

Interim Research Report – JDPC

INTRODUCTION

This report discusses the implementation and management of the Fodder Innovation Project in Ikire, South West Nigeria over the first quarter of 2009. It comprises: multi stakeholder processes (MSP), KPO action for change, the monitoring and learning system and most significant events or change. Finally, a synthesis of generic lessons, albeit preliminary, is attempted.

METHOD

Data for this report is a result of the collaborative efforts of the Key Partner Organisation, Justice, Development and Peace (JDPC) and ILRI Research Management Group. Most of the Consultative meeting with other partner organisations and monitoring were done by JDPC. The JDPC innovation coordinator then held a debriefing session with the ILRI Pdf and tabled a written quarterly report. This report is a synthesis of these activities.

CONTEXT

The Fodder Innovation Project (FIP) in southwest Nigeria focuses on intensification of goat production as a pathway out of poverty. An initial situation analysis of livestock, fodder and fodder innovation development was carried out in South West Nigeria in 2007. The inquiry showed that disease prevalence in this humid zone (see attached agro ecological zone map) limits the scope for animal husbandry (reference). Crop/livestock farmers largely keep small ruminants. Current features of ruminant production in Ikire are: production of the West African Dwarf which farmers say takes too long to mature; relegated a women's activity; loss to theft, road traffic accidents, poor access and response to the market, weak state agricultural and veterinary extension that has created space for quackery in input and service sectors (reference).

Because of the poorly developed product and input markets, goat production is risky. As a result, fodder is not regarded a serious challenge since goats are not priority livelihood option. Fodder would only become an issue if there is a transition from subsistence level goat farming to a semi-commercial market-driven enterprise. This complexity of interconnected biophysical social, economic and political factors pointed to a multi stakeholder approach.

As a result, during the induction workshop in January 2008, Justice, Development and Peace Commission (JDPC) chose to focus on “transition from subsistence level goat farming to semi-commercial market-driven enterprise”. It was also clear that goat production is dynamic of incentives between the state, the private sector and civil society; which depends on capacity of different sectors to engage constructively. Considering the multifaceted nature of the limiting factors to goat production, the key question to address this focus was “*how to strengthen the capacity and coordination of exiting and potential networks and mechanisms to support the transition of goat farming from a subsistence level to semi-commercial market driven enterprise.*”

Outline of the MSP

The situation analysis mentioned above showed that goat production is not an isolated activity. For instance, Phase 1 of the FIP tried to improve fodder availability through the transfer of various technologies. However, these interventions did not trigger any significant responses in the livelihood strategies of livestock dependent populations (Hall *et al*, 2007). This experience showed that goat production is affected by: markets, politics, technology, people and policies within and beyond the physical boundaries of the area in question. Commercialisation of goat production therefore, required a holistic approach, which coordinated different actors and interests. This was the basis and scope of the FIP multi-stakeholder process.

ILRI identified JDPC as a suitable anchor for FIP activities in South Western Nigeria. JDPC selected Ikire village in Osun State as a pilot site for crop livestock farmers. A network of actors representing the innovation system, namely: goat marketers (middle men), Osun State Agricultural Development Program (OSADP), National Veterinary Research Institute (NVRI), and Irewole Local Government were invited form an interim body that would steer the activities of the FIP. Considering that most , if not all actors were new to the network and to the approach; JDPC has coordinated most of the activities for instance facilitation of meetings, and collating the contributions from different work groups into an action plan.

The central role that JDPC plays in running the network makes it appear as if the other actors are merely an ‘advisory body’ rather than partners of a network operating as a system with collective agency. The symbolic situating of the first two meetings JDPC premises reinforces this view. As a result and as the Innovation Coordinator notes, many of the actors have been taking the exercise as a JDPC project and expecting some acknowledgement for their contributions. This is a fair observation that needs to noted as a distinguishing feature of how the Ikire multi-stakeholder process has unfolded. The observation is also important in accounting for process because it helps contextualize the strategy that JDPC has adopted in the January to March quarter.

Table 1. Multi-stakeholder processes in Ikire, 2008:

1st Stakeholders Forum	2nd Stakeholders Forum
Meetings held at KPO premises	Meetings held at KPO premises
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13 broad stakeholders identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of existing list of stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Situation analysis of livestock development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New actors identified

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • project objective and site proposed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint action plan through group work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mobilizing community interest 	

Table 1 above summarises JDPC's multi-stakeholder strategy and process in 2008. Another stakeholder forum was held in late 2008 whose activities are summarized in Table 2 below. This forum is significant in that it is a shift from planning to implementing, focusing all activities from JDPC to the network as a whole. For instance, this forum was held in the Ikire town within the king's palace. Also other actors with complementary resources to support development projects were invited and included in the net work. For example, the Fadama III is a government of Nigeria food security initiative. According to the World Bank, the project aims at sustainable increase in the incomes of natural resource users by directly delivering resources to the beneficiary rural communities, efficiently and effectively, and empowering them to collectively decide on how resources are allocated and managed for their livelihood activities and to participate in the design and execution of their subprojects (World Bank). Fadama III as part of the network will facilitate Ikire FIP farmer access to funds to purchase goats and the attendant inputs.

Table 2. Multi-stakeholder processes in Ikire, 2008

3rd Stakeholders forum
Meetings held at Ikire within the King's palace
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foster a platform for learning; progress report from actors including feed back and follow up
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of constraints and opportunities in
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New actors: Fadama III, Osun State ADP, Inputs supplier
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing of experiences from India
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification of roles
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building consensus on work plan (including roles and responsibilities)

The next section discussed specific activities that JDPC has carried out.

MAKING NETWORKING THE AGENDA:MSP in Ikire.

A major development observed in the preceding background to the Ikire multi stakeholder process is the emergence of JDPC rather than the network in determining how events unfold. On one hand, such a development is contrary to the underlying assumptions of the MSP paradigm; engaging different stakeholders in processes of dialogue and collective learning to improve innovation, decision making and action (Woodhill, 2005). On the other hand as a new process this contradiction is inevitable; and JDPC seems to have been aware of this. This section will now discuss measures that JDPC has taken in steering the MSP towards more networkiness (sic).

In the first quarter of 2009, JDPC has begun to build on stakeholders' understanding of each other's roles and expectations. To achieve this the multi-stakeholder consultative meeting is being used more as a platform to promote dialogue among stakeholders and create more opportunities for interaction to leverage innovation in goat production. For instance before the Multi-stakeholder meeting held in March, 2009 JDPC contacted various representatives of the stakeholders to prepare them for their roles in the network and for more effective participation at the multi stakeholder meetings. Below is a summary of some of the related activities done:

Table 3: Quarterly MSP processes Jan- Mar, 2009

<p>I. 3 village visits were carried out to 5 participating livestock farmers groups to mobilize farmers towards the dialogue forum.</p> <p>II. In collaboration with the Ikire Farmers' Umbrella Association Chairman in the area and JDPC Zonal Officer in Ikire (the project site), experienced and relevant actors for the dialogue were identified and a list compiled for contact comprising:</p> <p>a) 1 goat seller representative;</p> <p>b) 1 restaurant owner;</p> <p>c) 1 State Agricultural Development Programme Officer,</p> <p>d) 1 Local Government Extension Officer;</p> <p>e) 1 animal health specialist; and</p> <p>f) 1 farmer with experience about upgrading</p> <p>III. 5 individual meetings were carried with identified actors to brief them on the aims and approach of the dialogue and their individual roles as well as reaching agreement on the date, time and venue for the dialogue.</p> <p>IV. 1 preparatory meeting was held with farmers (small groups) on the aims and approach of the dialogue and to prepare farmers for productive interaction.</p> <p>Source: JDPC Quarterly reports and pers. com. with Innovation Coordinator</p>
--

The strategy of preparing individual stakeholders for the meetings had an impact on the relationships among the actors. For example at the meeting the representative of the goat marketers called for greater interaction between his group and the farmers. He noted that at several meetings, marketers have made themselves available to assist the farmers, but no farmers had come for help. He reiterated that the marketers knew popular breeds in the market; the commercialisation initiative had to focus on the right breeds

right from the start. Subsequently the marketer was invited and he traveled to interact with the villagers.

This development is significant as a marker for changing or more appropriately, scope for changing habits within the system. Generally, it is accepted that like all intermediaries in commerce, marketers are there to exploit the producers, if anything; the farmers should be cushioned from the predatory habits of the marketers. In institutional terms this case demonstrates that the perceptions and practices can be reworked. In one respect, it can be argued that the marketers view the new relationship instrumentally. For example, in a different forum the marketers had argued that they felt that should there be financial resources for farmers; the marketers should keep it in trust for the farmers to ensure that it is used to purchase the right breeds of goats. However the point that emerges is that interaction is and will be a process embedded in actor habits and practices. Action research becomes understanding meanings and facilitating new realities through dialogue (Friedman and Rogers, 2009).

Another feature of JDPC's approach to MSP is that it has sought to facilitate societal learning through a combination of interactive processes and methodologies. Dialogue in the MSP is not limited to gathering all stakeholders in one place all the time but to extensive consultations amongst particular groups. For instance, JDPC is trying to get the Irewole local government to play greater role in the FIP; considering it is in its area of jurisdiction. However, the request has been caught in the traditional bureaucratic practices and no response provided. JDPC has resolved to visit the authorities for individual meetings and seize opportunities sell the FIP to the authorities (see Table 4).

Consultations targeted at specific groups are also an approach used to rope in hesitant actors; Fadama III officials' behaviour was that of an interested outsider; for instance, irregular attendance of meetings, coming to make a presentation and not staying for the duration of the deliberations. Yet Fadama III is a critical player because they control funding that goat farmers can access to purchase goats in the FIP. To generate more interest JDPC and the goat farmer representatives have approached the Fadama III directly to encourage them to be active members of the network. At the same time, these targeted meetings are used to provide farmers access to those offices they would normally find inaccessible. In this case a farmers' representative joined the JDPC staff as a way to let him 'put his foot in the door' of the State bureaucracy (see Box 4).

Table 4: JDPC's interactive methodologies

<p>I. Follow up actions were carried out with Irewole local government regarding their contributions to goat value chain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 1 reminder letter was written to the State ministry in charge of local governments. b) 2 visits were made to Osun state ministry of local government: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o first visit to submit a reminder letter (JDPC zonal officer + LG extension officer) and to get an update on reactions to the introductory letter. o second visit comprised of Farmer Association Chairman and JDPC Development officers as a response to the letter of introduction of FIP.

- c) 2 preliminary visits were made to the Local Government Director of Agric to gather update on the letter of introduction.
 - d) 3 meetings were held with the Farmer association Leaders to deliberate on the way forward on the issue.
- II. Action taken to facilitate Osun State Fadama III acceptance of specific roles as an actor (not just visiting occasionally as a donor agency) in the innovation system in Ikire.
- a) 2 follow-up visits were made to the Osun state Fadama III facilitators in Irewole LG to gather updates on the processing of goat farmers applications and to obtain other contact information for their state office.
 - b) 3 meetings were held with goat farmers to obtain feedback on their registration and plan on the way forward.
 - c) Letters on FIP and Farmers groups were prepared to introduce FIP to the Osun state Fadama III State Office.
 - d) Telephone contacts with the state office to book appointment for a preliminary visit with the State Coordinator of Fadama III.
 - e) 1 preliminary visit made to the Osun state Fadama III State Office in Iwo with farmers' representative.

Source:JDPC Quarterly Report

KPOS ACTION TO CHANGE HABITS AND PRACTICES AND BEHAVIOUR OF THE STAKEHOLDERS

JDPC have conceptually separated the project into behavioural change (institutional and policy) and action based (technical) activities. Their initiatives and focus is on the former; how to come up with an architecture or configuration of actors that will leverage interaction and knowledge exchange. A major area they are focusing on is a change in the habits and practices of the stakeholders to foster connectedness. Below are some of the examples of action to trigger behavioural change.

In most cases the general organizational culture among state institutions in the FIP network can be characterized as inward looking and atomistic. Participation in external activities is done in anticipation of a reward. For instance actors invited to be part of the FIP network construed their participation as a favour done to JDPC that will be reciprocated. JDPC has taken some measures to address this 'Cargo mentality' (Worsley, 1957) among its collaborators; some examples will be discussed in this section.

State and local government extensions workers in Ikire have found it difficult to visit farmers because of a lack of transport (see diagnosis report). As a result interaction with farmers and other actors has been minimal. JDPC has presented FIP to these actors as a

way in which they will be to meet their obligations. For instance should JDPC be traveling to Ikire they should take advantage of the transport available and the possibility of meeting already organized farmers groups. In this way FIP makes it possible for them to be able to report to their own organisations, the progress they are making. The innovation coordinator says that because of this benefit there is greater enthusiasm among the actors to participate in FIP while at the same time less demand for compensation to attend meetings. At the same time there has been increased interaction of farmers and other actors.

Similarly Fadama III staff have viewed their role is mainly to advertise and process funding for rural development. In most cases, they only came to the FIP meetings to make their announcements and leave. They considered themselves a donor organisation with no time for other parties. JDPC has since taken measures to seek their greater involvement in the interactive processes.

The National Veterinary Research Institute (NVRI) office in Ibadan is part of the network. However, the NVRI office in Ikire has not been accessible to farmers by virtue of habits, practices, and physical location; behind the main local government building. JDPC has now begun linking the NVRI with their zonal office so that farmers have access to their resources and promote dialogue.

MONITORING AND LEARNING SYSTEM

JDPC monitoring and learning activities have been deferred to the second quarter of 2009

MOST SIGNIFICANT EVENTS

Significant events are emerging in the context of the focus of the project; establishing networks.

Goat producers and marketers' producers are forging a relationship based on exchange of information. According to the innovation coordinator, these marketers have a wealth of information especially on breeding, which the farmers are finding extremely useful.

JDPC say that although they have been working in the Ikire for the last 9 years they have never bothered about the actors like local government. In this attempt to incorporate the local government in to the FIP that have been exposed to a governance dynamic

Livestock production and management in Ikire, like most peasant households, has all along been privatized to the household even in those cases where there is collective access to pasture or commons. Recently the goat producers in Ikire have opted for collective confinement and a cut and carry strategy. While this approach will lead to second order challenges associated with common pool resources; this voluntary option for collectives action is significant.

Synergy has been struck in the efforts of FIP and Fadama III without the direction of politicians or government. FIP has managed to access Fadama III finances to purchase goats while the latter is working with farmers group that has a record of accomplishment in an environment with a plethora of virtual farmers' organisations.

Stakeholders in the network are beginning to feel part of the group. While in the past they have waited for JDPC to set up dates for subsequent meetings, at the last meeting all stakeholders collectively set the date for the next meeting.

GENERIC LESSONS

- Ownership : JDPC is willing to make the local authority take over the coordination of the network. The local authority still thrives with agendas it has full control over and thus hesitant to go into a forum like approach. As one of the officials stated that the in some quarters within the local authority FIP is considered a danger to the institution. However, the lower rungs of the bureaucratic ladder find the FIP positive because they have something to do and they have something to report to their superiors.
- synergies emerging among actors as mutual benefits become apparent; for instance the case of Fadama III and FIP
- While facilitating MSP entails situations where actors learn collectively it does not have to be in one place spatially or temporally.

References:

Friedman, V.J. and Rogers, T 2009 There is nothing so theoretical as good action research *Action Research* 7,1 31-47.

World Bank

<http://web.worldbank.org/external/projects/main?pagePK=64283627&piPK=73230&theSitePK=40941&menuPK...> - 38k) accessed 8 May 2009.

Worsley, Peter. *The trumpet shall sound: a study of "cargo" cults in Melanesia*, London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1957

Woodhill, J. 2005 Facilitating Complex Multi-Stakeholder Processes: A Societal Learning Perspective (mimeo)