

After closely analysing the stakeholders for possible engagement, it is necessary to prioritise them in terms of engagement. Prioritisation will help to save both money and time. However, it is fundamental for ZELA to be able to provide answers to the following issues;

- Does the list have all the important stakeholders necessary for the relocation issues?
• Does the ZELA understand where the stakeholders are coming from, their interests and commitment to the discussions on the relocation processes induced by large scale investments?
• Is the list of stakeholders sufficient to inform tactics that ZELA can use during the engagement process?
• Is ZELA able to further understand and qualify the stakeholders?

1.4 The Engagement
The engagement process is a product of proper vision setting, stakeholder identification, mapping and analysis. ZELA being the focal stakeholder plays a facilitator’s role in interacting with key stakeholders. The actual roles that ZELA plays in the engagement process are outlined later in the engagement activity plan. What should be noted is that ZELA will be overall responsible for the following key areas;

(i) approach the Ministry of Agriculture and share project expectations
(ii) facilitate the convening of stakeholder meetings by Ministry of Agriculture
(iii) play a watchdog role in focussing discussions during meetings
(iv) manage partner dynamics
(v) mitigate tension between stakeholders

1.4.1 The guiding coalition/Strategic Engagement coalition
The guiding coalition is made up of a subset of key stakeholders who share the organisation’s aspirations and will make efforts to realise your goals in the face of challenges or resistance from line ministries. It should be noted that, the guiding coalition is not the steering committee. The collective efforts of members of the guiding coalition should have the potential to make a difference in reaching the organisation’s aspirations. For the guiding coalition to be effective, there is need for the members to determine who amongst them will be responsible for convening meetings.

If properly constituted, a guiding coalition will provide the following services;
• Removal of barriers to change
• Exerting influence at key moments to support adoption of policy
• Providing technical expertise to the state
The guiding coalition comprises of strategic members such as affected communities, Members of Parliament for affected areas, Parliamentary Portfolio Chairperson on Lands, Ministry of Agriculture and ZELA. The role of the guiding coalition is to act as the sounding board during engagement. Their feedback and opinions may help reshape the aspirations of policy recommendations. Interactions with the guiding coalition can be either formal or informal.

Key asks in a stakeholder engagement process
1. Where would ZELA want to move the stakeholders for instance supportive when asked, convert others, etc.?
2. Tailor messages to stakeholder by clearly outlining how the proposed discussions on relocation induced by large scale investment will affect them
3. Clarity on how ZELA will reach stakeholders for instance face-to-face meetings, breakfast meetings, print/electronic media, roundtables, etc.
4. Timeline for engagement. When will ZELA reach stakeholders, how and who will do what?
5. Who are the key messengers? The key messengers are the ambassadors who will reach out to their peers for participation in the engagement processes
6. Monitoring and evaluation. How will ZELA know that the objectives of the engagement strategy have been achieved?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Expected outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smallholder/communal farmers</td>
<td>• Training of smallholder communities on human rights related to relocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Awareness raising on policies around relocation and resettlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training of communities on advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communities use their knowledge to demand accountability from duty bearers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community use attained knowledge on relation policies to demand accountability from duty bearers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders (village heads, headmen, chiefs, councillors)</td>
<td>Training on human rights related to relocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training on community engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness raising on relocation policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training of community leaders on advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community leaders uphold human rights in relocation processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community leaders informing and consulting affected communal farmers prior and after relocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 It should be noted that it may not be possible to all the proposed outcomes within the timeframe of the Land rights project.
| Community Based organisations (CBOs) | Training on human rights related to relocation  
Training on community engagement  
Awareness raising on relocation policies  
Training on monitoring of service delivery (Education, Health, dip tanks, etc.) | CBOs engaging affected communities and government ministries throughout the relocation process  
CBOs engaging the investor to develop the relocation agreements with the communities  
CBOs engaging the investors through monitoring to honour their commitments  
CBOS engaging duty bearers/policy makes on service provision prior to relocation  
CBOS engaging duty bearers/policy makes on service provision after relocation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Lands and rural resettlements</td>
<td>Engaging them through sharing experiences on best practices on resettlement</td>
<td>Discussions towards Development of a clear relocation policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture Mechanisation Irrigation and</td>
<td>Discussions on issues of compensation procedures for affected communities. Carrying out of an evaluation of property owned by the affected communities to determine compensation</td>
<td>Ministry officials engaging with the affected communities prior and after relocation. Ministry officials enforcing commitments in agreements between the investor and the affected communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ministry of Agriculture Mechanisation Irrigation and</strong></td>
<td>Convening awareness meetings with MoA Convening feedback meetings with MoA - conducting collaborative research on impact of large-scale investments on livelihoods of communal farmers Convening policy meetings with MOA Lobbying MoA to influence other line Ministries to adopt policy Supporting MoA to attend regional symposia on relocation induced by large scale investments</td>
<td><strong>Ministry of development promotion preservation national culture and heritage Rural and</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ministry of development promotion preservation national culture and heritage Rural and of</strong></td>
<td>Train Local Chiefs, Councillors, DAs on policies related to relocation and resettlement</td>
<td>Engagement of affected communities by these duty bearers. Equitable distribution of land by the traditional Chiefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Mines and Mining development</td>
<td>Ministry of Micro Economic Planning and Investment Promotion</td>
<td>Ministry of Health and Child Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Strengthening the capacity of the ministry officials in project appraisal  
• Strengthening the capacity of the ministry to monitor the impact of mining projects | - sharing experiences on how other countries are handling relocation induced by large scale investments in communal areas | Engaging Ministry officials on service delivery meetings with affected communities | Engaging Ministry officials on service delivery meetings with affected communities |
| Ministry officials engaging with the affected communities prior and after relocation. | -Investors developing agreements on compensation with affected communities prior to relocation | -Affected communities accessing primary health care within their proximity | Provision of adequate primary and secondary educational facilities to the affected communities within their proximity |
### Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Support Judges to attend regional symposia/exchange visits</th>
<th>Judges fairly handle cases on disputes related to relocation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with other countries where laws on relocation are implemented fairly</td>
<td>Judges give judgements that protect rights of relocated communal farmers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Engagement Tactics

The tactics that your ZELA will use to engage stakeholders who have an interest in the relocation processes induced by large scale investments will depend on the results of the stakeholder mapping and prioritisation exercises. This is illustrated in the following diagram:

**Figure 1: Illustration of Engagement strategies**

Figure 1 gives an illustration of engagement tactics that ZELA can use in this strategy. The figures shows that stakeholders have to have a common objective, that is they need to understand why they are being engaged or participating in the strategy. Once this becomes clear to the stakeholders, the next step is to determine what tactics/methods will be used to interact with the stakeholders. Generally, there are three tactics namely engage, communicate and inform. Choice of the tactic/method is a result of the various mapping strategies that were used to identify and analyse stakeholders.
Engagement formats for each group of stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ignore</th>
<th>Engage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>include in advisory group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly progress-review meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key informant interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus-building and decision-making forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact sheets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above classification helps to inform an organisation on how to plan its engagement tactics and formats. There are three broad tactics that can be used in an engagements strategy and these are; Engage, Communicate and Inform. The use of each tactic or format depend on the stakeholder’s level of expertise and willingness to engage.

Description of the engagement tactics

Engagement

Applies to stakeholders whom engagement is very necessary. These stakeholders have high expertise (HE) and high willingness (HW) to work with the organisation. ZELA should place high priority on these stakeholders in terms of engagement. In this case, ZELA could engage with the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Lands and Ministry of Mines. Potential engagement formats include collaborative researches, joint ventures and participation.

Communicate

The tactic of communication applies to stakeholders with high willingness (HW) to engage and a high level of expertise (HE). Despite their high willingness to engage, ZELA might not have worked with them in the past. As such, it is necessary to engage with them so that they will value engagement with ZELA. Strategies that can be used for communication include conferences, newsletters.
**Inform**
Informing is a tactic that applies to stakeholders who seek information only instead of conversation. In this engagement strategy, ZELA should rank such organisations as low priority stakeholders. The stakeholders in this group include academics, other CSOs.

**Action Planning**
Planning for action helps the organisation to capture current developments. The development helps the organisation to act on results/information gathered through exchanges.

An action plan helps to translate findings, insights and agreements from engagement into action and to communicate these actions to stakeholders. The plan has to distinguish what the organisation can do internally and what external stakeholders can do. To enable easy tracking of action points, it is imperative that an organisation in planning an engagement strategy, the organisation puts an action for each output. The process should take into account the concerns and perceptions of stakeholders. The building blocks of a good action plan include well-defined roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder, milestones and a realistic period for completion. The key to a successful engagement strategy is constant feedback between ZELA and other stakeholders. The feedback should include progress on the outcomes of the engagement strategy.

**THEORY OF CHANGE (TOC) FOR THE ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY**
Thus far, this engagement strategy has outlined vision/overall objective, identified critical stakeholders and suggested activities for engagement of each stakeholder. This information can be depicted in a Theory of Change. A Theory of change refers to a representation of how and why a change process will succeed under specific circumstances. It identifies a long-term goal and maps prerequisites for achieving such through outcome statements. For ZELA to achieve its ultimate objective of initiating discussions on relocation policy with various stakeholders there are various conditions, which need to be in place.

- ZELA needs to conduct a study to determine socio-economic implications of the relocating exercise that was done in Chisumbanje and Arda Transau. The study will focus more specifically on the comparison of livelihood outcomes between the affected communities and a control community. It should also consider access to social amenities like health and education.
• ZELA has to conduct legal study to determine the gaps within the current pieces of legislation on relocation in Zimbabwe.

The two studies will provide empirical evidence on the implications of the relocation exercises that was done due to these large-scale investments in mining and agriculture.

• ZELA has to validate the findings with the affected communities and local stakeholders like RDC, DAs and Government line ministries.

• ZELA has to share the findings with stakeholders at national level, that is, the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Mines and Minerals Development and Ministry of Lands and Resettlement.

• ZELA should also share their findings with the Parliament Portfolio Committee on Lands and Resettlement.

![Figure 2: ZELA's Theory of Change for the engagement strategy](image)

**1.5 Monitoring and evaluation**

The success of ZELA’s engagement strategy in the Land Rights project depends on how the organisation documents successes and lessons learnt. The key issues that should be reflected in the documentation are;

- What is the original purpose of the engagement?
• What are the methodologies used?
• Who were the participants in the engagement?
• What were the stakeholder concerns?
• What were the expectations and perceptions of the stakeholders?
• What were the discussions? (actions, proposals /recommendations)
Appendix 7: The impact of large-scale investments on the livelihoods of small holder farming communities.

Publication can be accessed at http://www.zela.org/download/theimpactoflarge-scaleinvestmentsonthe-livelihoodsofsmall-holderfarmer/

Appendix 8: Legal, policy and Institutional frameworks for community land rights in the wake of developmental Projects in Zimbabwe: Challenges and way forward.

Publication can be accessed at (ZELA Website currently under maintenance).
Appendix 9- Community Guide on Development Induced Displacement and Resettlement in Zimbabwe

Published work can be accessed at (ZELA Website currently under maintenance).

See Appendix 10 - Picture for some of participants at the National Agricultural Investments Forum
Appendix 11 – Picture of participants following procedures at GZU

Appendix 12 – Picture of participants at the ZEGU guest lecture
END OF FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT