SUNSHINE AGRICULTURE
e-Newsletter

ISSN (E): 2583 – 0821

*Sun. Agri.:e- Newsletter,* (2026) *6*(10), 61-63

Article ID: 687

# Better Goats, Stronger Communities: Breeding Led by Farmers

**Sonal Sharma[1]**
**Shiv Kumar Tyagi[2]**

[1]Ph.D. Scholar, Division of Animal Genetics and Breeding, ICAR- IVRI Izatnagar, Bareilly, U.P.

[2]Assistant Professor Department of Animal Genetics and Breeding College of Veterinary & Animal Sciences, Banda University of Agriculture & Technology

Open Access

*Corresponding Author
**Sonal Sharma***

*Available online at*
www.sunshineagriculture.vitalbiotech.org

**Article History**
Received: 06.10.2026
Revised: 10.10.2026
Accepted: 14.10.2026

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0.

## INTRODUCTION

For many rural households, goats are a source of food, income, manure and savings. They can be sold when a family faces an urgent expense, and they often fit into farms with limited land. Yet the animals' value can be held back when mating is uncontrolled, breeding males are selected by guesswork and no one keeps track of which does produce healthy, fast-growing kids. Community-based breeding offers a practical way to improve local goats by organizing selection around the people who raise them.

Unlike a programme designed entirely from the outside, a community-based breeding programme begins with the farmers' own priorities. Scientists and extension workers contribute methods and technical support, but farmers help define what "better" means. This matters because a goat that is valuable in one village may not meet the needs of another. The approach can improve production while giving local communities a stronger role in maintaining their own animal genetic resources.

### Begin with the trait's farmers care about

The first task is to discuss the breeding goal with goat keepers. They may want faster growth, more kids weaned, stronger mothering ability, a good kidding rate, milk for household use, survival during dry months, a particular body size or coat color, or animals that sell well in local markets. Farmers may also value temperament, ease of handling and resistance to common health problems. These priorities should be ranked, because selecting for too many traits at once can make progress slow and confusing.

The discussion should include women and other household members who take part in daily care and make decisions about feeding, treatment and sale. Their knowledge can reveal practical traits that are easy to miss in a formal survey. For example, a doe that raises kids reliably with limited assistance may be more valuable than one with a larger frame but frequent kid losses. A programme designed around local priorities is more likely to be adopted and sustained.

**Simple records make selection more dependable**

Once goals are agreed, the community needs a manageable way to identify animals and record their performance. A basic system can include the animal's identification number, owner, age, dam and sire where known, birth date, litter size, body weight at set ages, health events and whether the kid survived to weaning. For breeding does, useful information may include age at first kidding, kidding interval and the number of kids raised. Records should match the programme's goals; collecting too much information can discourage participation.

Measurements must be taken consistently. A body weight recorded at three months cannot be compared fairly with one recorded at six months. Where possible, animals should be compared within similar age groups and under broadly similar management. Feed availability, illness, season and litter size all affect growth. Keeping brief notes on these factors helps farmers and technicians avoid crediting genetics for an advantage that actually came from better feeding or a healthier start.

The system can begin with a notebook, ear tags and periodic weighing days. A phone application may help later, but technology is useful only when someone can enter, review and use the information. Local record keepers can be trained to check entries, follow up missing information and explain the results at community meetings. Regular feedback gives farmers a reason to keep recording.

**Choose breeding males carefully**

In many village herds, one or a few bucks sire a large share of the next generation. This makes buck selection especially important. A candidate should be healthy, structurally sound and suitable for the local environment. His own growth and the performance of his mother, sisters and previous offspring can provide additional clues. A buck should not be selected solely because he looks impressive; body size alone says little about fertility, kid survival or performance under local conditions.

Using a small number of popular males repeatedly can increase relatedness and reduce diversity. Communities can limit this risk by using several good bucks from different families, recording which does they mate and rotating males between groups according to an agreed plan. If a buck is shared, the schedule should be clear and animal-health checks should be followed. These practical steps can reduce close-relative mating while allowing farmers to access better breeding animals.

Selection is a gradual process. A strong kid crop in one season may reflect excellent rain, plentiful fodder or good health care rather than a genetic improvement. Records over several seasons give a more balanced picture. Technical staff can help communities compare animals, identify promising families and revise selection rules as new information emerges. The programme should be willing to learn; selection criteria need not remain fixed if farmers' needs change.

**Breeding and good management belong together**

Genetic improvement cannot overcome preventable disease, inadequate feed or unsafe housing. A breeding programme should connect selection with vaccination, parasite control, timely treatment, clean water, shelter

and feed planning. Pregnant and lactating does, growing kids and adult males may have different needs. Better nutrition and health care can improve performance immediately, while genetic selection produces change over generations. Both are important, and the two should not be confused.

Training should help farmers recognize common health problems, provide appropriate care and seek veterinary assistance when needed. It should also cover buck management, mating plans, kid care and record keeping. Local extension workers can make the programme more reliable by visiting regularly rather than appearing only at the start. Collaboration with veterinary institutions helps ensure that breeding decisions are supported by sound health advice.

**Organization keeps the programme alive**

A community programme needs agreed responsibilities. Farmers can decide who keeps records, how bucks are selected and shared, how costs are handled and when results are reviewed. Producer groups or local committees may help coordinate activities. Transparent decisions build trust, especially when only some animals are chosen for breeding. If farmers understand why a buck was selected and how future opportunities will be shared, they are more likely to participate.

The programme also needs realistic financial and institutional support. Weighing scales, identification materials, training and veterinary visits all cost money. Local departments, universities and development programmes can help with initial training and technical review. Over time, the goal should be for the community to own the routine work and for outside experts to provide periodic support. A system that depends indefinitely on one project worker is unlikely to last.

**Progress measured in generations**

Community-based breeding is not a quick route to instant transformation. It is a structured process: farmers set priorities, animals are identified, records guide selection, mating is planned and results are reviewed. When the programme is well organized, it can improve useful traits, strengthen local ownership and create an incentive to maintain adapted goat populations. The most important measure of success is not the number of forms completed; it is whether farmers see healthier, more productive animals and continue the work together.

## REFERENCES

Mueller, J. P. et al. (2015). Community-based livestock breeding programmes: essentials and examples. Journal of Animal Breeding and Genetics, 132, 155–168. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jbg.12136

FAO AGRIS. Breeding objectives and selection criteria of a participatory community-based breeding programme of goats and sheep. https://agris.fao.org/search/en/providers/122535/records/65df28d00f3e94b9e5d5b11a

ICAR-CIWA. Goat Farming for Improving Livelihood Security of Farm Women. https://www.ciwa.icar.gov.in/sites/default/files/ICAR-CIWA-TB33-2019.pdf