

HIMO CONVENTION
Himo, Tanzania, 1/2 December 2012
Report of Conversations:
Generations, Continuities & Governance

Written by Barbara Heinzen
New Baltimore, New York, USA, March 2014
Email: barbara@barbaraheinzen.com

CONVENTION PARTICIPANTS

The Fourth Barbets Duet Convention was hosted by Rose Lyimo at her site in Himo, Tanzania. Six people (representing five of the eight learning sites) were able to attend.

Attending	Barbet Site	Absent	Barbet Site
<i>Rose Lyimo, host</i>	<i>Himo, Tanzania</i>	<i>Msi Choke Seaweed Growers Cooperative</i>	<i>Mlingotini, Tanzania</i>
<i>Mwajuma Masaiganah</i>	<i>Mwasama Pre & Primary School, Bagamoyo, Tanzania</i>	<i>Sammy Muvelah</i>	<i>Lukenya, Kenya</i>
<i>Oby & Hilda Obyerodhyambo</i>	<i>Nkoroi & Seme, Kenya</i>	<i>Chris Jones</i>	<i>Woodland Valley Farm, Cornwall, England</i>
<i>Magode Ikuya</i>	<i>Molo, Uganda</i>		
<i>Barbara Heinzen</i>	<i>Hannacroix Creek, New York, USA</i>		

Rose Lyimo bought these three to four acres when her children were small, but they are now all grown. At the time, the land was at the edge of town; now it is in a growing urban area on the lower slopes of Mt Kilimanjaro. For many years, others in her family grew crops here. However, after failing to secure land in Rufiji, south of Dar es Salaam, she decided to create her learning site at Himo. While our meals and discussions were at the new house, most of us slept in a nearby hotel.

In addition to getting site reports from each person, the group took a tour of Rose Lyimo's place including a long-established irrigation stream managed through a Chagga traditional governance system. We also visited a local plant nursery and the entrance to the Kilimanjaro Park, continuing our discussions in the process. The overriding topic of the meeting was 'governance' of the Barbets Duet as a collective.

SITE REPORTS – INDICATORS & GOALS

The discussion began with the site reports. While listening to these, we tried to identify significant goals that each site would try to achieve before we met again, as well as any the indicators that the goals had been met. In the end, we only identified indicators and goals for three sites, as follows:

Barbet Site Reports – Indicators & Goals – set at Himo, Tanzania, December 2012		
Rose Lyimo, Himo, TZ	Magode Ikuya, Molo, UG	Obyerodhyambos, Seme, KQ
Talk with the school about creating a <i>shamba darasa</i> .	Make the fishpond operational: Secure site house, properly built. Site is fenced and secure and protected. Fishpond is restocked.	A serious <i>moringa</i> plantation Increase trees on the right hand field
Start a club of neighbours.	The tree cover around the site, must have been planted and the	Find more markets for vegetables

Barbet Site Reports – Indicators & Goals – set at Himo, Tanzania, December 2012		
Rose Lyimo, Himo, TZ	Magode Ikuya, Molo, UG	Obyerodhyambos, Seme, KQ
	learning site is beginning to look like a learning site.	
Tree identification & labelling.	Make a land use plan and know where you are putting different things. A land use plan. Keep it wild (pond is the economic front for the rest) What is in grasses and others things?	Increase onions, add pumpkins, test watermelons [unclear here] to double resilience economically
Starts an indigenous plant nursery.	Build infrastructure – build the road.	Start a woodlot and seedlings
	Get land demarcations formalised, documented & witnesses.	Add fruit trees.
		Identify and label trees.

There were no goals and indicators identified for the Shamba Darasa at Mwasama School or for the Hannacroix Creek site in New York.

GENERATIONS & CONTINUITY

Mwajuma Masaiganah was the first to report on her learning site. She described the creation of a “Learning Garden” at the Mwasama Primary School she founded in Bagamoyo, Tanzania. She said she began with a vegetable garden, but after the Safari Convention’s visits to Barbet Learning Sites in Seme, Kenya, and Molo, Uganda, she said “*I started thinking about something bigger.*” She began talking with Mwasama’s head teacher who named this bigger idea the *Shamba Darasa* – a garden classroom. The first crop the children grew was sugar cane, which they could cut and chew as a sweet. Now, both the children and teachers are proud of the *Shamba Darasa* which is now evolving into a botanical collection of trees and plants. Visitors to the school are also impressed. One person bought mango and orange trees and then “*planted them with her own hands. So it has another impact altogether.*”

As Oby pointed, planting something in a place creates a different kind of connection. “*[Because] of the [tree planting] work we did [in Seme] with American and British students, they start asking, ‘how are our trees?’*” Two young men from the village who went on to university in Nairobi have the same question when they return: “*What has happened to our trees?*”

Magode Ikuya added two other advantages of the *Shamba Darasa*: “*Children are naturally very inquisitive. ... Whenever there is an activity, the children are the first to come. ... then they tell the elders. ... Second, before in Africa, the combining of assignments and activities was part of the training of a child. There was no way that you would wait until you are 22; the work is part of their assignment.*”

Rose Lyimo, thinking about her place in Himo, which is next door to a school, was also impressed. “*I will take the idea and try it,*” she said.

Mwajuma’s report led Hilda Adhiambo to lead in another direction: “*I would like to think through how to leave behind what we are doing.*”

To which Oby Obyerodhyambo added: “*We need structures – like the Shamba Darasa – that make this generational thing happen.*”

Magode Ikuya described the challenge slightly differently: *“Our idea is in our heads, it is not yet a social idea. No member can yet say and visualise the same idea in the same way. So ... how are we going to identify individuals ... who can continue these ideas? ... This is not just children, but at the management level. We need someone who can articulate the ideas and carry on, even if you are sick.”*

Oby argued that we need first to be able to articulate very clearly a vision of what we do, but we also need *“people on the ground who can articulate the vision.”* At his place in Seme, western Kenya, his younger brother, Henry (aka Cus) decided not to take a job with an NGO in Nairobi, but instead returned to Seme after finishing his university degree in Community Development. Oby described how valuable it has been to have Henry living in Seme. *“... we can talk about children’s engagement, but engaging can take another level. My younger brother, Cus, he is the one who is doing it. He is totally committed, he understands it. When we sit down and talk with someone he listens and later says, ‘There is this, and what is that about?’”*

Rose had already started developing another idea for spreading our thinking, one that has its roots in older traditions. *“I was looking at having a club of the neighbours ... so that when you come back next time, the whole area will be changed.”* She then spelled out how this club would work. *“What I am thinking, first we work together in my shamba, next time, we work together in another lady’s shamba. That is what we used to do.”*

By the end of the next day, Rose had already put her idea into action. After visiting a local nursery and buying some two dozen young trees, all of us, plus two neighbours, planted the trees in Rose’s *shamba*, filling in the bare ground that had been exposed after the building works for her new house had ended.

GOVERNANCE – WITH OUR STATES & NEIGHBOURS

Throughout our discussion, issues of governance came up repeatedly, at all levels of interaction around our sites. There were issues surrounding land tenure and management, both customary and state-defined, as well as issues around disputes with neighbours. There are also open questions about the identity and purpose of the Barbets Duet experiment itself: how we should define, govern and finance ourselves?

One of the recurring negotiations in Africa since colonial times has been around rights to land. In the Barbets Duet, we describe two different systems, simplified as ‘column rights’ and ‘mosaic rights’. In a column rights system, one person or entity owns the exclusive rights to a piece of land and everything on it. Column rights have supported modern markets and industrial development, with their purest form found in the USA. Mosaic rights, by comparison, share the wealth of the land among a clan or group, thereby distributing various rights in an inclusive manner. Mosaic rights are a legacy of pre-colonial African societies and we believe they have been better at maintaining high biodiversity and social equity. The tension between these different systems continues as African societies look for ways to define themselves as modern societies. (See presentation on “Mosaic Rights in the 21st Century” [here](#).)

This tension was illustrated by Rose Lyimo’s story of how she came to put her Barbet site in Himo, on 3-4 acres of land, rather than in Rufiji (south of Dar es Salaam) where she was negotiating with a village for the use of 100 acres of land near a national park. Rose reported, *“I went back to Rufiji and ... asked them what is what? And they said, now if you want that land, you have to buy it. ‘Where is this money going?’ I asked. ‘It is going to the village? Am I going to get a receipt for it?’ ‘Ah we*

don't have a receipt.' And they said 'We can only give you fifty acres, not 100.' Previously, they were going to give it for free."

Mwajuma Masaiganah reported that there were now stricter rules about land transfers in Tanzania because many people were taking advantage of customary land use arrangements under which land had been shared. *"Village governments have been selling up land ... so now even if you buy from a private owner, you have to pay a royalty to the village."* She then offered an example from Bagamoyo: *"Mr Patel, a colleague of Tanzania's president, has bought land from Bagamoyo – 260 millions shillings – and he had to pay 26 million to the village of Mlingotini. The village got 26 million even though he bought the land from an individual. The village government has to agree [to the sale] and has to go into the use of that money. If they don't do it, it is a misuse of the money. ... Any use [of the land] has to be approved by the village."*

Mwajuma summed up the situation as follows: *"In TZ we have 2 land laws: the big law and the Village Land Act which the village can use up to a certain level. Above 50 acres it is covered by local government not the village."*

Magode Ikuya sees the tension over land raising questions about the role of the state in African societies. Since independence in the 1960s, African states have taken on responsibility for development and usually defined development in terms of imitating Western societies and economies. This has created a tension with older institutional arrangements. Against that history, Magode was especially impressed by the traditional canal running through Rose's property. In return for use of the water, neighbours are obliged, every week, to keep the canal clean, effectively managing a viable irrigation system under customary rules recognised by the Tanzanian state. As Rose reported, if someone complains to the police about the use of the canal, *"they will be told, that is not our problem, take it to the village."*

Such recognition of traditional institutions is not universal, however. Thinking of Uganda, Magode reported that *"There are institutions like this one on managing water, but because this institution is not recognised by the legal system, the [customary] sanctions are taken as a crime. So we now need to get legal recognition for such institutions."* He later concluded that although traditional institutions were an important part of voluntary compliance, *"The state came to usurp the role of the traditional institutions."* In the process, both systems have lost legitimacy so that in the end, so people no longer respect either traditional or modern institutions.

Hilda Adhiambo commented that respect for traditional institutions seems to have survived longer in Tanzania than in Kenya and Uganda. *"In both Kenya and Uganda we have the [colonial] chief system, where they took power and really abused it. In Tanzania you had ujamaa,"* a policy established by Julius Nyerere to modernise Tanzanian society by building on traditional institutions.

Rose, however, argued that it was *"not just ujamaa, but the Chagga system."* The survival of the Chagga system around Kilimanjaro is what brought her back to this area where she grew up and where many traditional arrangements are still respected. *"That is why I am here in Chagga."*

Magode Ikuya built on what Rose was saying, returning to his thinking about the role of the state. *"That should not surprise us – it is the tensions of two worlds [African and Western]. The strains are creating a crisis. The crisis has got to be overcome. That is why in our organisational forms, we must look at other methods to ensure compliance. There are many forms to do that. We do not have to use the states."*

Magode argued that as new practices become acceptable *“others will impose compliance.”* Barbara Heinzen developed this thought further: *“This business of compliance comes out of doing what we are doing. As we continue, respect will create compliance.”*

This conversation about compliance came out of the experience of many Barbet sites where our experiments have been undermined by the behaviour of neighbours. In 2012, just before his first harvest at his new fishpond, Magode discovered that all the fish had been stolen and the land around the ponds, including newly planted tree saplings, had been burned. At Sammy Muvelah’s place, the fence is repeatedly broken so that his neighbours can graze their cattle on the restored land he protected. His neighbours also allow their animals to walk into the dam he and others dug, dirtying the water and weakening the sides. At Oby and Hilda’s place in Seme, neighbours’ animals grazed the *Markamia lutea* trees that had been planted, virtually destroying the planting work that had been done. Neighbours had also misused the three ponds that had been dug in Seme. In all three places, Barbet partners had consulted with neighbours and were happy to share vital resources, like water, that they had developed. Partners also shared knowledge of new techniques, but still suffered from casual misuse and damage to their efforts by their neighbours.

Traditional institutions had ways of marking the use of land, which was then respected by the neighbours, limiting such damage. Where there was a dispute, a lengthy discussion of the rights and wrongs would take place, something that Oby reported Sammy Muvelah had done at his place. *“When we were talking with Sammy Muvelah, people were coming and grazing his trees. So he goes and sits there, they have a baraza, and the person who has committed grazing, they have a fine. They have a meeting; they sit until 11 at night. But they say, it is only grass, and Sammy say, but they are destroying my trees. And they are fined – a chicken.”*

More broadly, Oby felt that many of the things being tried at the Barbet Learning sites were not well understood and therefore not valued. *“In some of the things we are doing, people don’t understand it, so it doesn’t have value.”* When he first dug dams to capture water, his neighbours thought it was a mad thing to do. *“But as they see what water can do, they see value in it.”*

Oby called this the theory of positive deviance: *“In Vietnam, they found women whose children were not having malnutrition, because when they cooked rice, they added some seafood. They were an oddity, a deviance, but they started urging women to start adding seafood to their rice. So it was not an external thing, but something that works in the community.”*

“What we are doing is like positive deviance in our communities. ... People think you are crazy, but people start to change when they see the fruit of the trees you have planted or the water in your well. The impact over time is when you see 1000 people having an arboretum. Positive deviance is the idea. You don’t try to conform. Conformity is what led us where we are.”

What is also clear, however, is that creating respect for this deviance takes time and negotiation. Magode Ikuya described a dispute he experienced when he began developing his fishponds on clan land, with the approval of the clan leaders. *“As we put an embankment to move water to my pond, a very little piece, just one foot of land, [was affected and] they were screaming at me. They would not scream at others, so I paid him for the right to flood his land. This is clan land. The clan controls it and approves the uses of it. I want to formalise it by paying them for loss of the right to use it. On another side I have paid, but I am not using it. They think that part of the contribution I will make is a road that will link one side of the village to another, because they will have a foot path, a driveway that will help the other side.”*

Since then Magode has been offered more land for other sites he might use. *“I cannot start to think about that until I have the fishpond in order. But that is subject to a lot of consultation.”*

Because issues of land were involved, Mwajuma worried that Magode needed better demarcation of the land he was allowed to use and he needed to create some kind of formal record. Traditionally, demarcation would have been done using traditional grasses or other plants, but this was not always effective. Magode agreed. *“Most of those people don’t have those demarcations of traditional grasses. People just know. So you need your witnesses. But witnesses can die off or be bought, so it is better to have it in writing.”*

GOVERNANCE AMONG OURSELVES

Much of the discussion at Himo explored the issue of how we should be governing our collective work. Early on, the Barbets Duet agreed that each site would evolve according to its own conditions, and that each site would be self-financing. However, we also agreed that there was value in coming together and we anticipated that some goals would be better achieved collectively than separately.

Informal Governance

Since then, what governance exists has been informal and cooperative – organised around achieving particular goals such as arranging for all of us to meet roughly once a year. At such times, partners have allocated their responsibilities according to what was needed and what each person could offer. Each partner has also accepted responsibility for making our work better known, with myself, Barbara Heinzen, taking on the task of making our work familiar to people outside East Africa, largely through personal meetings, presentations and occasional reports posted on a website.

This informality has largely served us well. It has kept the process of evolution fairly open and avoided the burden of too much time spent on accounting and reporting. It has also safeguarded the independence of our thinking. When Magode found that his first harvest of fish had been stolen and his fishpond ruined, he was faced with the challenge of raising new capital to rebuild and protect the ponds. Reporting on a conversation about finance with a Ugandan colleague, he said, *“I restated my determination to stay on course about the independence of our programmes [rather than] adjust to someone else’s tune. ... [Our colleague] was very categorical: the way we are doing it is the best form - use your own internal resources, you can do solidarity, but the initiative is with people of like-mind. If you try to get ahead quickly, you can be badly served.”*

This conversation overlapped with a discussion of the evolving relationship with the Msi Choke Seaweed Growers Cooperative. They originally joined the Barbets Duet through their neighbour, Mwajuma Masaiganah, who represented them. However, it has become clear that Msi Choke are founding partners of the Barbets Duet in their own right and need to be included in all Conventions, with time allowed for translating from English to Kiswahili and back again.

Including Msi Choke in the context of thinking about governance was especially timely. As Oby observed *“Msi Choke is a very different learning site. It is a cooperative, a community of people working together. ... How do we learn from a community process? It has completely different governance structures. ... For me, I can simply make a call and we can do something [because Seme is our family place]. So we need to learn about Msi Choke’s processes and capture those processes [of working cooperatively].”* Magode later added, *“They can enrich our ideas about other organisational forms.”*

The ability to learn from each other – to report on our own work and get the advice of our partners – is at the heart of the Barbets Duet. It is also essential to the larger experiment in systemic change. At each Barbet Convention, the reports from the learning sites have taken a large part of very limited time. And yet, they are essential on many levels. As Oby observed *“the reality is that every time we meet, it is after a year or year and a half, and there is so much reporting. But it is through the doing that we are learning.”* Barbara then observed that *“the sharing is also the raw data for the big constitutional issues, so we need to do the [site reports and conceptual thinking] together.”* The site reports, and reactions to them, also function as a peer review mechanism. This, however, is only effective as long as the number of sites is small. *“You cannot think about many sites, the peer review will not work with large numbers,”* said Oby.

For that reason, the partners had agreed at the Partners Meeting at Nkoroi in 2009 that we would not get into the process of approving new Barbet Learning sites. Instead, we would rely on inspiring others by our example, which shows signs of happening in various places.

Magode observed that, *“The reason why we may be inspiring others, is that we are not yet boxed in. If someone is interested in certain aspects of our work, we can share it.”* For that reason, our *“first step is making successes of what we are doing now.”* However, we also need to anticipate a time when *“we actualise the many thing we want to be done.”* At that point, we will be required *“to take the next necessary step to assist the shape of what we will become.”* We need to start thinking about that shape now or we *“will become stunted and remain there”*. *“That issue will come, if we are at all successful,”* he said.

Hilda picked up one part of his statement. *“Let’s think about consolidating what is already there. This is when we are actually defining for ourselves what a successful site should be.”*

Formalising the Informal

No one questioned Hilda’s conclusion on the need to consolidate what we are doing, so the discussion shifted to the trickier questions of governance, organisational form, identity and finance. Hilda added a very pragmatic perspective to the mix: *“if we asked ourselves, do we want to formalise this process, we need to ask: for what purposes?”*

One answer to that question is that our current self-reliance has its limits, especially when we are told of opportunities to apply for money from foundations or other bodies. In order to apply, we need to be a formal organisation with appropriate reporting and accounting procedures that establish our trustworthiness with people who do not know us personally. For that reasons, we had recurrent comments on the need to develop indicators of progress and common standards of things we all seek to achieve.

Hilda: *“If we are going to put up another proposal, we need say something that cuts across all the learning sites. We need to show the indicators that are unique to every site, but we should also have 2-3 indicators that bind us as a group.”*

Magode agreed, talking about our ability to evolve individually while working towards common goals. *“In that evolution, there are specific things that must be done at certain points, to harmonise your activities, they cannot remain only localised. We must have some standards that are coming in common. We started differently, but over time we must have something in common.”*

During the site reports, an attempt was made to ask each site what it wanted to have achieved by the next time we met. *"This is,"* said Oby, *"the first time we are defining indicators of what we are doing. It is going towards our vision ... it is a turning point."*

By the end of the first day, the discussion had turned to the question of identify: what, exactly, is the Barbets Duet? Mwajuma and Oby were clear that we are a network, but Barbara hesitated, as the networks she had experienced were little more than talking shops where people exchanged business cards.

"That type of network is not what we are talking about," said Magode. *"That is a network of convenience. What we are talking about is that there is some common driving purpose, force."* He then went on to describe that purpose: *"What was our orientation? To demonstrate the possibility of creating an economy out of environmental things. That being a very new concept and very complex, it must have money in the process, otherwise how are you going to run some common things?"* However, the newness of this concept, forces us to ask how we relate to existing social and economic structures. *"The economy of the environment includes using that very destructive economy to reverse what is there. ... So we must be skilful also, how do we deal diplomatically with groups who don't understand our spirit?"* There is a risk, said Magode, that we are perceived as little more than a cult or fringe group ... *"because we are talking good things, but do not want to be in the mainstream. We must show some presence there, because those people are influential. This is now what we have to discuss, within the general principle, that the way our sites take shape will influence a lot the final structure."*

Oby: *"This goes back to what does the network do? Documentation and representation. You are not just a fringe group, you speak as a network of sites across the sites. That is why it is so important for the network to document what you are doing. ... And we need to be clever describing the thread that weaves us together. ... In forums about the environment, we should be there to present an alternative view. When people talk about economic development, we should be able to say, look at this site, look at this site, and how it has affected the community around it and how it is impacting life. And this is why monitoring becomes an important activity. ... When you succeed, we all succeed. That is why we are working together. ... We all know this journey is tending to the same direction. We advise and encourage each other, we inspire each other."*

Hilda added specific examples: *"If someone wants to know how to organise a community water system, we refer them to Rose's place here. Or how to inspire children, go to Mwasama."*

Rose Lyimo wanted us to be more concrete in our thinking. *"The issue of governance is our issue and whether we like it or not, we have to tackle it at the end of the day. How do we want to appear in front of other people? Because it matters. It tells who we are. We have to sit down and come up with ABCs of the institution or institutional framework and how we want to move from point a to point b to point c and how we want to look like."*

Oby agreed with her impatience. *"There are things that are lingering, things we need to formalise, we need to go to the next level. We need to have a corporate image ... What we are now is probably not adequate ..."*

Throughout the evening, there was an exhausting debate on whether we were – or were not – a network. And if we were a network, what kind of a network were we? Repeatedly, the examples given came from the world of non-governmental organisations and non-profits many of which drew on donations from foundations and international agencies to support their work financially.

Oby returned to his experience reviewing applications made to the Wellcome Trust, many of which were to fund networks, maintain a database or organise a meeting. *“For us,” he said, “we know that we are going to be meeting every year. The thing we have to figure out: do we want to formalise the networking?”*

Reflecting on the model Oby had just outlined, Barbara worried that describing Barbets as a network which called on philanthropic money to support its work would simply *“turn us into a charity.”* Was that what the partners wanted and had intended? The question was left hanging as everyone agreed it was finally time to go to bed.

Because Rose’s house was not yet completed, most of us slept in a nearby hotel where Oby, Barbara and Magode stayed up late debating the identity of the Barbets Duet and what that meant for the organisational form it needed to develop. The next morning, Magode Ikuya summarised their midnight discussion. Unfortunately, his comments were not fully recorded as the electricity failed and the laptop battery gave out, but his initial reflections helped all of us understand why this seemingly simple question of ‘what are we’ was so hard to answer.

“What is the outward expression of this madness which we have in our heads?” Magode asked. *“What is it that you have in mind that you are expressing that is not expressed in any other form? If you cannot visualise it, no one will see you, so we must agree on some kind of form.”*

He described the need to audit and record what each site is doing, so that our work can be seen by others, rather than remaining a record in our own heads alone, *“We need to document our thoughts at present ... to look at every level of achievement, and record that. Then we have an objective basis for anyone to say that is a traceable record.”*

Magode then referred to the midnight discussion back at the hotel. *“We found that we were having two problems. We were trying to define our world, but using the yardstick of a different world. The yardstick of the other world [uses] monetary principles to express success or non-success. [With] business accounting, there is profit: you put in so much, you gain out so much. But now this environmental question, how do you measure that? If you use that business logic, why do you put in so much money in this work to get so little? You have put in so much money, but you have only 2-3 trees taking shape. It might be a pleasurable thing, but it is not economic.”*

The following dialogue between Hilda and Magode clarified the distinction between business accounting and what we would consider success in our Barbet sites.

Hilda: *“Are you saying we cannot measure what we put in, or we cannot quantify the output?”*

Magode: *“First of all, the quantification itself does not exist [for what we are doing].”*

Hilda: *“We have been able to attract the community around us, can we not record that?”*

Magode: *“Yes, but in terms of business accounting ... how do you weigh the gain and loss? So our view was that we would not use that kind of weighing scale, the business logic. If you were to weigh us only by business logic, using a profit and loss accounting, they would say you are being illogical.”*

Hilda: *“But our profit cannot be quantified in monetary terms. It can only be quantified in terms of your influence in the community, that the environmental quality has changed, that the women and children are changing.”*

Magode: *“In social economics that is fine, but the business profit/loss accounting is not sufficient.”*

At this point, the laptop battery ran out and the electricity was still not restored. However, this exchange on Sunday morning helped to define the challenge of the Barbets Duet as it relates to the formal world. Clearly, there are existing models to support what we are doing, but these models rely on the benevolence of others. East Africans have long experience of accepting financial support from organisations who then impose their own thinking rather than letting the conditions of life in East Africa define the work that needs to be done. Given that history, the partners of the Barbets Duet face the challenge of defining their organisation in a way that secures a stronger financial base for the work being done while also maintaining the integrity of their initial objective: *“to demonstrate the possibility of creating an economy out of environmental things.”*

Given the complexity of the challenge, and the unpredictable, emergent character of the many experiments and explorations of the Barbets Duet, it is not surprising that the Himo Convention ended with no clear answer to the question so loosely described as 'governance'.

*Barbara Heinzen
March 2014*