

TVNI Awards Announcement

For ICV-8, TVNI is focusing its Awards on the need for the types of documented, verifiable field evidence to underpin advocacy for policy and programmatic support for scaling up of the use of the Vetiver System, as well as to provide the stories that illuminate how VS benefits people's lives and so encourages adoption by governments, the donor community, nonprofits, private sector, and grassroots organizations.

Every submission meeting a minimum documentation bar will receive a Certificate of Recognition – so anyone who does the work of well-documenting a real application comes away recognized for their contribution to the global body of practical evidence.

1. Vetiver Grass Technology Case Study Awards

Three awards of US\$1,000 each. TVNI is seeking documented case studies of successful Vetiver System applications: what was done, what it achieved, and what it cost against the benefits delivered. Priority goes to mature applications (at least three years since initial establishment) that are old enough that the full range of benefits is visible, measurable, and attributable.

Categories

- (a) Agriculture** – on-farm soil and moisture conservation, erosion control, yield and productivity, pest and nematode management, forage, and farm-scale water management.
- (b) Bioengineering** – slope and embankment stabilization, infrastructure protection, landslide and flood mitigation, riverbank and coastal protection, mine and quarry rehabilitation.
- (c) Phytoremediation** – contaminated land and water, wastewater and landfill leachate treatment, nutrient and heavy-metal removal, and constructed or floating wetlands.

Eligibility

Open to anyone – farmers, practitioners, researchers, engineers, companies, NGOs, and government agencies. Self-nomination is expected and welcome, and submissions may be authored by teams. Serving TVNI Board members and their immediate families are ineligible. Board members may co-author submissions led by others but will not share in the prize monies.

The case study template

TVNI will supply a template so submissions are comparable, and the resulting set is usable as evidence well beyond the awards. The types of information that will be asked for in the template are listed below. Some of the information is required in order for the case study to be considered, whereas some of the requested information is considered ideal. Nothing marked “ideal” is a condition of entry. A submission will not be set aside for lacking it, though the more of it you can supply the stronger the submission will be. Where you cannot provide something required, say so and say why. Above all, report honestly what you could and could not measure. For example, a case study stating plainly that a figure is a farmer's estimate rather than a measurement is worth more to TVNI, and will score better, than one implying a precision it does not have.

1. Identification – title; author(s) and affiliation; contact; who implemented the work and who paid for it. **All of this is required.**

2. Location and scale – country, district, site; latitude and longitude; area treated; length of hedgerow or number of plants where applicable. **Required:** enough locational detail to find the site on Google Earth. **Ideal:** GPS coordinates for each discrete site, and area treated measured rather than estimated.
3. Setting – the problem addressed; slope, soil, rainfall and climate; land use; and who the affected users are. **Required:** the problem, the land use, who is affected, and slope, soil and rainfall as known locally. **Ideal:** slope measured, soil classified from survey or analysis, and rainfall from a station or other record.
4. What was done – design and layout; VS specifications including within-row plant spacing and between-row spacing or vertical interval; planting material source and quality; establishment date and method; and the maintenance actually carried out, as distinct from what was planned. **Required:** layout (spacing and vertical interval), establishment date, planting material source, and the maintenance actually carried out. **Ideal:** a sketch or dimensioned layout.
5. Age and condition – years since establishment; current hedge closure and condition; and any failures, gaps, losses or replanting. **Required:** years since establishment, present condition, and any failures, gaps or losses. **Ideal:** the dates and extent of any replanting.
6. Results – quantified outcomes, each with its measurement method and the comparison used (before-and-after, treated against untreated, or distance-from-hedge gradient). What was not achieved should be reported alongside what was. **Required:** at least one quantified outcome, with the method used to measure it, and a note of what was not achieved. **Ideal:** more than one outcome.
7. Benefits and costs – establishment and maintenance costs in local currency (and USD, if possible) with the year stated; quantified benefits; and a simple benefit-cost ratio or payback period with assumptions shown. **Required:** establishment and maintenance costs with currency and year, and a description of the benefits. **Ideal:** benefits valued in money, and a benefit-cost ratio or payback period with the assumptions shown.
8. Adoption and replication – whether others copied it, over what area, and why or why not. **Required:** whether others copied it, and why or why not. **Ideal:** the number of adopters or the area taken up.
9. Lessons and constraints – what would be done differently, and what limits wider application. **All of this is required.**
10. Evidence annex – dated photographs, a time series where available, maps or sketches, and raw or summary data. **Required:** at least two dated photographs. **Ideal:** a photographic time series from establishment onward, a map or sketch, and the underlying data.

Evaluation criteria

- Quality and credibility of the evidence, including measurement method – 30%
- Benefit and cost documentation – 20%
- Replicability: whether a reader has what they would need to repeat it – 20%
- Maturity of the application and the durability it demonstrates – 15%
- Completeness: georeference, dated photographs, data annex – 15%

Recognition

Winners will receive US\$1,000 each with an Award Certificate, publication in the ICV-8 Proceedings, and presentation at ICV-8 for authors attending.

2. The GVF Field Evidence Award

One award of US\$750. This award has a different intent from the case studies. Rather than documenting what worked, it invites rigorous, constructive critiques of how [TVNI asks farmers to test the Vetiver System](#), together with any concrete recommendations for improvements. [For further context, read here](#). The purpose is both to encourage more people to apply and test the proposed methodology, as well as to perfect the current draft monitoring protocols.

The scope of the work we wish to encourage with this Award is field evaluation of the design, protocols, measurement guidance, and farmer-facing usability of the Global Vetiver Farmer Trials. Examples of questions to guide the assessments include: *Does the gradient-based approach hold up in practice? Will this capture mechanisms or only outcomes (i.e., if a farmer sees improvement but cannot attribute it to the hedge, the approach has not done its job)? Is distance-from-hedge measurement, or something like it, built in well enough to establish attribution? Are the protocols executable by a farmer without external support, and do the data capture tools match what a farmer can realistically record? Are the demonstration models the right ones, and is anything important missing from the set?*

Requirements

A submission must be grounded in an actual attempt to use the draft GVF monitoring approach in the field, at least at one site. Desk critiques (i.e., opinion pieces; literature reviews with no field component) and/or critiques that identify a problem without proposing a specific fix and/or simple endorsements will not be considered.

For every issue you raise, also provide the following: (i) what the protocol instructs; (ii) what actually happened when you did it, with the specific measurement, observation, or blank field that shows it; (iii) what a farmer, or TVNI, would wrongly conclude if the issue is left as it stands; and (iv) the fix, written specifically enough to drop straight into the protocol – the revised wording, the revised measurement interval, the redesigned data sheet, or the added step.

Length: three to six pages plus annexes. Annexes should include your completed or attempted recording sheets, dated photographs, and any raw data.

Evaluation criteria

- Substance and validity of the critique – 35%
- Specificity and practicality of the recommendations – 35%
- Grounding in field evidence or direct experience – 20%
- Clarity – 10%

Recognition

The winner will receive US\$750 with an Award Certificate, publication in the ICV-8 Proceedings, and presentation at ICV-8 if attending.

3. Exceptional Individual Contributions

Certificate only. These five awards honor individuals who made exceptional lifetime contributions to Vetiver System knowledge, promotion, and application. Under the framework for ICV-8, each of these will be awarded to the authors of the case studies that present the

strongest submissions in the thematic area matching the namesake's own contribution – the honor attaches to the namesake's legacy, and the recognition goes to work carrying it forward.

Award	Thematic area	What the winning case study must demonstrate
The Monty Yudelman Award	Agriculture	A case study whose significance reaches beyond the site to the food-security and agricultural-development agenda – evidence a ministry, research system, or funder could use to argue for VS at scale.
The John Greenfield Award	Agriculture	A case study centered on smallholder – particularly rainfed farmers – where a farmer or community-level initiative demonstrates VGT's affordability, practicality, implementability within local capacity, and demonstrable uptake by farmers themselves rather than by a project.
The Mark Dafforn Award	Bioengineering or phytoremediation	The submission with the strongest scientific and technical rigor – measurement design, data quality, and defensible attribution of the result to the Vetiver System.
The Nick Dolphin Award	Cross-cutting	A case study in which community engagement and genuine participation are demonstrably why the application succeeded – and why it is still standing years later.
The Criss Juliard Award	Cross-cutting (enterprise)	A case study from a Vetiver Service company with a minimum of four years of documented experience and performance in both commercial and outreach aspects.

Eligibility

The same as for the Vetiver Grass Technology Case Study Awards, with the exception of author or authors that have won a Vetiver Grass Technology Case Study Award.

4. Certificates of Recognition

Every submission meeting the minimum criteria, but not receiving a case-study award or a named award, will receive a TVNI Certificate of Recognition, issued electronically for the recipient to print and display.

Minimum criteria

A complete submission on the TVNI template; a verifiable, georeferenced location; an application meeting the maturity floor; at least one quantified outcome with its measurement method stated; and dated photographic evidence.

5. Process and timeline

- Submissions to – information@vetiver.org with “TVNI Award Submission” in the subject line
- Submission deadline – 1 April 2027
- Winners notified – 1 May 2027
- Awards conferred and papers presented – at ICV-8

- Language – English preferred, however submissions in other languages will be accepted with an English summary, and where necessary, machine translated for the judges' review
- Publication – winning case studies will be published a part of the ICV-8 Proceedings and on TVNI's website. All qualifying case studies will also be made available on the TVNI website.