**Preferred livestock interventions for small-scale ~~livestock~~ farmers in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area: a demand-driven and systemic approach**

**Vimbai Gobvu1,9\*, Sharai Ncube2, Venancio E. Imbayarwo-Chikosi3, Robin Bourgeois4,5,6, Prisca H. Mugabe2,Alexandre Caron7,8**

1Department of Livestock, Wildlife and Fisheries, Great Zimbabwe University, P O Box 1235 Masvingo, Zimbabwe

2Department of Livestock Sciences, University of Zimbabwe, P O Box MP 167, Mount Pleasant, Harare, Zimbabwe

3Department of Animal Science, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Eswatini, P.O. Luyengo, Eswatini

4CIRAD, UMR ART-Dev, Saint Louis, Senegal

5 ART-Dev, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, Univ Paul Valéry Montpellier

6Univ Perpignan Via Domitia, CIRAD,Montpellier, France

7ASTRE, CIRAD, INRAD, Université de Montpellier, Montpellier, France

8Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Eduardo Mondlane Universidade, Maputo, Mozambique

9Marondera University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology, Department of Animal Production Sciences, Private Bag 35, Marondera, Zimbabwe

\*Correspondence: [vgobvu@gmail.com](mailto:vgobvu@gmail.com)

**Abstract**

In southern Africa, residents of Transfrontier Conservation Areas practice small-scale farming in semi-arid environments constrained by the presence of protected areas and extensive wildlife/livestock/human interfaces that come with conflicts and opportunities. Under these contexts, livestock production aims at supporting local livelihoods despite the harsh semi-arid environment and conflicts with wildlife. In order to promote local development and the well-being of TFCA residents, prioritization of livestock interventions adapted to the local context is needed. The objective of this study was to test a methodology to identify demand-driven interventions for livestock production (cattle, small ruminants and chicken) in a communal land in Zimbabwe. This study used the outputs of an anticipatory scenario-building workshop and individual questionnaires to establish possible and desired livestock interventions by local stakeholders. Results were largely similar and complementary between ~~both~~ the co-elaborative scenario building workshops and the questionnaire survey. ~~had participants preferring~~ ~~almost~~ Preferred interventions ~~that~~ were: restocking herds with breeds adapted to local production; training in livestock practices and production; support to marketing; feed development and value addition; loan schemes to invest in livestock housing and stockfeed; and finally, animal health interventions to reduce the heavy disease burden. The individual questionnaire data specified preferred interventions for each domestic species. These demand-driven interventions provide a basis for future development projects in the area and avoid top-down approaches by development agencies that fail to address local needs and lack appropriation by local stakeholders necessary for the sustainability of the interventions.

**Keywords:**Livestock production, small-scale farming, scenario planning, participatory approach, bottom-up approach, Transfrontier Conservation Area

1. **Introduction**

Mixed crop and livestock systems practiced by agropastoralists in southern Africa are the predominant form of agriculture and source of income and produce more than 80% of food in the region (Tui et al., 2021). Mixed farming or crop-livestock systems are an integrated agricultural system that cultivates crops and rears livestock on the same farm (Sere & Steinfeld, 1996; Mkuhlani et al., 2020). Extensive livestock production systems (LPS) characterised by a low productivity per animal and per surface use small amounts of inputs, capital, and labour compared to more intensive production systems. Extensive LPS in sub-Saharan Africa are challenged by decreasing rangeland sizes, poor-quality livestock feed (based mainly on crop residues), diseases and pests (Mupangwa & Thierfelder, 2014). These LPS are also characterized by constrained operational environment such as limited access to markets and veterinary services and negative impacts of climate such as unpredictable and variable rainfall and worsening droughts (Easter et al. 2018; Oduniyi et al., 2020; Mogomotsi et al., 2020). Stocking capacity is thus determined by pasture and feed availability. Soil erosion, land degradation, and a reduction in soil fertility are caused by overgrazing, which frequently occurs on rangelands. Socioeconomic constraints, limited extension services, and risky environment for foreign investment are some of the reasons behind the poor adaptation of new equipment and infrastructure (Matope et al., 2020).

Agropastoralist communities in Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCA) practice livestock production in the most semi-arid environments of southern Africa, characterised by rainfall variability and unpredictability. TFCAs were founded on the realization that natural resources that straddle international boundaries are a shared asset with the potential to meaningfully contribute to the conservation of biodiversity, welfare and socio-economic development of rural communities (Hanks, 2003). In TFCAs, LPS farming communities live close to protected areas and experience additional constraints such as human-wildlife conflicts including livestock predation by wild carnivores, competition between livestock and wild ungulates for forage and water and infectious (potentially zoonotic) diseases that can be transmitted between wild and domestic animals (Matseketsa et al., 2019; Caron et al., 2013; Cumming, 2011). Information on vulnerability and adaptation of these production systems is required that are context specific, while accounting for the main farming system components (Tui et al., 2021).

Despite this context, African agropastoralist LPS are required to address an important challenge. Projected demand for animal-derived proteins will increase by 30% in Africa, mainly driven by the growth of the human population on the continent (OECD & FAO, 2021). Successful transformation of the agropastoralist LPS with increased output and productivity to meet the increased demand for animal proteins, requires appropriate intervention modes. However, LPS interventions are often designed centrally and implemented in a top-down manner, leaving farmers outside the innovation process, as passive stakeholders. This results in low outputs or even failure of interventions that do not match local knowledge, experience and production conditions (Hauser et al., 2016). Agropastoralist communities have not always been consulted in social-change processes (Şandru, 2014, Gobvu et al., 2021) and as a result, development partners may not be appropriately informed of the community priorities.

To be more sustainable and locally relevant, LPS interventions must be informed by farmers’ needs as well as prevailing state and conditions of livestock production (An et al., 2024). Community-based approaches have been suggested to identify and prioritize problems (Khashtabeh et al., 2019). Participatory approaches to solving livestock production build a strong base for the intervention in the community (Mubita et al., 2017). In addition, they ensure that interventions are designed to respond to a demand-driven process and not parachuted in a top-down manner, that is not embraced by final beneficiaries. LPS interventions defined through a participatory approach should therefore produce interventions that are locally owned, context-relevant and adapted to local constraints but still match national objectives.


In Zimbabwe, the productivity of agropoastoralist cattle herds remains very low, with average calving rates of about 45% against a potential of 60%, and off-take rates of about 6% against a recommended 20% (GoZ, 2018). Changes in land use patterns following the land reform of the early 2000s have influenced LPS across Zimbabwe, whereby the national livestock herd sizes declined by about 20% for beef, over 83% for dairy, and 26 and 25% for pigs and small ruminants respectively (Ossome and Naidu, 2021). Livestock and livestock products still contribute significantly to the economy of Zimbabwe, with cattle accounting for 35% to 38% of the GDP contributed by the agricultural sector (Runganga and Mhaka, 2021). The Zimbabwe National Agriculture Policy Framework calls for the formulation of interventions that directly respond to the local people’s needs and enhance the flow of investments that are critical to sustaining the growth of the agricultural sector with a decided focus on increasing agricultural productivity and production (GoZ, 2018).

This study is rooted in post-normal sciences and action research, re-instating the scientist in the social field and promoting the concerns of people in the transition to action (Funtowicz & Ravetz, 1993). Our hypothesis was that by enabling local farmers to coproduce interventions and their outputs, those would: i) differ from top-down interventions promoted by the state or other external organisations; ii) result in more empowerment and appropriation by local stakeholders of the interventions; iii) result in more locally-relevant interventions. These hypotheses were not tested in this article but it contributed to the co-design of an intervention and provides a methodology that is replicable and to the benefit of local stakeholders. In the agro-ecological, institutional and socioeconomic context described, this study was part of the Promoting Sustainable Livelihoods in TFCAs (ProSuLi) development project and used an inclusive and participatory approach to identify demand-driven LPS interventions in a communal area in South-east Zimbabwe belonging to the Great Limpopo TFCA.

1. **Material and methods**
   1. **Study context and design**

The Promoting Sustainable Livelihoods in TFCAs (ProSuLi) project recognised that the success of development programs is rooted in positive stakeholders’ interactions, recognising the legitimacy and importance of their respective positions, needs and constraints and the need for negotiations in order to achieve a shared common vision of a sustainable project (Caron et al., 2022). ProSuLi objective was to promote sustainable livelihoods in 4 local communities living in the periphery of protected areas in Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Botswana within the Great Limpopo TFCA and the Kavango-Zambezi (KAZA) TFCA.

* 1. **Study Site**



**Figure 1**: Map of the area including the Ward 15 of the Sengwe communal land (yellow area) and Gonarezhou national park (“National Park”). The southern-eastern part of the map is Mozambique and the area South of the Limpopo River (bottom left) is Kruger National Park in South Africa. All the area shown on the map is part of the Great Limpopo TFCA.

Sengwe Communal Area is located in the Great Limpopo TransFrontier Conservation Area (GLTFCA) in the Southeast Lowveld of Chiredzi District, Zimbabwe, which lies at 21o33’S and 31o30’E. The specific study site, Ward 15, lies at the southern edge of Gonarezhou National Park buffered by the Malipati Safari Area to the South and Malilangwe Conservancy Trust towards the North. The average altitude is 392 m. Chiredzi District is in Agroecological Region V and is characterised by erratic rainfall and low mean annual rainfall of around 450mm (Kupika et al., 2019, Nyarumbu et al., 2019) with high interannual rainfall variation (Poshiwa et al., 2013). Minimum temperatures range between 4.3 and 21.1 °C and maximum temperatures range between 27.8 and 37.3 °C. Major soils are eutric vertisols, chromic luvisols and eutric fluvisols. *Colophospermum mopane* trees dominate in the area. Livelihoods are crop-based (41%), non-farm based (47%, e.g., cross border trading, employment) and cattle-based (12%, e.g., cattle trading) (Murungweni et al., 2016). Drought, poor management of rangelands, and rangeland fires limits the availability of fodder (Tavirimirwa et al., 2013). Masikati, (2011) mentions that seasonal deficiency in feed quality and quantity particularly during the second half of the dry season is the major constraint to communal livestock production.

The common cattle diseases in the area include Rift Valley Fever, Anthrax, Brucellosis, Theileriosis, Bovine Tuberculosis, Rabies. Foot-and-Mouth Disease, Babesiosis and Anaplasmosis (Caron et al., 2011; Gomo et al., 2012; de Garine-Wichatitsky et al., 2013; Gadaga et al., 2016; Pfukenyi et al., 2020). In each village, diptanks are infrastructures that allow livestock to be immersed in a water pool in which an anti-tick chemical molecule has been diluted. This helps to fight against tick infestation and tick-borne diseases (e.g., theileriosis, babesiosis, anaplasmosis), the diseases with the most impact on cattle mortality in the area.

Different organisations have come up with livestock interventions in the study area before; Brahman restocking programs, Boer goats and Boschveld chickens restocking (Mudavanhu et al., 2024). However all of these have been top-down and failed to be sustainable due to lack of community involvement in project selection and design (Silvius and Schipper, 2014).

* 1. **Co-elaborative scenario building towards action**

**Participatory prospective analysis and the Futures workshop**

This study applied two approaches namely: a co-elaborative scenario-building workshop called Participatory Prospective Analysis (PPA) (Bourgeois et al., 2023) to support a group of local stakeholders/actors in producing plausible contrasted scenarios about the futures of livelihoods in the Sengwe site by 2038, followed by a planning workshop and a questionnaire-based survey. The year 2038 was selected as 20 years after the workshop, a period that was estimated to account for a generation locally (it was proposed and agreed by the participants). A questionnaire survey was conducted in September/October 2019 on sampled individual households to identify their preferred livestock interventions.

The PPA was used for engaging key stakeholders through participatory meetings. All expert stakeholders progressively identify and develop a range of scenarios and elaborate actions in response to the scenarios identified (Larson et al., 2023). The co-elaborative scenario-building workshop was conducted in October 2018 and was implemented through a three-day “Futures Workshop”. Purposefully selected community representatives covering community livelihoods and support sectors were in attendance. They were selected because they were expected to be able to share and provide a range of different perspectives on livelihoods and to be “knowledge broker” about specific aspects (e.g., livestock production, education system) in the study areas, based on their knowledge and experience. The workshop gathered 31 participants, 80% of which were male who acquire most of the influential positions in existing community structures. Participants were community members (68%), some occupying committee positions (e.g., irrigation schemes, development trust), traditional leadership (n=3) or famer group positions, the remaining participants (32%) belonging to governmental and non-governmental institutions operating in Malipati (Table 1). The facilitating team included 10 members (including students).

**Table 1**. Institutions engaged in the co-elaborative scenario planning workshop

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **Mandate** |
| Agritex | Agricultural extension services |
| Veterinary Services of Zimbabwe | Livestock health and management extension |
| Malipati Development Trust | Strategising and spearheading village level development projects |
| Communities Initiative for Sustainable Development (CifoSude) | Good governance of the community structures Advocacy of development Information |
| Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources Committee (CAMPFIRE) | Communal natural resource management  Advocating for wildlife management |
| Manjinji and Magogogwe Irrigation Schemes | Food security |
| Malipati and Samu Dip Tank Committees | Livestock health management |
| Gonarezhou Conservation Trust (GCT) | Ecotourism  Community engagement |
| Southern Alliance for Indigenous Resources (SAFIRE) | Capacity to adapt to climate change  Assist traditional leaders in resource governance |
| Malipati School Committees | Education support |

The project team, including researchers and students from Zimbabwe, Mozambique and France facilitated the workshop. The workshop alternated plenary and group sessions taking the participants step-by-step from their perception of the future to the strategic tipping points connecting the future with the present. For detailed information about the methodological steps, see Bourgeois et al. (2017 & 2023). In summary, the objective of the Futures workshop is not to predict the future but to give the possibility to participants to use the future to make sense of, and to sense novelty in the present (Miller, 2015). The future does not exist, does not belong to anyone and therefore can be used by anyone. Using the future is thus a transitional step that allows participants to explore pathways beyond the current trends, to use future thinking to change the present. The resulting scenarios are not predictions and do not intend to become blueprints for action. Their role is to widen the perception the participants have of the present by engaging in a stimulating reflection about the evolution of their environment, and what could happen to their livelihoods beyond usual basic trend analysis. As such they serve to “benchmark” the future, opening horizons, enabling people to think differently and becoming pro-active in TFCA management (Bourgeois et al., 2023).

Participants identified through group work and plenary sessions “factors of change” (i.e., factors that could impact the livelihoods of local communities in the study site). Factors of change were later distributed according to the STEEP classification (Bowman, 1998), namely social, technical, economic, environmental and policy dimensions. Amongst, the factors of change, participants selected five driving forces of local livelihoods in the area (i.e., the 5 factors of change identified as the most influential on other factors of change and local livelihoods). In order to identify the five driving forces to build the frame of the future scenarios, participants engaged in a reflection on the interconnections between the different factors. A voting process took place where each participant was allocated dots of different colours to indicate on a board the factors that were the most influenced by the others and the factors that were the most influential on the others. Based on this voting process, participants selected five driving forces of local livelihoods in the area.

Then, for each driving force, different future states were proposed and discussed in common. Future states in 2038 could be desired or not desired states. Compatible future states of driving force were grouped to form synopsis that were at the basis of scenario after integrating the remaining factors of change under the form of future states linked to the driving forces’ future states considered.

After the workshop, each factor of change was classified as directly, indirectly or not linked to LPS based on their definition and expert opinion (Table 2). Also, scenarios were printed on posters and presented to the larger community (non-workshop participants) for discussion and feedback.

**From anticipation to action: a follow-up participatory workshop**

A few months after the Futures workshop, a follow-up participatory workshop was organized with the participants from the first workshop. This was done in order to provide feedback on the outputs of the first workshop and from the larger community, validate them and organize the way forward towards the selection of activities for the project.

A follow-up participatory workshop was held on the 12th and 13th of April 2019 to plan the way forward following the co-elaborative scenario planning. Participants included local development trusts, local NGOs, community-based natural resource programme; community childcare workers, teachers form primary and secondary schools, local irrigation schemes, veterinary services, seed multiplication farmers, animal health care centre, farmers, religious leaders, agriculture extension services and headmen.

* 1. **Questionnaire survey**

After the co-elaborative scenario building processes, a survey was conducted on potential livestock interventions in order to consolidate the outputs of the participatory workshops with participants who were not present in the scenario planning workshop. A questionnaire survey was implemented using semi-structured questionnaires to collect information on preferred livestock interventions . The questionnaire thematic areas were: demographic information, livelihoods activities, livestock kept and preferred livestock interventions (Supp Mat 1). Structured interviews collected information on livestock species kept and preferred livestock interventions per species of livestock. Respondents were sampled from 9 villages of Sengwe ward 15, as initially selected by the ProSuLi project. This ward was chosen because of its past involvement in research and development projects with the team (such as the DREAM Project on Learning Platforms) and as a ward sharing a border with Gonarezhou National Park, the second largest park in Zimbabwe in the South-East corner of the country. Each village had around 25 households and for the 9 villages there were 225 households. By law, villages in a rural district should have up to 25 households, once they exceed such, another village is built. It was assumed that half of the households (0.5) had livestock (ZimVac, 2017). The confidence coefficient was assumed to be 95% giving a z-value of 1.645. A 0.05 acceptable sampling error was also assumed. The sample size was calculated using the following Cochran’s sample size formula (Cochran, 1977).

Where ***p*** is the population proportion (50%), ***e*** is the acceptable sampling error (5%), ***z*** is the z-value at reliability level of 0.95 (1.645) and ***N*** is the population size (225). The computation provided for a sample size of not less than 123 households. An additional three households were included from the outcome of the purposive sampling to create a final sample size of 126 households, with 14 households per village across the 9 villages in the ward. The survey purposely selected household heads for respondents.

* 1. **Statistical Analysis**

Data from the household survey were analysed with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 25 (IBM Corp, 2017). Data were described using frequencies and means procedures of SPSS. Exploration of livestock numbers per household was done through the median because the frequency distribution of the data was skewed.

1. **Results**
   1. **Co-elaborative scenario building toward action**
      1. **The Futures workshop**

Thirteen out of 35 (37,1%) factors of changes were directly linked to LPS and 15 (42,9%) were indirectly linked to LPS which together indicated that 28 factors of change (80%) for local livelihoods were directly or indirectly linked to LPS. The report of the futures workshop can be found in Supp Mat 2.

**Table 2**: **Factors of change (n=36) and driving forces (in bold) influencing directly or indirectly LPS. The LPS driving force has been shaded for clarity.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Definition** | Dim. | Link to LPS |
| **Capacity to adapt to climate change** | **The capacity of local people to adapt to climate change through actions** | **En** | **D** |
| Quality of air | The quality of air in the area | En |  |
| State of natural resources | Vegetation cover, excluding water and water bodies | En | D |
| State of water and water bodies | The quality and availability of water | En | D |
| State of animal health | Including domestic and wildlife | En | D |
| Human wildlife interactions | The nature of interactions between local people and wildlife | En | D |
| **Governance capacity of the local community** | **The capacity of the local community to organize and influence decisions** | **P** | **I** |
| Natural resources management | By whom and how are natural resources (excluding wildlife) managed | P | D |
| Wildlife management | By whom and how is wildlife managed | P | I |
| Land use policy | Who decides and how about land use at the local level | P | I |
| Land use allocation | By whom and what for is land use allocated | P | D |
| State of health infrastructure | Quality and distribution of hospitals, clinics and pharmacies | P |  |
| Access to health services | Who has access to health services quality of the services | P |  |
| Distribution of wealth | Who is wealthy and where are they located | Ec | I |
| Nature and type of investment locally | Nature and type of investment locally | Ec | I |
| Nature and type of development | Which economic sector is developed how, by whom | Ec | D |
| State of poverty | Who is poor and how is poverty distributed | Ec | D |
| Movement of people | Migration flows out and into the area (number of people, who move in and out of the area) | Ec |  |
| State of transport infrastructure | Quality and distribution of transportation networks | Ec | I |
| Accessibility to and from the area | How easy it is to reach and leave which parts of the area | Ec | D |
| Access and type and quality of education | Who has access to what type of education including the quality of it | T |  |
| State of Information, Communication and Technology (ICT) | Level of development and accessibility to information and communication technologies | T | I |
| State of farming knowledge and skills | Include crops and livestock | T | D |
| **Type of livestock farming system** | **How livestock is managed and by whom** | **T** |  |
| Livestock density | Number and distribution of cattle in the area | T | D |
| **Type of farming system** | **Who is farming and how (crops)** | **T** | **I** |
| Type of energy and access | Who has access to energy and what type of energy | T |  |
| Attitude/behaviour of people | Individual attitude and behaviour of people locally | S | I |
| **State of local culture and traditions** | **The place of the local culture and traditions in the local society** | **S** | **D** |
| Place of men and women in the society | Place of men and women in the society | S | I |
| General level of education | The level of literacy of the people I n the area (including who and also distribution) | S | I |
| Nature of people relationship | The nature of the local social links between people | S | I |
| Density and distribution of the population | Who and how many live where | S | I |
| State of health of people | Who is healthy, where, who is not healthy, why | S |  |
| **State of food security / poverty** | **Who is food insecure, how many and where** | **S** | **I** |
| Demographic policy | The public means used to regulate the number of people living in the area | S | I |

*Note: in bold the 6 driving forces (both “Types of farming systems” were merge by participants as one driving force; the “Dim.” column indicates the related STEEP dimension as follows: S=Social, T=Technical, En=Environment, Ec=Economic, P=Political; the last column “Link to LPS” indicate the factors of change that are directly (D) or indirectly (I) linked to LPS.*

The participants selected five driving forces of local livelihoods in the area: LPS was regrouped with farming production systems as one of the five driving forces because of the interdependency between both type of farming systems (i.e., mixed crop-livestock farming systems); others were “State of food security / poverty”; “Governance capacity of the local community”; “Capacity to adapt to climate change”; “State of local culture and tradition” (Table 1).

In plenary and subsequent validation sessions, participants collated 5 plausible contrasted scenarios based on the future states of the 5 driving forces (in bold in Table 2, future states can be found in Supp Mat 3), and code-named them as : *Selfish Pain, The Male Power, Laissez-faire Kills, Bye Poverty!, A Big One for a Few Ones* (Box 1; English versions chosen by the participant based on vernacular expressions). Full narratives resulted from the inclusion all the remaining 30 factors of change into the synopsis. The process was that the initial narratives were written by the project team and later validated by local stakeholders through participatory feedback and comment sessions.

**Box 1**: Five synopsis which hare the basis of the 5 full narratives (see Supp Mat 4)

*Chaitemura Chavakuseva – Bye poverty!:* In 2038, there is a mix of local and foreign cultures with good governance, empowered local leaders and cross-cutting inclusiveness in land use allocation. Due to the adoption of solar energy, there is well-adapted irrigation which promotes mixed farming using adapted livestock breeds and crop varieties with high-value markets. As a result, the level of poverty has been reduced to 30%. The poor and vulnerable groups (women, orphans and elders) scattered around the park.

*Mazvakemazvake - Laissez-faire kills:* In 2038, an individual culture prevails and people do whatever they want, affecting the governance capacity of the local community and leading to infighting for leadership. The power struggle deviates people from adapting to climate change. As a consequence farming has collapsed. A very disturbing situation exists whereby ninety

*Matimba Avanuna - The male power:* In 2038, local culture and traditions are central to the society, taught at school. The governance capacity of the local community is characterised by abuse of power by male-dominated leaders and corruption in land allocation. People are resisting to adapt to climate change. As a result there is no more farming activities and livestock! Therefore 90% of the population is living in poverty throughout the whole area, except for the 10% who are either employed or have their own business.

*A big one for a few ones*: In 2038, the local culture and traditions are central in the local society and people’s lifestyles entice them to resist to adapt to climate change. A top down governance system has taken over the capacity of governance of the local community and land use allocation. It is supporting agricultural activities based on zero grazing at small scale with small livestock (rabbits, chicken…) and greenhouse/rooftop farming. 60 % of the population remain poor, particularly women, children, elder men and the unemployed. Poverty is spread across the villages.

*Selfish pain*: In 2038, the local culture and traditions have been erased, leading to chaotic fight for power and unclear land use allocation. Ninety percent of the population has first become poor due to no more farming and livestock products. This resulted in everyone abandoning the area, leaving it with no capacity to adapt to climate change.

After discussion and debate about the pros and cons for the different scenarios, the workshop participants finally agreed collectively that they preferred the *Bye Poverty!* narrative(Box 1; See Supp Mat 4 for the full narrative of the *Bye Poverty!* narrative) as an acceptable future for 2038 that the project could take as a vision. Subsequent intra-community workshops were organised by participants of the workshop to feedback the experience and outputs of the workshop and validate the narrative chosen.

* + 1. **Follow-up participatory workshop**

After feedback on the Futures workshop during day 1, participants decided to create four thematic groups (i.e., Governance and advocacy, Livestock production, Crop production and Ecotourism) to identify activities to be implemented during the project. Each thematic group had to come up with activities to start the pathway towards the desired scenario in 20 years. Group committees were created with a membership based on interests and also the need for equitable representation in the presence of the facilitatory team members.

As a focus for this study, in addition to a list of theme and activities (Table 3), the LPS group listed also the material needed to complete activities for their thematic group.

**Table 3:** Sub-themes and activities identified by the livestock production system thematic group

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **Sub-theme** | **Activities** |
| Desired state: Mixed farming prevails with local farmers practising the use of adapted breeds of livestock with higher market value | Production | * Bringing in adapted breeds of cattle, goat and chicken * Building of a small-scale abattoir in Malipati * Setting-up revolving fund for farmer to |
| Supplementary feeding | * Silage making * Planting of pasture grasses * Hay cutting |
| Animal husbandry | * Create feedlots for direct slaughter * Create paddock to control breeding |
| Animal health | * Organise regular dipping for tick control * Vaccination * Available treatment for common diseases * Organise regular deworming |
| Empowerment | Training farmers on   * Animal health and production * Livestock marketing * Value addition, e.g., animal skin tanning * Running an enterprise |

* 1. **Questionnaire survey results**
     1. **Socio-demographic information**

The database can be found in Supp Mat 5.

Females represented 57.9% of respondents. The average household size was 7.21±3.54. Respondents had an education up to primary level (49.2%) or secondary level (30.2%) while 20.6% did not attend school at all. Close to 60% of the respondents were aged between 41 and 60 years old, while 20% were older than 60 years and 20% younger than 31 years. The major source of income for households was livestock production (27.8%), followed by horticulture (23.8%) and minor sources of income being salary, pension or part-time work.

**Table 4: Livestock numbers per household in Malipati Community**


|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Livestock type | Mean | Median | Skewness |
| Cattle | 10.88 ± 13.45 | 8.50 | 3.001 |
| Goats | 14.94 ± 19.96 | 10.00 | 6.731 |
| Chickens | 15.17 ± 21.23 | 10.00 | 5.716 |
| Sheep | 1.06 ± 4.36 | 0.00 | 4.802 |
| Donkeys | 1.97 ± 3.18 | 0.00 | 2.232 |

Livestock ownership across households was generally greater for small stock, with 91.2% of households owning a mean flock size of 15 chicken (and up to 36); 94.4% of households owning a mean of 15 goats (and up to 35). Cattle were owned by 78.6% of households with a mean herd size of 11 (up to 25). Only 8% of the respondents owned sheep while 37.3% had donkeys which they kept only for draught power. The main reasons for keeping cattle were social security (e.g., in case of an unexpected need of money for burial, health issues), milk production and to a lesser extent for draught power (Gobvu et al. 2021).

* + 1. **Preferred livestock interventions**

Most livestock interventions mentioned were for cattle (93.8%), poultry (98.1%) and goats (95.4%), with much less mentions for donkeys (21%) and sheep (10%). Even farmers who did not have a certain species would require interventions on the particular species especially restocking interventions as some would mention having previously owned the same or would want to rear certain species.

Figure 2 presents, for each species, the most cited interventions by species’ owners. For cattle, the most cited interventions revolved around animal health in terms of access to drugs and vaccine as well as the capacity to organise dipping and dosing against important vectors (e.g., ticks) and parasites (e.g., gastro-intestinal parasites). The next important mentioned interventions were revolving around feeding and access to water, especially during the dry season during which both these natural resources are scarce.



**Figure 2:** Preferred livestock interventions per domestic species in Sengwe (species are always in the same order)

For goat production, health issues linked with access to drugs and vaccines were largely the most cited, with issues related to restocking (with locally adapted breeds) and access to water being less cited. For chicken, restocking was the most cited intervention, followed by access to drugs and vaccines and training on chicken production systems. The most preferred intervention for sheep was dipping and dosing (4%) followed by drugs and vaccines (3%). For donkeys, the most preferred intervention was dipping and dosing (13%) followed by water access and training.

1. **Discussion**
   1. **Advantages of participatory approaches**

African agriculture faces the challenge to feed a human population that will double by 2050 (Losch et al. 2013). So-called top-down approaches from central government to district levels or from the northern hemisphere to the southern hemisphere have failed to raise lesser developed countries out of poverty until now (e.g., Van Damme et al., 2014). One of the reasons is that innovation or technology transfer from science to practice or from one region to another is necessary but not sufficient to achieve effective agricultural development (An et al., 2024).

Different organisations working in the Sengwe Communal Area have previously come up with livestock interventions for cattle restocking programs, goats and chickens restocking using ‘improved’ exotic breeds (Mudavanhu et al., 2024). Most of these interventions have been imposed in a top-down manner and had sustainability challenges due to lack of community involvement and buy-in in project selection and design (Silvius and Schipper, 2014). For example, a Brahman restocking programmes through pass-on schemes (World Vision, Heifer International, and SEDAP) brought in Brahman breeds for restocking without much consulting local community about their preferred performance traits or interventions (Mudavanhu et al., 2024). The local community complained of the Brahman being less drought-tolerant than their local breeds. Today, the community has mostly Brahman crosses, and the loss of their hardy indigenous breeds is felt by part of the farmers. Innovation users, farmers in our case, are considered as passive stakeholders with no decision to make in the choice and way the innovation is used by them and without any recognition of their knowledge in the local agricultural context and its practices. As a result, introduced innovation do not match local needs and contexts and fail to bring adoption and a positive change (Duguma et al., 2010).

Participatory approaches have been developed and used to inverse top-down processes by giving to the final beneficiaries of the agricultural innovation, i.e., the farmers and their family, a role in the design, implementation and monitoring of the intervention (Chambers, 1994). Deployment of bottom-up studies across different types of production systems provides the evidence base needed making it possible to consider the perspectives of livestock farmers first in order to better inform interventions (Duckett et al., 2017). Any development endeavour needs to be aligned to the specific goals of the target communities and production environments. This gives them ownership of the project and there are better chances of sustainability of the intervention beyond the project life-time (Silvius and Schipper, 2014).

The co-elaborative scenario building process and the follow-up workshops that were used in this study promoted the involvement of local stakeholders in the design of intervention and collective discussions and consensus among the participants. To support the long-term sustainable management of GLTFCA, the co-elaborative scenario building process gave room for the community to build sustainable development pathways through desired pathways and futures. Through this process, not only did local stakeholders were empowered to think about the future of their own livelihoods but they were given the capacity to work on the linkages between the different factors of change, the main driving forces amongst them and how these driving forces could evolve in a generation time (i.e., 20 years). This provided an opportunity to contextualize LPS within the constraints and opportunities of local livelihoods and design interventions acknowledging these inter-relationships between livelihood components. The fact that LPS were directly or indirectly linked to 80% of factors of change demonstrated the importance of LPS in local livelihoods but also that some interventions could have multiple impact for local livelihoods beyond LPS: e.g., the state of food security and nutrition (Wordofa and Sassi, 2020), distribution of wealth, increased household level income through sale of livestock products (Muema et al., 2021) (Table 3).

If the participatory process did not provide interventions detailed to the domestic species under consideration (i.e., cattle, goat, chicken, sheep and donkey), the questionnaire survey helped identifying interventions at species level. With a year between the two processes, they reflected similar views on livestock health and alimentation (i.e., pasture and water) as pillars to LPS, especially for cattle and goat production. The main difference between activities identified through the working group and through the questionnaire was on the value chain (e.g., building abattoir, create paddock) and marketing aspects (e.g., create feedlots for direct slaughter) and also more technical options for supplementary feeding (e.g., silage making) of LPS which were highlighted from the co-elaborative workshop. This could be explained because the attendance to participatory workshops provided participants with a better capacity to project themselves into the future and consider LPS in a more progressive way or because the co-elaborative working group was a more diverse group of stakeholders including governmental services (e.g., veterinary services), with higher levels of education and exposure to market-oriented interventions. There were more females in the questionnaire survey than males while there were more males than females during the scenario building workshops. The workshop participant membershipreflected male-domination in the societal structures of the community (Gbaguidi, 2018; Gyan et al., 2022). The dominance of female in the survey can be attributed to the male migration to neighbouring South Africa for employment and the fact that women are left head of households (Manamere, 2014).

The creation and subsequent discussion of ‘what if’ learning narratives during the workshops enabled participants to consider creative and novel alternative LPS interventions. The *Bye Poverty!* narrative indicated the importance of livelihood systems which integrate local cultures, good governance, empowered local leaders, mixed farming with integrated livestock and cropping production systems, high-value markets and poverty reduction. These are all illustrated across the various LPS interventions selected by the communities. It is hard to imagine farming without the tight integration of crops and livestock in smallholder agriculture (Melesse et al., 2021) and the livelihood systems are complex and coupled with human/natural systems (Senda et al., 2020). One of the driving force identified collectively by participants were the “capacity to adapt to climate change”. The region is known to be prone to more erratic rains and droughts, as already experienced several times in the last decade. Droughts in particular will exacerbate all identified interventions around health, feeding and reproduction for LPS. In all scenario, the capacity of LPS to cope with droughts is therefore embedded and should be reflected in all interventions. In addition, proposed interventions in our study focused on improving solidarity within the livestock sector through improved planning and formal communication networks between farmers, a way to increase the resilience of LPS.

* 1. **Relevance of identified interventions**

The importance of animal health in this district is well-known and health-related interventions were ranked first for cattle, goats and donkey and second for poultry (Figure 2). The context of the wildlife/livestock interface due to the presence of protected areas and the risk of pathogen spill-over between wild and domestic populations and even to humans in the case of zoonoses puts a an additional burden on the sanitary status of livestock populations (Caron et al, 2013; de Garine-Wichatitksy et al., 2013; Miguel et al., 2013; Gadaga et al., 2015). A highly listed intervention was dipping of livestock that contributes to controlling the impact of ticks and tick-borne diseases on livestock populations responsible for the highest morbidity and mortality in the LPS. In Zimbabwe, the Veterinary Services are in charge of distributing quality chemical (i.e., amitraz) to farmers and controlling for dipping frequency in order to optimize cattle dipping. However, since the land reform in the 2000s, Veterinary Services have struggled fulfilling this mandate (Mutibvu et al., 2012). A survey by Mlambo, (2002) showed that most of the cattle farmers have poor access to veterinary extension services except for contact with the dip attendants during dipping days. As a result farmers have resulted in acquiring and administrating themselves the chemical at diptanks. These practices often include mis-use and under-dosing of the chemical that can result in resistance to acaricide and less efficiency of control measures (Makuvadze et al., 2020). For example, during the time of study, dipping frequency was irregular due to lack of dipping chemicals and there was an issue of water availability at dipping sites due to the difficulty to access water (especially during the dry season) and the quantity of water needed for each dipping (several thousand litres to counteract the evapotranspiration happening in the multiple thousand litres diptank) (Mhere D, personal communication, November, 2019). Sungirai et al., (2017) mentions that interruptions to dipping in communal areas are usually due to long distances from homesteads to diptanks which makes it difficult for them to present cattle frequently for dipping and also issues of drought which cause diptanks to become non-functional due to lack of water. In the study area, there were no dipping systems for goats and sheep, but only dipping and vaccination programs for cattle. Hove et al. (2008), mentions that despite the prevalence of ticks on goats, as well as of the pathogens they transmit, their control by the state-run veterinary services is minimal and tick control mostly targets cattle. Other respondents would not mention the need for dipping and dosing goats and this may be due to the mistaken perception that goats are resistant to disease (Poku, 2009), despite the fact that they asked mainly for interventions around access to drugs and vaccines. Health-related interventions were therefore to compensate or re-activate the previously functioning dipping system and improve access to drug market in this remote area.

The access to food resources (i.e., pasture and water) was the second most cited intervention for cattle and shoats (Figure 2). Competition for rangeland and access to water is prevalent as water is distributed along the main River (i.e., Mwenezi River) that delineates the border between the communal land and the Gonarezhou national park. During the dry season, a few pools of water remain in the riverbed to water wild and domestic ungulates and constrain livestock pasture to a few kilometres around those pools (Zengeya et al., 2014; 2015). A report by the Zimbabwe Resilience Building Fund (2017) showed that the trekking distance for water for livestock in Chiredzi district was above the normal 2km. This distance-to-water constraint in the dry season has important implications for pasture access and disease spread (Guerrini et al. 2019). This limited access to pasture during the dry season is compounded by the lack of access to credits by smallholder farmers to purchase commercial feed for supplement provision (Gilbert et al., 2022). Livestock benefit from improved feed supply through larger quantities and improved quality of crop residues (Tui et al., 2021). The different importance implied in the preference for feed intervention among cattle and goats could be due to the perception and observation that herbaceous grazing becomes more limited for cattle compared to goats, which can forage more efficiently on the predominant woody vegetation. Poultry, on the other hand rated higher in the feed intervention partly because this species needs feed to be brought to them. This supports the well documented LPS constraints in these contexts (Van Rooyen and Homann-Kee Tui, 2009; Chatikobo et al., 2013; Tui et al., 2021).

For poultry, the most preferred intervention was restocking. Boschveld chicken have been only introduced recently in the area (2019). This breed which requires more inputs (e.g., veterinary drugs) and labour is susceptible to the harsh environment and predation in the area (Mudavanhu et al., 2024). Those constraints may explain the need for restoking chicken in the area. Women are usually in charge of the management of chicken locally and they play a major role in rural family poultry production and are generally the main owners and managers of poultry (Assan, 2014; Gueye, 2000; Njuki and Sanginga, 2013). After restocking, the most listed intervention for poultry was access to drugs and vaccines. Chicken diseases such as Newcastle disease induce high mortality in chicken in sub-Saharan Africa (Miguel et al. 2013). During the study, a suspicion of Newcastle disease outbreak killed many birds and left many homes with very few to no birds (Madzinga B., personal communication, November 2019). Respondents had no prior knowledge about vaccination for poultry diseases like Newcastle disease and requested interventions on training on health management of poultry. Only poultry interventions had mention of shelter, presumable due to their higher vulnerability to predation in the area. In implementing their project, “Strengthening resilience to enhance food security and nutrition of vulnerable rural communities to cope with recurrent shocks and stressors in Chiredzi district”, the Mwenezi Development Training Centre have implemented interventions on developing poultry shelter for the local communities (MDTC, 2022).

The very low economic value of donkeys and their capability to withstanding poor treatment contributes to them receiving poor management (Muvirimi and Ellis-jones, 1999). Donkeys are an important asset for traction power and transport, have high drought tolerance compared to cattle, play a critical role in providing draught power for smallholder farmers but their potential is not fully utilized (Maburutse et al., 2012; Hagmann et al., 1995).

1. **Conclusion**

This study formed the first steps of a development project aiming at promoting local livelihoods in the context of TFCAs. Given the failure or lack of appropriation of previous LPS development programmes (i.e., as reported by local farmers), our anticipatory and participatory approach located farmers and members of the community at the centre of the co-production process, with the support of local governmental and non-governmental stakeholders. Being empowered, local stakeholders demonstrated a buy-in and a high level of appropriation of the project objectives and subsequent activities (Caron et al., 2022). This process ensured that LPS interventions were not repeating previous mistakes and were demand-driven and locally relevant. In addition, local stakeholders are now prepared to discuss with external interventions (development or state projects) about their priorities in terms of LPS interventions and negotiate with these stakeholders the terms of any LPS intervention in the area.

**Acknowledgements**

This study was designed and implemented within the EU-ProSuLi project and conducted within the framework of the Research Platform Production and Conservation in Partnership ([www.rp-pcp.org](http://www.rp-pcp.org)). We appreciate the continued support from farmers in Sengwe communal land who participated in the study. We would also like to extend our sincere gratitude to veterinary and extension officers for their overwhelming support. This study would not be possible without their cooperation. A special mention goes to Pastor Steven Chauke who was our local site coordinator and interpreter.

**Conflict of interest disclosure**

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

**Data accessibility**

In Supplementary Information 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 attached to the publication, the questionnaire template, the full narrative report of the futures workshop, the matrix of the future states of the driving forces, the full narrative of the Bye Poverty scenario and the anonymized database can respectively be found.

**Funding**

This study was funded by the European Commission under the EU-ProSuLi project, FED/2017394-443.

**References**

An, Z., Yang, Y., Yang, X., Ma, W., Jiang, W., Li, Y., Chen, G.et al., 2024. Promoting sustainable smallholder farming via multistakeholder collaboration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 121* *(21)*, e2319519121. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2319519121

Assan, N., 2014. Gender disparities in livestock production and their implication for livestock productivity in Africa. 126-138.

Bourgeois, R., Guerbois, C., Giva, N., Mugabe, P., Mukamuri, B., Fynn, R., Daré, W.S., Motsholapheko, M., Nare, L., Delay, E. and Ducrot, R., 2023. Using anticipation to unveil drivers of local livelihoods in Transfrontier Conservation Areas: A call for more environmental justice. *People and Nature* *5,* pp. 726-741.

Bourgeois, R., Penunia, E., Bisht, S. and Boruk, D., 2017. Foresight for all: Co-elaborative scenario building and empowerment. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *124*, pp.178-188.

Bowman, C., 1998. *Strategy in practice* (p. 201). London, UK: Prentice Hall Europe.

Caron, A., Miguel, E., Jori, F., Hofmeyr, M., Pfukenyi, D., Foggin, C and de Garine-Wichatitsky M. 2011. Prevalence of diseases at different wildlife/livestock interfaces in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area. Research Platform Production & Conservation in Partnership (RP-PCP) AHEAD Conference, Mopane Camp KNP.

Caron, A., Miguel, E., Gomo, C., Makaya, P., Pfukenyi, D.M., Foggin, C., Hove, T. and de Garine-Wichatitsky, M., 2013. Relationship between burden of infection in ungulate populations and wildlife/livestock interfaces. *Epidemiology & Infection*, *141 (7)*, pp.1522-1535.

Caron, A., Mugabe, P., Bourgeois, R., Delay, E., Bitu, F., Ducrot, R., Fafetine, J., Fynn, R., Guerbois, C., Motsholapheko, M. and Daré, W., 2022. Social-ecological System Health in Transfrontier Conservation Areas to Promote the Coexistence Between People and Nature. One Health Cases. doi: 10.1079/onehealthcases.2022.0005.

Chambers, R., 1994. The origins and practice of participatory rural appraisal. *World development, 22 (7):* 953-969

Chatikobo, P., Choga, T., Ncube, C. and Mutambara, J., 2013. Participatory diagnosis and prioritization of constraints to cattle production in some smallholder farming areas of Zimbabwe. *Preventive veterinary medicine*, *109 (3-4)*, pp.327-333.

Cochran, W.G., 1977. *Sampling techniques*. John Wiley & Sons.

Cumming, D. H. M. 2011. *Constraints to conservation and development success at the wildlife-livestock-human interface in southern African transfrontier conservation areas: a preliminary review*. Wildlife Conservation Society, New York.

de Garine-Wichatitsky, M., Miguel, E., Mukamuri, B., Garine-Wichatitsky, E., Wencelius, J., Pfukenyi, D.M. and Caron, A., 2013. Coexisting with wildlife in transfrontier conservation areas in Zimbabwe: Cattle owners’ awareness of disease risks and perceptions of the role played by wildlife. *Comparative Immunology, Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*, *36 (3)*, pp.321-332.

Duckett, D.G., McKee, A.J., Sutherland, L.A., Kyle, C., Boden, L.A., Auty, H., Bessell, P.R. and McKendrick, I.J., 2017. Scenario planning as communicative action: Lessons from participatory exercises conducted for the Scottish livestock industry. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *114*, pp.138-151.

Duguma, G., Mirkena, T., Haile, A., Iñiguez, L., Okeyo, A.M., Tibbo, M., Rischkowsky, B., Sölkner, J. and Wurzinger, M., 2010. Participatory approaches to investigate breeding objectives of livestock keepers. *Participatory definition of breeding objectives and implementation of community-based sheep breeding programs in Ethiopia*, *7*.

Easter, T.S., Killion, A.K., Carter, N.H., 2018. Climate change, cattle, and the challenge of sustainability in a telecoupled system in Africa. *Ecology and Society*, *23 (1)*, doi: 10.5751/es-09872-230110

Funtowicz, S.O., Ravetz, J.R., 1993. Science for the Post-Normal Age. *Futures*: 739-755

Gadaga, B.M., Etter, E.M.C., Mukamuri, B., Makwangudze, K.J., Pfukenyi, D.M. and Matope, G., 2015. Living at the edge of an interface area in Zimbabwe: cattle owners, commodity chain and health workers’ awareness, perceptions and practices on zoonoses. *BMC public health*, *16*, pp.1-10.

Gbaguidi, C., 2018. The representation of the African woman in male-dominated society: A study of Chinua Achebe’s Things fall apart and Amma Darko’s Beyond the horizon. *AFRREV IJAH: An International Journal of Arts and Humanities*, *7 (2)*, pp.40-48.

Gobvu, V., Ncube, S., Caron, A. and Mugabe, P.H., 2021. Community-based performance indicators for monitoring and evaluating livestock interventions. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*, *53*, pp.1-9.

Gomo, C., de Garine-Wichatitsky, M., Caron, A. and Pfukenyi, D.M., 2012. Survey of brucellosis at the wildlife–livestock interface on the Zimbabwean side of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area. *Tropical animal health and production*, *44*, pp.77-85.

Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ). 2018. *National Agriculture Policy Framework*, Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement, Harare

Guerrini, L., Pfukenyi, D.M., Etter, E., Bouyer, J., Njagu, C., Ndhlovu, F., Bourgarel, M.et al., 2019. Spatial and seasonal patterns of FMD primary outbreaks in cattle in Zimbabwe between 1931 and 2016. *Veterinary Research, 50*: 73.

Gyan, C., Malik, M. and Siddique, A., 2022. Barriers to the participation of women in community development process in rural Ghana: a regression analysis. *Development in Practice*, *32 (4)*, pp.448-459.

Hagmann, J. and Prasad, V.L., 1995. Use of donkeys and their draught performance in smallholder farming in Zimbabwe. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*, *27 (4)*, pp.231-239.

Hanks, J., 2003. Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs) in Southern Africa. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry, 17 (1-2)*: 127-148, doi: 10.1300/J091v17n01\_08

Hauser, M., Lindtner, M., Prehsler, S., Probst, L., 2016. Farmer participatory research: Why extension workers should understand and facilitate farmers’ role transitions. *Journal of Rural Studies, 47*, pp. 52-61.

Hove, T., Mukandi, R., Bere, M., Horak, I.G. and Latif, A.A., 2008. Ixodid ticks infesting domestic goats in communal land areas of Zimbabwe. *Journal of the South African Veterinary Association*, *79 (3)*, pp.116-120.

Khashtabeh, R., Akbari, M., Kolahi, M., Talebanfard, A. and Khashtabeh, R., 2019. Investigation of participatory needs assessment to prioritize sustainable development indicators of rural communities using hierarchical analysis process. In *International Conference on Researches in Science & Engineering & International Congress on Civil, Architecture, and Urbanism in Asia. Bangkok Thailand* (Vol. 7, p. 18).

Kupika, O.L., Nhamo, G., Gandiwa, E. and Kativu, S., 2019. Local ecological knowledge on climate prediction and adaptation: agriculture-wildlife interface perspectives from Africa. In *Traditional and Indigenous Knowledge for the Modern Era* (pp. 227-260). CRC Press.

Larson, A.M., Monterroso, I., Liswanti, N. and Tamara, A., 2023. What is forest tenure (in) security? Insights from participatory perspective analysis. *Forest Policy and Economics*, *147*, p.102880.

Losch, B., Magrin, G., Imbernon, J., 2013. *Une nouvelle ruralité émergente: regards croisés sur les transformations rurales africaines*. Cirad, Montpellier, France.

Maburutse, B.E., Mutibvu, T., Mbiriri, D.T. and Kashangura, M.T., 2012. Communal livestock production in Simbe, Gokwe south district of Zimbabwe. *Online Journal of Animal and Feed Research*, *2 (4)*, pp.351-360.

Masikati, P., 2011. *Improving the water productivity of integrated crop-livestock systems in the semi-arid tropics of Zimbabwe: an ex-ante analysis using simulation modeling*. ZEF.

Matope, A., Zindove, T.J., Dhliwayo, M. and Chimonyo, M., 2020. Mitigating the effects of drought on cattle production in communal rangelands of Zimbabwe. *Tropical animal health and production*, *52*, pp.321-330.

Matseketsa, G., Muboko, N., Gandiwa, E., Kombora, D.M. and Chibememe, G., 2019. An assessment of human-wildlife conflicts in local communities bordering the western part of Save Valley Conservancy, Zimbabwe. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, *20*, p.e00737.

Makuvadze, F.T., Hove, T., Makaya, P., Waniwa, E., Nemaungwe, T., 2020. Resistance of ticks on cattle to amitraz in Zimbabwe. *Trop Anim Health Prod*, *52* (6): 3323-3330.

Miguel, E., Grosbois, V., Berthouly-Salazar, C., Caron, A., Cappelle, J., Roger, F., 2013. A meta-analysis of observational epidemiological studies of Newcastle disease in African agro-systems, 1980-2009. *Epidemiol Infect, 141* *(6)*, pp. 1117-33.

MDTC. 2022. Retrieved at [Programmes — Mwenezi Development Training Centre (MDTC) (mdtco.org.zw)](https://mdtco.org.zw/programmes/) on 13 February 2023

Melesse, M.B., Tirra, A.N., Ojiewo, C.O. and Hauser, M., 2021. Understanding Farmers’ Trait Preferences for Dual-Purpose Crops to Improve Mixed Crop–Livestock Systems in Zimbabwe. *Sustainability*, *13 (10)*, pp.5678.

Miguel, E., Grosbois, V., Caron, A., Boulinier, T., Fritz, H., Cornélis, D., Foggin, C., Makaya, P.V., Tshabalala, P.T. and de Garine-Wichatitsky, M., 2013. Contacts and foot and mouth disease transmission from wild to domestic bovines in Africa. *Ecosphere*, *4 (4)*, pp.1-32.

Miller, R. 2015. Learning, the future, and complexity. An essay on the emergence of futures literacy. *European Journal of Education, 50*, pp. 513–523.

Mkuhlani, S., Mupangwa, W., MacLeod, N., Gwiriri, L., Nyagumbo, I., Manyawu, G. and Chigede, N., 2020. Crop–livestock integration in smallholder farming systems of Goromonzi and Murehwa, Zimbabwe. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, *35 (3)*, pp.249-260.

Mlambo, B.T.H. 2002. ‘Strengthening the pluralistic agricultural extension system: a Zimbabwean case study’, *Agricultural Research Council*, pp. 1–48.

Mogomotsi, P.K., Sekelemani, A. and Mogomotsi, G.E., 2020. Climate change adaptation strategies of small-scale farmers in Ngamiland East, Botswana. *Climatic Change*, *159 (3)*, pp.441-460.

Mubita, A., Libati, M. and Mulonda, M., 2017. The importance and limitations of participation in development projects and programmes. *European scientific journal*, *13 (5),* pp.238-251.

Mudavanhu, C.R., Mugabe, P.H., Mukamuri, B., Imbayarwo-Chikosi, V.H., Caron, A., 2024. Socio-economic and ecological dynamics associated with adopting foreign livestock breeds by Zimbabwean small-scale communities in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation area. . *Revue d’élevage et de médecine vétérinaire des pays tropicaux*, Minor revisions.

Muema, J., Oyugi, J., Bukania, Z., Nyamai, M., Jost, C., Daniel, T., Njuguna, J. and Thumbi, S.M., 2021. Impact of livestock interventions on maternal and child nutrition outcomes in Africa: A systematic review and meta-analysis protocol. *AAS Open Research*, *4*.

Mupangwa, W. and Thierfelder, C., 2014. Intensification of conservation agriculture systems for increased livestock feed and maize production in Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, *12 (4)*, pp.425-439.

Murungweni, C., Van Wijk, M.T., Smaling, E.M.A. and Giller, K.E., 2016. Climate-smart crop production in semi-arid areas through increased knowledge of varieties, environment and management factors. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, *105*, pp.183-197.

Mutibvu, T., Maburutse, B.E., Mbiriri, D.T. and Kashangura, M.T., 2012. Constraints and opportunities for increased livestock production in communal areas: A case study of Simbe, Zimbabwe. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, *24 (9)*, p.165.

Muvirimi, F. and Ellis-Jones, J., 1999. A farming systems approach to improving draft animal power in sub-Saharan Africa. In *Meeting the Challenges of Animal Traction: A resource book of the Animal Traction Network for Eastern and Southern Africa (ATNESA). Intermediate Technology Publications, London* (pp. 10-19).

Njuki, J. and Sanginga, P.C., 2013. Women, livestock ownership and markets. *Bridging the gender gap in Eastern and Southern Africa. Londres-Nueva York: Earthscan Routledge*.

Nyarumbu, T., Kaseke, T., Gobvu, V., Murungweni, C., Mashingaidze, A. and Chikwambi, Z., 2019. Phenotypic and genetic characterisation revealed the existence of several biotypes within the Neorautanenia brachypus (Harms) CA wild accessions in South East Lowveld, Zimbabwe. *BMC ecology*, *19 (1)*, pp.1-14.

Oduniyi, O.S., Rubhara, T.T. and Antwi, M.A., 2020. Sustainability of livestock farming in south africa. outlook on production constraints, climate-related events, and upshot on adaptive capacity. *Sustainability*, *12 (7)*, p.2582.

OECD, FAO, 2021. *OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2021-2030*. doi: https://doi.org/10.1787/19428846-en

Ossome, L. and Naidu, S.C., 2021. Does land still matter? Gender and land reforms in Zimbabwe. *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy*, *10 (2)*, pp.344-370.

Pfukenyi, D.M., Tivapasi, M., Matope, G., Ndengu, M., De Garine-Wichatitsky, M. and Cetre-Sossah, C., 2020. Seroprevalence and associated risk factors of Rift Valley fever in cattle and selected wildlife species at the livestock/wildlife interface areas of Gonarezhou National Park, Zimbabwe. *Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Research*, *87 (1)*, pp.1-7.

Poku, S.O., 2009. Analysis of the current status of small-scale sheep and goat production by farmers of different age groups in the Jirapa and Lambussie districts, Ghana. *Journal of developments in sustainable agriculture*, *4 (2)*, pp.149-159.

Poshiwa, X., Groeneveld, R.A., Heitkönig, I.M.A., Prins, H.H.T. and van Ierland, E.C., 2013. Wildlife as insurance against rainfall fluctuations in a semi-arid savanna setting of southeastern Zimbabwe. *Tropical conservation science*, *6 (1)*, pp.108-125.

Runganga, R. and Mhaka, S., 2021. Impact of agricultural production on economic growth in Zimbabwe. *Munich Personal RePEc Archive*

Şandru, C., 2014. Participatory needs assessment in local communities. methodological aspects. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov, Series VII: Social Sciences and Law*, *(2)*, pp.97-104.

Senda, T.S., Kiker, G.A., Masikati, P., Chirima, A. and van Niekerk, J., 2020. Modeling climate change impacts on rangeland productivity and livestock population dynamics in Nkayi District, Zimbabwe. *Applied Sciences*, *10 (7)*, p.2330.

Sere, C., Steinfeld, H., 1996. *World livestock production systems: current status, issues and trends*. In FAO Animal Production adn Health Paper. Rome: FAO, vol. 127, 58

Silvius, A.J. and Schipper, R.P., 2014. Sustainability in project management: A literature review and impact analysis. *Social Business*, *4 (1)*, pp.63-96.

Sungirai, M., Abatih, E.N., Moyo, D.Z., Clercq, P.D. and Madder, M., 2017. Shifts in the distribution of ixodid ticks parasitizing cattle in Zimbabwe. *Medical and veterinary entomology*, *31 (1)*, pp.78-87.

Tavirimirwa, B., Mwembe, R., Ngulube, B., Banana, N.Y.D., Nyamushamba, G.B., Ncube, S. and Nkomboni, D., 2013. Communal cattle production in Zimbabwe: A review.

Tswegye, G., Ssemakula, E. and David, B.B., 2022. Adoption of Supplementary Feeding in Smallholder Dairy Cattle Production in Mbarara District. *American Journal of Agriculture,* *4 (1)*, pp. 58 – 88.

Tui, S.H.K., Descheemaeker, K., Valdivia, R.O., Masikati, P., Sisito, G., Moyo, E.N., Crespo, O., Ruane, A.C. and Rosenzweig, C., 2021. Climate change impacts and adaptation for dryland farming systems in Zimbabwe: a stakeholder-driven integrated multi-model assessment. *Climatic Change*, *168 (1-2)*, p.10.

Van Damme ,J., Ansoms, A., Baret, P.V., 2014. Agricultural innovation from above and from below: confrontation and integration on Rwanda's hills. *African Affairs, 113* *(450)*: 108-127

Van Rooyen A. and Homann-Kee Tui, 2009. Promoting goat markets and technology development in semi-arid Zimbabwe. *Tropical and subtropical agroecosystems*, *11* *(1)*: 1-5.

Wordofa, M.G. and Sassi, M., 2020. Impact of agricultural interventions on food and nutrition security in Ethiopia: uncovering pathways linking agriculture to improved nutrition. *Cogent food & agriculture*, *6 (1)*, p.1724386.

Zengeya, F.M., Murwira, A. and De Garine‐Wichatitsky, M., 2014. Seasonal habitat selection and space use by a semi‐free-range herbivore in a heterogeneous savanna landscape. *Austral ecology*, *39 (6)*, pp.722-731.

Zengeya, F.M., Murwira, A., Caron, A., Cornélis, D., Gandiwa, P. and de Garine-Wichatitsky, M., 2015. Spatial overlap between sympatric wild and domestic herbivores links to resource gradients. *Remote Sensing Applications: Society and Environment*, *2*, pp.56-65.

Zimbabwe Resilience Building Fund. 2017. *ECRAS Annual Report*.

Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee (ZimVAC) 2017 Rural Livelihoods Assessment Report.