

**COMMUNITY DIALOGUE  
DETAILED METHOD DOCUMENT**

**Project Name:** Sustainable Poverty Alleviation From Coastal Ecosystem (SPACES)

**Project No.** NE/K010484/1

[Contents](#)

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SAMPLE SELECTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Community dialogue meeting with specific groups' process: .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>a. Presentations.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>b. Focus group discussion.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>c. Copies of presentation distribution.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>d. Informal meeting.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Combined/ general meeting .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>a. T shirt distribution.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>b. Presentation from community/FGD out puts .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>c. Art theatre .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>STAKEHOLDERS MEETINGS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Sample selection .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Methodologies used.....</b>	<b>5</b>

## INTRODUCTION

### **Objective:**

The broad objective of the project was to disseminate SPACES research results to the community and co-create findings and potential solutions, that was then to be shared with impact partners and local and; regional initiatives in coastal Kenya

**Scope:** 6 sites in Kenya: including: Jmbo, Tsunza, Vanga, Shimoni, Mkwiro and Kongowea.

4 sites in Mozambique: peri-urban sites of Ruela and Maringanha and rural sites of Vamizi and Lalane

The team conducted a more intensive feedback with organized gender based small groups for 2 or 3 days then had an extra day for the general community joint meeting bringing together all the smalls groups, village elders, leaders and relevant stakeholders which were successful.

### **SAMPLE SELECTION**

In all sites, the team managed to reach out to an approximate number of 800 participants discussing findings from SPACES research work.

The selection of dialogue participants was based on gender, livelihood activities and age, while on the last day of meeting, representatives from community groups, community members who never participated in the group discussions and religious leaders bringing a balance between the SPACES research respondent and non-respondent.

Below is summary for all the sites activities and targeted groups:

## METHODOLOGY

### 1. Community dialogue meeting with specific groups' process:

50 different participants were invited for each day's meeting with participants being gathered in a hall within the site and selection was based on gender, livelihood, age etc.

The days programmed included presentation from each topic from SPACES findings thereafter individual members were divided into small group discussion of 10-15 members for discussions of 4-5 guided questions and copies of presentation issued while on the last day of the joint meeting, presentations was done by representatives from each individual different groups of discussions then had some art theater play to summarize all the research finding and some of the possible solutions to these identified challenges.

#### a. Presentations

The presentation were done using power point and in case of power failure, the information was to be transferred on a flip chart. The presenters shared the findings by explaining each slide and used question and answer methods to ensure participants understood what was being presented to them and in case the presentation was long, an icebreaker was used to break boredom.

#### b. Focus group discussion

After presentation, 4 focus groups discussion were conducted of 10-15 participants each and this was based on gender i.e. 2 male & 2 female though in Jimbo site, there were 5 focus groups of mixed gender with each having over 15 participants since facilitators were not enough to accommodate the number of participants who attended the meeting. Guided questions were used to start the discussions with recorders used to capture the proceedings of the discussions with a note taker and later on one to present the outcomes of group discussion during the combined meeting chosen by group members with the help from the facilitator. After the group discussion, participants were given an extra time to digest and discuss the outputs of the FGDs. Here, the note-taker was to read through all the captured points during the discussions thereafter including any of the points which might have been missed during the discussions and later on all the leaders from same gender group were asked to merge and harmonize their notes for presentations during the combined/joint meeting.

#### c. Copies of presentation distribution

This was issued during the FGDs meeting where participants were given copies of the presentation to keep with them to either refer to, share with other members of the community who never attended the meetings or in case of point clarifications during the FGDs discussion.

#### **d. Informal meeting**

Informal meeting had been planned to take effect after the meetings and this did not materialized due to participants lack of time as were had other activities to perform- chase for livelihoods, household chores while in some site due to scattered household especially in Tsunza and bad weather conditions.

### **2. Combined/ general meeting**

This included any individual member of the entire community -community/ religious leaders and all participants during day 1. 2 or 3 activities with activities being, T. shirts distribution presentation from community/FGDs output discussions and art theatre play

#### **a. T shirt distribution**

T-shirts were distributed to all the participants involved in the dialogue activities and individual members of the community who had chance to attend the joint meeting. T-shirt slogan was “our environment, our wellbeing, our future and had SwedBio and SPACES website and logos printed on them to make it easier for other stakeholders and impact actors to access more information on SPACES research work and findings

#### **b. Presentation from community/FGD out puts**

The group representatives gave feedback on what was discussed during the FGDs meetings and the aim of this activity was to allow community members learn from within and by themselves. The presentations captured most of things discussed during the FDG meetings.

#### **c. Art theatre**

The group managed to come up with skits based on the key messages drawn from the presentations and FGDs outputs for each site. As the last activity of the dialogue process, the play summarized all information shared during the dialogues meetings with some solutions to identified challenges. The theater also was an effective tool to communicate the findings more the illiterate and semi illiterate members of the community.

### **STAKEHOLDERS MEETINGS**

The objective of the 1-1 meeting was to:

1. Disseminate and discuss findings to key stakeholders
2. Discuss issues that the stakeholders are facing and see whether SPACES work can address some of the issues.
3. Understand what other information is of interest to the stakeholders and provide it to them after the meetings
4. **Share the messages from the communities’ dialogue of relevant to the stakeholders**
5. To discuss policy and decision-making on key aspects

## 6. Identify future opportunities for SPACES research to have impact.

### Sample selection

Stakeholder analysis was conducted where a number of actors were identified. This was narrowed down to 20 target stakeholders based on relevance of SPACES data to their work. The stakeholders included government agencies, Non government organizations, donors, learning institutions and private agencies.

### Methodologies used

The one on one meetings were conducted in 3 main stages namely planning of the meetings, conducting of the meetings and evaluations of the meetings. Planning of the meetings involved synthesis of the research findings, mapping of the findings with stakeholders, sending out requests for meetings, making follow-up and agreeing on dates and venues, making logistical arrangements for the different teams to visit the stakeholders on-site.

The meetings were conducted through power-point presentations followed by discussions with the stakeholders and compilation of meeting proceedings.

The evaluation of the meetings involved a detailed discussion with all the team members involved in conducting the meeting on their views and experiences and on what went on well and what did not go on well as per our planning.