

WEBINAR FAILING FORWARD

WE FALL. WE LEARN. WE RISE.

Session Transcript

Date: Monday, 23 June 2026

Duration: 59 minutes 10 seconds

Hosted by: GOAL Global & Data Friendly Space

Speakers

- **Elizabeth Devine** – Head of Programme Technical Team, GOAL Global (Moderator)
 - **Juliet Parker** – Director, ALNAP
 - **Tino Kreutzer** – Chief Operating & Innovation Officer, KoboToolbox
 - **Noela Ojara** – Founder & Managing Director, Divine Organic Foods (Uganda)
 - **José Cobos Romero** – Head of Innovation, Data Friendly Space
 - **Madigan Johnson** – Programme Manager, Data Friendly Space (Co-host)
-

Note: This transcript has been lightly edited from the automated recording for clarity and readability. Speaker names have been corrected, filler words removed, and minor transcription errors fixed. The content and meaning of all contributions remain unchanged.

Welcome & Housekeeping

Madigan Johnson [0:44]

Hi everyone, welcome to Failing Forward. We're going to give everyone just a minute to join and then we'll get started.

All right, perfect. First of all, welcome everyone, and thank you so much for being here. My name is Madigan Johnson. I'm a programme manager at Data Friendly Space, and I'm really glad that you've joined us here today. Welcome to the webinar called Failing Forward.

The most useful conversations in our sector are the ones we don't have enough of – the ones where someone puts up their hand and says, actually, that didn't go the way we planned. Here's what we wish we'd known. Today is exactly that.

Together with the GOAL Innovation Lab at GOAL Global, we've brought together a group of practitioners to talk about the projects that hit walls, the tools that didn't land the way we expected, the learnings we've encountered, and how as a sector we move forward from here.

At Data Friendly Space, we'll be sharing our own experiences – what we underestimated, what we'd approach differently – and we'll also hear from colleagues at ALNAP, KoboToolbox, and Divine Organic Foods, each bringing their own perspective. We hope this feels less like a webinar and more like a conversation. Please use the chat to ask questions and share your own experiences. Let's dive in.

A few housekeeping notes: the session is being recorded; please use the chat to share thoughts and questions; the Q&A is also open at any time. All attendees are on mute, but speakers and moderators will be live. We'll try to wrap up in 30 minutes.

I'd like to introduce Elizabeth Devine, Head of GOAL's Programme Technical Team at GOAL Global, to introduce herself and the other speakers. Over to you, Liz.

Introductions

Elizabeth Devine [4:02]

Thanks so much, Madigan. Hi, everyone. My name is Liz Devine. I'm the Head of GOAL's Programme Technical Team – we provide support to all of our country teams in terms of design and implementation of humanitarian projects. I'll be your moderator today.

First things first: over 170 people have registered for this webinar. That alone, I think, tells us something – either the sector has a very healthy relationship with failure, or we're all quietly desperate to talk about it. I suspect it's more the latter.

And here's the proof: we ran a campaign before this event asking people to submit their own failure stories. We got zero. Not one. People will tell you everything that went wrong over a bad cup of conference coffee, but ask them to put it on the record and suddenly there's nothing to share. That tension – between knowing failure matters and living in a system that punishes you for admitting it – is exactly what we're here to dig into today.

There will be no slides, no polished takeaways – just a group of people who've agreed to be honest in public, which is rarer than it should be. The stories will range from AI tools meeting the chaos of real field environments, to an iron fish that a community in northern Uganda wasn't ready to trust, to 20 years of humanitarian learning research that keeps arriving at the same conclusions.

Let's get into it. I'd like to invite each of our speakers to introduce themselves with their name, organisation, and role. Juliet, we'll start with you.

Juliet Parker [5:42]

Thank you. I'm Juliet Parker, Director of ALNAP – the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action. I'm really delighted to be joining today.

Tino Kreutzer [5:57]

Great to meet everyone. Excited to be here and talk about failure. I'm Tino Kreutzer, Chief Operating and Innovation Officer at KoboToolbox.

Noela Ojara [6:09]

Thank you. Hello and greetings from Uganda. My name is Noela Ojara, Founder and Managing Director of Divine Organic Foods, a private sector SME in Uganda.

José Cobos Romero [6:25]

Thanks, everyone. My name is José Cobos Romero. I work as Head of Innovation for Data Friendly Space, an NGO focused on AI, technology, and analytics. I'm based in southern Spain. Very glad to be here.

Q1: How do you define innovation in your context?

Elizabeth Devine [6:42]

Wonderful. Let's set the stage. We're going to start with a question that might seem basic, but I think is worth sitting with – because I suspect everyone will answer it slightly differently.

How do you define innovation in your context, and how is it different from how other sectors might define it? In a sector where the stakes are human lives and resources are scarce, does the word innovation even fit? Juliet, let's start with you.

Juliet Parker [7:43]

At ALNAP, we focus on learning – our mandate is to look at learning and improve performance across the humanitarian sector. Innovation is interesting because over ALNAP's 27-year history, our mandate has been interpreted differently at different times. At the beginning, it was all about evaluation. Now it's really about knowledge equity. But there was a period in the middle where innovation was a critical part of learning – there was a sense that we needed, around the time of the World Humanitarian Summit, a particular injection and focus on innovation to unlock a step change in sector performance.

Over the last ten years, there has been a lot of learning about where innovation has enabled improved performance and where it has been blocked. For us, innovation is one of the tools within the learning landscape to unlock those step changes.

Tino Kreutzer [8:59]

From our side – especially when the technology angle comes in at KoboToolbox – innovation is not synonymous with what most private sector technology companies would call it. It's not about capturing the market as quickly as possible, or being disruptive. For us, innovation is actually using the tools we have, leveraging the knowledge that humanitarian field users already possess, and making sure we build something durable, reliable, safe, and secure. Sometimes those tools take more time and money to build. But that, to us, is real innovation – reusing what we already have.

For anyone familiar with the Apollo 13 movie: the idea of dumping everything on the table and making use of what you have, even when it doesn't seem like enough. That's humanitarian innovation. Not looking for the shiniest, most disruptive thing, but helping everyone use what they already have so there's no need for costly retraining or investment in new technologies.

Noela Ojara [10:22]

Coming from the private sector and the SME space, we define innovation as co-creating solutions with communities that are practical, nutrition-sensitive, and sustainable. We provide products and services that address nutrition needs in communities. By working together with communities, we ensure we're delivering what they need – in a way that lasts. That's how we define innovation at Divine Organic Foods.

José Cobos Romero [11:07]

For us as an NGO that does tech, the innovation is not focused on the technology itself – what might seem innovative to non-technical people is not really the core of what we do. We sit somewhere in the middle: as a tech organisation, we don't benchmark only on speed and accuracy in markets, but as an NGO we also need to help communities alleviate suffering – from a data point of view, which is not easy.

We don't only need to build with and for others – we also need to create trust. Helping others understand what data can do in a sector this close to actual human suffering: that's the real innovation for me.

Q2: What innovation are you most excited about right now?

Elizabeth Devine [12:12]

Now let's look at what innovation actually looks like on the ground. What is one innovation your team is most excited about right now? And why should the person most affected by a crisis care about it? José, let's start with you.

José Cobos Romero [12:37]

We create platforms, tools, software, and do analytics – we work with data. If you ask me from a purely technical point of view, being able to query massive datasets using regular words is impressive. A person with no knowledge of statistical software just asking data questions and getting answers – that is great. However, I think our main innovation, or the thing we're most excited about, is a programme born out of a struggle with trust and sustainability in tech. We came up with something that works through a network of professionals who devote their time to maintaining and improving these tools. We found ourselves discovering the most innovative aspect of our work in something that is absolutely non-technical.

Noela Ojara [14:29]

From our side, we're excited about a new product: an instant composite Vitamin A porridge flour. This flour is made from bio-fortified foods – orange flesh sweet potato, orange maize, and soy for protein. It has been classified by Uganda's National Drug Authority as a food supplement, and certified by our standards body. It is addressing the Vitamin A deficiency crisis in Uganda.

Why Vitamin A? Because Vitamin A deficiency in children below two years causes blindness – and, per the World Health Organization, 50% of children who go blind also die within the next year. It also causes lack of immunity, making children very susceptible to respiratory infections. And deficiency in a mother of reproductive age affects both the child in the womb and the child she is breastfeeding.

Our innovative nutritious porridge – using bio-fortified food supplements – makes us feel quite proud as a team because we have made it affordable, accessible, and safe for vulnerable communities, contributing to wiping out Vitamin A deficiency in Uganda.

Tino Kreutzer [16:37]

For us, one of the things we're most excited about is putting our new speech recognition and automatic AI analysis features to work. These are features we've been building for years – long before ChatGPT, we were exploring where artificial intelligence could help us collect more qualitative data.

We have many organisations relying on Kobo to collect quantitative data – millions of surveys. But what we heard over and over is that organisations were yearning for a deeper understanding of what affected populations truly need. So we built features into Kobo to allow users to collect open-ended audio responses, transcribe them at scale with humans in the loop for accuracy, and then use AI tools for rapid qualitative analysis.

We don't try to be the first – we want to be the safest option. And what we've found is that it's sometimes difficult to control for environment: recording in a noisy space dramatically affects quality. But this is, to us, a big change – not just in how we conduct surveys, but in how we interact with affected populations, so we don't try to fit everyone into a checkbox anymore.

Q3: Assumptions dismantled by field reality

Elizabeth Devine [18:49]

You're talking about innovations hitting the messy, unpredictable realities of field environments. Are there other assumptions you've held with real confidence that the operational context just completely dismantled? What did that feel like for you and your team? Tino, let's stay with you.

Tino Kreutzer [19:07]

In some ways, the tools have been way better than we thought – the qualitative analysis driven by good open-source LLMs is tremendously strong. But in terms of hitting messy field realities: we did a large survey with partners across 14 countries in the Middle East, covering many local Arabic dialects. Initial testing showed results were quite good. But as the project rolled out, quality dropped off tremendously.

It wasn't that we were recording populations with stronger accents. It was that during the training-of-trainers process, the requirement to use good audio equipment in quiet environments fell out of the instructions. So the quality of audio dropped, and therefore the quality of speech recognition dropped too. Technology was doing its job – but how we trained people and how we relied on a cascade of trainers was what failed us. We should have spotted this earlier. The lesson: good audio equipment and quiet environments are the foundation for good qualitative data.

Q4: Building a culture of honest failure documentation

Elizabeth Devine [21:06]

Thanks very much, Tino. José, you've described failure as information – but information only has value if people are willing to surface it. How do you build a culture where teams document failure honestly, rather than quietly burying it and moving on?

José Cobos Romero [21:27]

There is something in the nature of our organisation: failure and feedback loops are day-to-day in any IT development. We don't feel guilty if our software needs to improve, or if feedback is hard. We do document it, and we make it public.

This year, for example, we had a session with colleagues at KoboToolbox specifically about surfacing issues from our own tools. We were exposing issues we identified in our tool, and how we overcame them. We went public on it – and recently we had a paper published with real-life examples, including deployments in Myanmar and in Palestine. We were open about it. There is no way data or software or analytics gets better if we're not open.

I think that requires a cultural change. Organisations need to stop treating public acknowledgement of issues as a penalty. If you look at the culture of GitHub – a shared repository where we all share resources and learnings so the best things can be replicated and errors not repeated – that's our approach.

Q5: A specific moment of failure – the Lucky Iron Fish

Elizabeth Devine [23:29]

Noela, can you take us to a specific moment – not a vague lesson, but a real one – where something you tried in your supply chain or with a community partner failed, and tell us what it actually forced you to change?

Noela Ojara [23:48]

In 2024 we worked with official data from Uganda's Ministry of Health, which stated that 49% of people living in Agago were iron deficient. This brought the concept of the Lucky Iron Fish to GOAL's Uganda office, and we as the private sector partner were brought in to implement this innovation in Agago.

The Lucky Iron Fish is made from food-grade iron. When introduced into water or food with a level of acidity, it releases iron into that food. We got ready and went up to Agago. But we had to ask ourselves tough questions: would the community afford to purchase it – at approximately \$8 per ingot, for a community that had suffered 21 years of war in northern Uganda? Was it culturally acceptable? Did the community actually need this intervention?

Immediately we had to test the foods the communities consumed. We picked food samples, ran them with and without the Lucky Iron Fish, mimicking how food is prepared locally. The lab results confirmed that, first, the foods the communities were already eating contained iron – even without the Lucky Iron Fish. And second, the food with the Lucky Iron Fish showed an increase in iron content.

That led us to test the water. We collected potable water samples from the communities using East African potable water standards. The results showed there was iron in the water – in some instances, far above what was even recommended for human consumption.

As part of the innovation we also used a minimally invasive device to test iron levels in blood in real time. Analysing the data using CDC standards, we found that 90% of those

tested were within the normal range of iron in their blood. The data on the ground was not matching the official statistics.

There was some initial resistance – here was a concept that was well-developed and had received funding, but the field data was not aligned. As we kept engaging with stakeholders, we recognised that food insecurity was the biggest underlying challenge. Where a household cannot eat adequate food, they also cannot drink adequate water. So even with iron available in their environment, the real barrier was access.

We had to redesign the entire strategy. Fortunately, we had the goodwill and understanding of the GOAL team and the Innovation Hub to do that together.

Q6: Has the sector genuinely gotten better at learning?

Elizabeth Devine [30:19]

Thanks very much, Noela – a lot of robust learning from that story. Juliet, there's often a tension between innovating and learning in the humanitarian sector, and ALNAP has been studying humanitarian learning for decades. Has the sector genuinely gotten better at learning? Are we still paying for the same mistakes with different faces? What keeps these patterns repeating?

Juliet Parker [31:01]

I see different tribes – the innovation tribe mostly talking to other innovation people, and the learning people mostly talking to each other. They occasionally intersect. There are also different funding streams maintaining that difference, different language, and potentially different objectives. Learning is often seen as more “fluffy” while innovation is seen as cooler, especially in tech.

On whether the sector has got better at learning: we did a study looking at trends over time. We found really strong evidence of learning and improved performance at a technical, sector-specific level. We're getting better at nutrition interventions, WASH interventions, cash interventions. Where the learning pathway isn't so clear is at the system level – on localisation, on linking relief and development, on accountability to affected populations. The recommendations in evaluations now are almost word for word the same as they were 20 years ago. The question is why.

One reason is that it's within the control of individual agencies to make technical improvements, and there is an incentive structure that supports that. We call it single-loop learning – organisations get better at doing what they're already doing, rather than stepping back and asking whether they should be doing it in the first place. And we are incentivised to improve on things that sit comfortably within the sector's business model. The problem with the humanitarian-development nexus, accountability to affected populations, and localisation is that they bump up against that business model. That's why those patterns keep repeating.

Innovation investment has tended to be sector-specific over the last ten years, with very few cross-sectoral or political innovations. Most were tested in relatively easier operational contexts. We're at a very interesting moment now: will innovation funding be cut? Or is there a resurgence of interest because we need to innovate our way out of the current dramatic funding shift? Nobody knows which way it's going to go. But innovation, like many things, is a trend – it cycles.

Q7: Move fast and learn – when the people you're testing with can't afford your learning curve

Elizabeth Devine [35:17]

Hopefully through continued conversations like this, we can disrupt some of those patterns. There is a version of "move fast and learn" that works in innovation – but the people you're testing with can't always afford your learning curve. How do you navigate that? And have you ever gotten it wrong? Brief reflections – José, let's start with you.

José Cobos Romero [35:56]

"Move fast and be accurate" just doesn't work in this sector. We try to hold the principle of "do no harm" as the speed governor. That, combined with keeping humans in the loop, means innovation has to be human-centred, do no harm, and locally driven – and it's not always easy.

We have a product that automates analysis with a human in the loop. It was deliberately slowed down in one context because local coordination colleagues said: we think it's quality, but we don't think this is the moment to launch or scale it publicly. We accepted that. Locally driven means that. Equally, we could tomorrow scale our situation hubs to a thousand countries – but we would lose the human-driven component.

And in the opposite direction: in Myanmar, we shared information with partners in-country and they flagged very quickly that some of it was wrong. Those same partners then turned around and said: we acknowledge the limitations, there is a massive lack of data – let's go public with that. Being wrong doesn't always mean it must not be published. We need to avoid being paternalistic and let those who need the data decide.

Tino Kreutzer [38:20]

"Move fast and break things" is just not acceptable as a motto for us. KoboToolbox serves about 35,000 organisations – around 200,000 to 250,000 active users per month. Those people rely on us to not break things, to have a service that is reliable so that when you collect data, it's still there tomorrow. Nothing gets breached. You're not selling data to others. The features you built your entire M&E framework around, that you trained a hundred people on yesterday, will still work tomorrow. That's a massive

responsibility – and in the non-profit, humanitarian space, that responsibility is in our DNA.

The way we guard against this: testing, testing, testing. We pilot with real data, with our own internal projects, with synthetic data, with test-driven development and automated and manual testing – so that long before a solution reaches users, we are very sure it works. For example, we're currently building an AI-enabled form builder. Before release, we're piloting with partners in Ethiopia to make sure results in the field, not just the lab, match expectations – measured against human experts. Only if we're satisfied and any remediation is addressed do we release. We don't release to meet an arbitrary timeline.

Noela Ojara [41:11]

We have absolutely gotten it wrong several times – and we pick up. What we've learned is that moving fast, for us, is about listening – not just marketing or distributing products. Learning is through the community and client voice.

We do a lot of product sales, testing, and trials, but also adapting our supply chains to the social and cultural realities of our consumers. "Move fast and learn" should not be used generically, because the responsibilities of people involved in innovation vary. Those responsibilities vary based on the RACI: who is Responsible, who is Accountable, who do we Communicate to, and what information are we communicating? We monitor continuously, implement in phases, report, extract learnings, and redefine for success. That's how my team and I work through it.

Q8: What the sector doesn't want to hear about localisation

Elizabeth Devine [42:42]

It's clear it's not just about getting things out there fast, but ensuring we have evidence and data to support what we're putting out. Juliet, from research and direct experience working with local partners and leaders – what has the sector learned that it doesn't want to hear about how localisation actually works? Where do good intentions consistently collapse into the same old power dynamics?

Juliet Parker [43:16]

We've got a sector that was built for speed and scale that also wants to have nuanced, individually curated responses. These two things are bumping into each other. Add into the mix the vested interests of organisations, the unwillingness to cede power regardless of how good the rhetoric sounds, and the concentration of resources – which basically isn't changing. You still have few donors funding few large organisations. The sector doesn't yet know how to fund a more diverse range of actors. There are interesting ideas around pooled fund ecosystems, but the sector hasn't really made that leap in any meaningful way.

In terms of innovation and learning: a lot of local knowledge is invisible to the humanitarian sector. The learning, innovation, adaptation, and change happening fluidly within every project is largely invisible – assumed. A large part of what we try to do at ALNAP is give visibility to that learning and innovation that is already happening.

But the same power dynamics that exist in operational localisation exist in the knowledge dimension too. There is an inherent bias towards more northern-generated knowledge, and away from locally generated knowledge. Project-level innovation and learning is largely unfunded. South-South learning and exchange on innovation is largely unfunded. That northern dominance of knowledge and innovation is, some would say, stifling more natural forms of innovation and knowledge generation. I think a great innovation would be to better use information technologies to enable a more natural, fluid, real-time exchange and visibility across all the change that is happening at project level. That's the next stage of the localisation discussion – knowledge, and respect for a broader range of knowledge than we currently recognise.

Elizabeth Devine [46:15]

Thank you, Juliet. Noela, how does this align with your experience of localisation in practice in northern Uganda?

Noela Ojara [46:31]

From my experience as a team leader at Divine Organic Foods, and working with other SMEs in the nutrition space: as long as we contextualise the community setting and appreciate their needs, innovation can actually be shaped to address those needs. We've worked in different communities across Uganda, and each community has different cultural settings. We go deep to understand who our target market is, what their need is – and particularly, for women of reproductive age, how they perceive a particular product.

Then we work around influencing the community through health workers, cultural leaders, and political leaders to ensure that we bring the innovation into reality and meet the need it is meant for.

Q9: One structural change to how the sector treats innovation and learning

Elizabeth Devine [47:53]

We've heard a lot of rich reflections from everyone on the panel today. Let's finish with one last question. If you could make one structural change to how the humanitarian sector treats innovation and learning – not just at your organisation, but sector-wide, and you knew it would actually stick – what would that change be? We'll start with José.

José Cobos Romero [48:28]

I would say: praise the learning, not just the novelty. We are a sector that celebrates new pilots, new tools, new ideas, and treats them as the whole story of innovation. I would try to move to a system that consolidates innovation – less attractive as a headline, but much more needed, more efficient, and more easily locally driven.

I would redefine what a success story looks like. A documented case of “we saw something that wasn’t working, we learned, we struggled, we managed it in cooperation with partners, and now here is something sustained and useful that saves lives” – we need to advocate for that.

Noela Ojara [49:47]

Innovate *with* the end users rather than *for* them – ensuring that their knowledge, perspectives, and contributions are all integrated into the process. And have the development partner or funder be part of that process and those steps.

Tino Kreutzer [50:15]

I would say every failure – or even partial failure, like the ones we discussed, because they are really successes wrapped in failures – should be systematically published. It should be incumbent on donors and on the organisations doing the innovation, particularly nonprofits using public funds, to publish them. A “failure as data” approach, with a shared repository. We all learn more from failure than from success. The more we talk about it, the more it becomes normalised – and the better we can actually do innovation in the future.

Juliet Parker [51:14]

With my magic wand, I would create greater investment in sharing platforms to give greater visibility to national-level innovation and projects – without being tied to funding streams, and without having to go through the intermediary of a northern institution. Really creating more space and opportunity for national and local experiences within a sharing culture.

Audience Q&A

Elizabeth Devine [51:43]

We’re approaching the last seven minutes and we’ve received a couple of questions from the audience. First question: as donor-funded institutions, we often find ourselves over-complying with requirements, which limits the ability to innovate. What practical advice would you give to help organisations step out of this comfort zone and foster a culture of innovation while still maintaining accountability?

Juliet Parker [52:24]

There's no easy answer. There is potential to negotiate with funders – sometimes it works, sometimes it doesn't. There are funds particularly good at funding innovation, sometimes within traditional donors where you have a real innovation champion. Some philanthropies are increasingly positioning themselves as sector disruptors, with a different appetite and attitude. Some are getting very good at small grants with no strings attached, which gives total space and freedom. They're few and far between and often rely on personal relationships, but if you can find them, they're remarkable.

Elizabeth Devine [53:17]

The practical advice is to try to build those relationships. We have another question from the chat: where do feedback loops most commonly break down in humanitarian innovation? And have you ever chosen not to act on data, and why?

José Cobos Romero [53:43]

It's a great question. When it comes to software, data, or IT products, unaddressed feedback usually leads to abandonment of certain platforms or initiatives. You don't see the feedback being implemented because users just stop being users. And it won't make the news. The fact that something was just abandoned eludes documentation. That's extremely negative – not because of the failure itself, but because it doesn't allow the next team to avoid repeating your mistakes. It's a huge problem that we do not recognise, or publicly state, our not-so-successful stories.

Elizabeth Devine [54:44]

Thanks very much, José. Last question: what about working with research institutions and universities on innovation and learning in the humanitarian sector? Are we seeing success with this?

Tino Kreutzer [55:04]

Absolutely. Some of our best conversations and suggestions come from academia – enthusiastic students, medical researchers, academics of all levels of seniority. There are many good ideas. Sometimes academics rely on the humanitarian sector because it's genuinely hard to understand and gain access to the field. The close collaboration, as long as it's possible and ethical, is mutually beneficial.

At the same time, there is a reason for the ivory tower stereotype. Academia can be quite slow because certainty about data is what academic culture values – and that can hold back ideas that are time-sensitive. The real challenge is how to break that cycle.

Perhaps the academic sector isn't built for that speed. So we need to bring research thinking into humanitarian organisations – few organisations have really built internal research capacity that can inherit the goals of an academic partner without being fully dependent on their slower timeline or overly strict ethical review boards not designed for practical humanitarian environments.

Closing

Elizabeth Devine [56:52]

That's a great point – research collaboration can be very useful for the evidence base, but also adds its own complexities. Well, thank you very much, everyone. That's all the time we have for questions.

Before I let everyone go, I wanted to take a moment because I think something really important has happened here today. What struck me the most is that from all the stories we heard, they all followed a similar shape: a confident assumption, a reality that dismantled it, and teams that chose to stay with the problem instead of walking away. That is not a small thing. It takes a lot of courage – and a culture that actually allows for it.

I'd like to thank our speakers: Juliet Parker from ALNAP, for giving us honest, research-backed truth that the sector doesn't always want to hear, and for connecting today's stories to the bigger patterns that keep repeating; Tino Kreutzer from KoboToolbox, for showing us that moving fast and being responsible are not opposites, and that no matter how well you design something, the field will always have something to say about it; Noela Ojara from Divine Organic Foods, for bringing us into the lived reality of innovation in northern Uganda and reminding us that community trust is not a given – it has to be earned every time; and José Cobos Romero from Data Friendly Space, for making the case clearly and honestly that failure documented is failure transformed, and that a culture of learning has to be built, not assumed.

For everyone attending: a follow-up will land in your inbox after the session, at the email address you registered with. It will include resources shared by our speakers and any relevant links from the conversation. This is the first in what we hope will be an ongoing series. If something resonated with you today, or if you're finally ready to submit that failure story, we'd love to hear from you. Thank you all for being here. Take care.

© 2026 GOAL Innovation Lab & Data Friendly Space. This transcript may be shared freely with attribution.