BUSI-1764: Global Entrepreneurship and Innovation

Assignment 1: Learning Diary

Introduction

Pumakawa, established by Ashoka Fellow Kai Pacha in Villa Rumipal, Córdoba, Argentina, is a non-governmental organization focused on wildlife conservation and environmental education. The organization operates a natural reserve where it creates space for native species, rehabilitates wildlife and restores habitats while instilling sustainable lifestyles within the local community. Pumakawa also provides workshops, guided tours and education experiences that teach the public about biodiversity and ecological sustainability (Ashoka, 2022).

This venture aligns with ecopreneurship, which refers to the entrepreneurial activities toward environmental sustainability through innovative business practices (Schaltegger, 2002). Conserving Biodiversity: Pumakawa is an excellent example of this focus on balancing both humans and nature. It includes some aspect of social value because it has an education objective, but its primary purpose is ecological and not systemic changes in wider society, which would be the domain of social entrepreneurship (Dees, 1998). The church was started on its own, separate from any other organization (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003), so it is not intrapreneurship. Finally, although some authors suggest that international entrepreneurship implies cross-border operations (Oviatt & McDougall, 2005), Pumakawa do not esteems as an international operator since its activities take place only within Argentina, thus confirming the ecopreneurial nature of this business model.

Identifying the Innovative Element in Pumakawa

Arguably, the most innovative part of Pumakawa exists in its Cacu Project that rethinks the interactions between agricultural producers and pumas in a cooperative manner. Fostering Awareness, Conservation and Livestock Management to Reduce Human-Wildlife Conflict through this project Through this project they are working with producers, local authorities and conservationists to develop practical solutions which includes bringing back native species such as vizcachas that can restore the ecological equilibrium and prevent pumas from killing livestock (Ashoka, 2022).

It is an example of process innovation here as it reforms the management of human-wildlife interactions by redesigning processes. The project, for example, includes sustainable practices

like implementing intermittent light kits and breeding mules to protect ranchers from pumas with less negative impact on the animals. Such solutions streamline operations and generate benefits for various stakeholders, especially those farmers likely to be found on the opposite side of conservation efforts.

The Cacu Project is definitely something that changes the game, but it does not fit product innovation as there aren't any new physical products per se (even though, tools like light kits are used during the process). Finally, this is not business model innovation; the revenue streams and organizational structure of Pumakawa will stay quite static. Finally, it is not service innovation because the emphasis is on disruptive changes in the procedures [1], and not improving delivery of services to end consumers (Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010; Schilling, 2020).

Cacu Project Incremental Innovation First, Cacu uses techniques and practice already implemented in the wildlife work, but it refines and fuses together these practices into a complete, potentially replicable model. It does not change the paradigm of the sector but rather fixes certain inefficiencies in existent systems, so it is neither radical nor disruptive. It is the first application of the innovation in that region, as it has been adapted to Argentine socio-ecological condition (Córdoba) (Christensen et al., 2015).

Reflection from Tutorials

During tutorials, we analyzed cases such as **Dialogue Social Enterprises**, which demonstrated how creating new processes could shift societal perspectives. Similarly, the Cacu Project uses innovative processes to alter attitudes and behavior of agricultural producers towards pumas, promoting co-existence rather than conflict. My group and I observed that effective process innovations tend to correlate with high-level stakeholder engagement, consistent with the network theory of internationalization, which suggests a need for cross sector relationship-building in driving systemic change (Johanson & Mattsson, 1988).

In the context of Schumpeter's (1947) theory of creative destruction, Cacu Project is an example of how process innovation can destroy unsustainable processes e.g. puma hunting and replace such practice with solutions that are win-win for both human society and ecosystems.

Internationalizing Pumakawa's Innovation

The Cacu Project has considerable potential for replication in other areas experiencing comparable wildlife agriculture conflicts. But those adaptations would be the key to successful internationalisation:

1. **Cultural Sensitivity**: Approaches would have to consider the local cultural approach towards wildlife. An example of this is adapting engagement in regions that have a history of wildlife worship versus those with hunting cultures.
2. **Ecological Considerations**: The species and ecosystems involved would vary by location, necessitating customized solutions.
3. **Partnership Networks**: Collaborations with local NGOs, governments, and agricultural bodies would be crucial to implement the project effectively.

The most appropriate market entry mode would be forming **strategic alliances** with local conservation organizations. This aligns with the network theory, as partnerships can help Pumakawa navigate regulatory environments and cultural differences while leveraging local expertise (Johanson & Mattsson, 1988). Additionally, the Uppsala Model suggests that starting with partnerships in psychically closer regions (e.g., within South America) would reduce risks before expanding further (Vahlne & Johanson, 2017).

The Cacu Project exemplifies how process innovation can create sustainable solutions to complex socio-ecological challenges. Its incremental nature ensures that it builds on existing knowledge while offering significant improvements in how human-wildlife conflicts are managed. By adapting to local contexts and leveraging strategic partnerships, Pumakawa can expand its impact internationally, fostering a global culture of coexistence between humans and wildlife.

Conclusion

Pumakawa, through its innovative Cacu Project, demonstrates the potential of process innovation to address complex environmental and socio-economic challenges. By fostering collaboration among agricultural producers, conservationists, and policymakers, it effectively mitigates human-wildlife conflict while promoting sustainable practices. The project's incremental innovation builds on existing conservation knowledge, integrating it into a replicable framework tailored to local socio-ecological conditions in Argentina. This approach highlights how systemic changes in processes can create long-term benefits for both human communities and ecosystems.

Internationally, the Cacu Project offers a blueprint for addressing similar challenges in other regions. However, Nevertheless, replication can only be successful with careful adaptation of local cultural, ecological and infrastructural contexts, which highlights the need for strategic alliances with local partners. Both the network theory of internationalization and Uppsala Model emphasize the importance of maximizing on partnerships and going to places psychically closer before stepping out further places.

Pumakawa's work illustrates how ecopreneurship can drive sustainable change by reshaping human-environment interactions. It successfully balances conservation and agriculture, paving an example for the rest of the world to follow in integrating biodiversity protection with human development. Scaling its innovative solutions globally will allow Pumakawa to make a significant contribution towards promoting coexistence between humans and wildlife even beyond our region.

References

- Antoncic, B. and Hisrich, R.D. (2003) 'Clarifying the intrapreneurship concept', *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 10(1), pp. 7-24.
- Ashoka (2022), *Kai Pacha - Ashoka Fellow*. Available at: https://www.ashoka.org/en-gb/fellow/kai-pacha (Accessed: 17 November 2024).
- Christensen, C.M., Raynor, M.E., and McDonald, R. (2015), 'What is Disruptive Innovation?', *Harvard Business Review*, 93(12), pp. 44-53.
- Dees, J.G. (1998) 'The meaning of social entrepreneurship', *Stanford University Research Paper*, pp. 1-6.
- Johanson, J. and Mattsson, L.G. (1988), 'Internationalization in Industrial Systems', *Network Approach*, 1(1), pp. 303-321.
- Osterwalder, A. and Pigneur, Y. (2010), *Business Model Generation*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Oviatt, B.M. and McDougall, P.P. (2005) 'Defining international entrepreneurship and modeling the speed of internationalization', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(5), pp. 537–554.
- Schaltegger, S. (2002) 'A framework for ecopreneurship: leading bioneers and environmental managers to sustainability innovation', *Greenleaf Publishing*, pp. 1-20.
- Schilling, M.A. (2020), *Strategic Management of Technological Innovation*. 7th edn. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1947), *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vahlne, J.E. and Johanson, J. (2017), 'From Internationalization to Evolution: The Uppsala Model at 40 years', *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48, pp. 1087-1102.