

Innovation processes in a smallholder goat development project: Experiences from Mozambique

Birgit Boogaard (ILRI), Kees Swaans (ILRI), Saskia Hendrickx (ILRI), Michaela Cosijn (CARE Mozambique)

ImGoats project aims to

- Increase incomes and food security by enhancing pro-poor goat value chains (VC)
- Increase market opportunities through Innovation Platforms (IP)

Poster objective

To reflect on the dynamics of innovation processes in three innovation domains of the imGoats project in Mozambique



Improving access to animal health services

- ✓ *Context*: no animal health services for goats CARE had experience with training paravets (community animal health worker) for cattle
- ✓ *Innovation*: technological and organisational (paravets provide animal health services)
- ✓ *Initiative*: CARE/ILRI at project start
- ✓ *Changes*: limited - refined existing extension and training models
- ✓ *Flexibility*: limited - planned intervention, CARE and ILRI took initiative based on proven model
- ✓ *Results*: 16 paravets trained, smallholders use and pay for services

Innovation process: planned, clear, CARE/ILRI led, familiar stakeholders, straightforward activities, *predictable*

Project implementation

- CARE Mozambique and ILRI
- Feb 2011- June 2013
- Inhassoro district (Inhambane province)
- >500 goat keepers in 22 communities
- 8 IP meetings organized



Improving market access

- ✓ *Context*: irregular goat sales, no goat markets CARE had experience with cattle fairs
- ✓ *Innovation*: organisational and institutional (increased coordination between VC actors, introduction of weighing scale)
- ✓ *Initiative*: IP members and CARE/ILRI
- ✓ *Changes*: goat market demand lower than anticipated, traders reluctant to use scale
- ✓ *Flexibility*: quite high - CARE and ILRI experimented with different market models e.g. local market, private sector, markets at longer distances
- ✓ *Results*: 6 goat fairs organized to date

Innovation process: partially planned, led by IP members with CARE/ILRI, familiar and new stakeholders and activities, *rather unpredictable*

Data collection and analysis

- Detailed process reports of IP meetings
- Monitoring through Outcome Mapping
- Mainly qualitative assessment



Development of communal pasture areas

- ✓ *Context*: most goats tethered, limited documented experiences in Mozambique
- ✓ *Innovation*: organizational and institutional (collective action between smallholders, community leaders, paravets and local government; legalisation of areas)
- ✓ *Initiative*: IP members
- ✓ *Changes*: unexpected, not planned by CARE/ILRI
- ✓ *Flexibility*: very high - joint experimentation CARE supported local government to act on existing land use strategies
- ✓ *Results*: Communal pasture areas identified and re-used in 8 communities, but challenges remain (e.g. theft, lack of herders, uncontrolled fires)

Innovation process: unplanned, led by IP members and other actors with strong input from CARE/ILRI, new stakeholders and activities, *unexpected*

Conclusion

Different innovation processes coexist in the same project context; all are justified and contribute to development outcomes.

Key challenges

1. Tension between short project period (2,5 years) and different paces of the unfolding innovation processes
2. Difficulty to keep traders engaged in the project
3. Support of unplanned ideas, e.g. communal pasture areas, required significant resources of CARE and ILRI

Recommendations - Research

1. High diversity of innovation processes requires flexibility in and reflection on the roles of research in R4D
2. Interrelatedness of different innovation types requires an integration of different types of knowledge and scientific fields
3. Participatory M&E is needed to capture the dynamics of innovation processes and learning

Recommendations – Practice & Policy

1. Decision makers need to be engaged in the process to ensure that innovations are embedded in government strategies and policies
2. Innovation processes ask for joint experimentation and learning among project partners
3. Project design and donor funding should allow for a certain degree of flexibility