



UNIVERSITY  
of  
GREENWICH | Natural  
Resources  
Institute

## Sustainable NGO/CBO Agricultural Marketing Initiatives. Project evaluation report. 1 January 2001 - 31 May 2003

---

### **Greenwich Academic Literature Archive (GALA) Citation:**

Greenhalgh, Peter and Wandschneider, Tiago (2003) *Sustainable NGO/CBO Agricultural Marketing Initiatives. Project evaluation report. 1 January 2001 - 31 May 2003*. Project Report. Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, UK.

### **Available at:**

<http://gala.gre.ac.uk/12091>

---

### **Copyright Status:**

Permission is granted by the Natural Resources Institute (NRI), University of Greenwich for the copying, distribution and/or transmitting of this work under the conditions that it is attributed in the manner specified by the author or licensor and it is not used for commercial purposes. However you may not alter, transform or build upon this work. Please note that any of the aforementioned conditions can be waived with permission from the NRI.

Where the work or any of its elements is in the public domain under applicable law, that status is in no way affected by this license. This license in no way affects your fair dealing or fair use rights, or other applicable copyright exemptions and limitations and neither does it affect the author's moral rights or the rights other persons may have either in the work itself or in how the work is used, such as publicity or privacy rights. For any reuse or distribution, you must make it clear to others the license terms of this work.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

---

### **Contact:**

GALA Repository Team: [gala@gre.ac.uk](mailto:gala@gre.ac.uk)  
Natural Resources Institute: [nri@greenwich.ac.uk](mailto:nri@greenwich.ac.uk)

**NRI Report No: 2384**

**CROP POST HARVEST PROGRAMME**

**Sustainable NGO/CBO Agricultural  
Marketing Initiatives**

**R7941**

**PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT**

**1 January 2001–31 May 2003**

**AME and Catalyst Management Systems  
(CMS) in India National Agricultural  
Advisory Services (NAADS) in Uganda**

**Peter Greenhalgh and Tiago Wandschneider  
Natural Resources Institute (NRI) United Kingdom**



**CROP POST HARVEST PROGRAMME**

**NRI Report No: 2384**

**Sustainable NGO/CBO Agricultural Marketing Initiatives**

**R7941**

**PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT**

1 January 2001 – 31 May 2003

AME and Catalyst Management Systems (CMS) in India  
National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) in Uganda

Peter Greenhalgh and Tiago Wandschneider  
Natural Resources Institute (NRI) United Kingdom

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Section A	Executive Summary ..... 1
Section B	Project Background..... 3
Section C	Evaluating the design and identification stage..... 4
Section D	Evaluating the implementation process ..... 7
Section E	Activities ..... 9
Section F	Evaluating project effectiveness ..... 14
ANNEXES	..... 36
I	Project Logical Framework..... 37
II	Analysis of Expenditure over Implementation Period..... 41
III	Results of End of Project Workshop..... 42
V	Feedback on the Process from Collaborating Institutions ..... 45
VI	List of Publications ..... 49
VII	A Catalogue of Data Sets and Their Location ..... 50

## **Section A Executive Summary**

The project purpose is to develop commercially sustainable and replicable agricultural and processing interventions by community-based organisations (CBOs) and non-government organisations (NGOs) which improve the livelihoods of resource-poor and remote farmers. Special emphasis is given to enhancing access to food crop markets.

NGOs and CBOs have an important role to play in improving market access by poor and remote farmers, but they often lack the expertise and contacts to develop sustainable and replicable marketing interventions. This represents a lost opportunity.

The research was based on participatory case studies in India and Uganda. Research was conducted by NRI, in collaboration with NAADS (Uganda), AME and CMS (India) and case study NGOs. The main institutions targeted by the project were NGOs and CBOs, and government and donor agencies in India, Uganda and other developing countries.

Project implementation went according to plan. All activities were completed, with the exception of some dissemination initiatives which are still underway. Thirteen case studies were developed (nine in India and four in Uganda). Most case studies involved small local NGOs, which lack the resources to access expert advice. Most studied interventions supported CBOs such as farmer associations and self-help groups.

Case study areas included: support to farmer groups; promotion of market linkages; dissemination of market information; market-oriented food processing; and inventory credit services. The choice of case studies reflected marketing interventions that are commonly found in developing countries and the interests of target institutions in India and Uganda.

While it is too early to fully assess achievements, experience so far suggests that the project purpose is likely to be largely reached (rating 2). Demand for project outputs is high and feedback from various stakeholders in the study countries has been very positive. In Uganda there is evidence that case study organisations are already adopting project recommendations. There are also indications that future adoption by Indian NGOs and donor-funded programmes and Ugandan government and donor agencies is very likely.

Wider adoption is partly dependent on future dissemination activities. In addition, project staff are collaborating with NRI colleagues and two Ugandan organisations to produce a training manual for extension agents and radio programmes targeting farmer groups. Ongoing collaborations between project staff and NGOs in countries such as Bangladesh and Mozambique offer further opportunities to put project findings into practice.

All project outputs were achieved (rating 1). Two outputs were particularly important: i) the development of good practice guidelines (some examples are presented in the report for illustration purposes); and ii) the identification of NGO/CBO capacity building needs for improved agricultural marketing initiatives.

Farmer associations and self-help groups would generally benefit from enhanced organisation and management skills, improved agricultural and post-harvest practices; and greater business

development capacity. This can be achieved through the provision of advisory services, extension and training activities, and linkage development initiatives.

The potential role of NGOs and CBOs in agricultural marketing is largely unrealised. Capacity building in a number of areas is therefore required to bridge the gap between existing knowledge and practice. NGOs must improve their understanding of marketing systems; recognise that certain forms of interaction between poor farmers and the commercial sector may serve social goals; and be able to identify and assess intervention opportunities. They must also have the capacity to address production and post-harvest issues in an integrated manner, to develop appropriate monitoring and evaluation systems, and to implement well-thought exit strategies. Focused workshops and seminars can play an important awareness-raising role and can contribute to strengthening contact networks, but significant capacity building can only be achieved through targeted training initiatives. Partnerships can also prove instrumental in enhancing capacity and contributing to the scaling-up and replication of marketing initiatives.

## Section B Project Background

<b>Period under report</b>	January 2001-May 2003
<b>NRIL Contract Number</b>	R7941
<b>DFID Contract Number</b>	
<b>Project Title</b>	Sustainable NGO/CBO Agricultural Marketing Initiatives
<b>Research Programme</b>	Crop Post-Harvest
<b>Production System</b>	Cross-cutting
<b>Project Leader/institution</b>	NRI
<b>Collaborating institution(s)</b>	AME and CMS (India) and NAADS (Uganda)
<b>Target institutions (s)</b>	CBOs and NGOs, government agencies and departments, donor and development organisations (Uganda, India and other developing countries)
<b>Start date</b>	January 2001
<b>End date</b>	May 2003
<b>Budget</b>	£174,448 (£204,976 including VAT)

## **Section C      Evaluating the design and identification stage**

### **Project purpose**

The project aimed to develop commercially sustainable agricultural marketing initiatives by community-based organisations (CBOs) and non-government organisations (NGOs) which improve the livelihoods of resource-poor and remote farmers in developing countries. It identified and disseminated good practice for commercially sustainable and replicable interventions seeking to address the constraints these farmers face in accessing domestic food crop markets on favourable terms.

The research was based on participatory case studies of NGO/CBO marketing initiatives in India and Uganda, chosen after consultation with key stakeholders in each country. The project team collaborated with participating organisations to learn lessons from existing initiatives, develop sustainable marketing strategies, identify capacity-building needs and devise appropriate dissemination products and mechanisms.

### **The focus on improving access to food markets by resource-poor and remote farmers**

Previous work by NRI and other organisations reveals that resource-poor farmers in developing countries repeatedly cite problems in marketing their surplus produce. While such research has generated a wealth of knowledge on marketing constraints and systems, little attention was paid to the specific role of NGOs in the marketing sphere. Moreover, such research focused mostly on export crops and areas with relatively good market access rather than domestic crops and remote regions. The project sought to address these gaps and worked closely with different organisations to bridge the gap between knowledge and practice.

While marketing constraints result in high transaction costs and risks, thereby discouraging production and trade and depressing producer prices, their impact goes well beyond farming households and the local economy. The typically high trading and processing margins that characterise marketing systems in developing countries and the latter's inability to efficiently move produce across regions and seasons have negative livelihood and development implications. These attributes of marketing systems penalise urban and rural consumers; impose undue costs on industries using agricultural inputs; and constrain the capacity of a country to compete in international commodity markets. In short, agricultural marketing problems affect the well-being of farming households, limit rural development prospects, and have negative food security and balance of payment consequences.

### **The focus on India and Uganda**

India and Uganda share some characteristics that justify their choice as study countries. First, a significant proportion of the population resides in rural areas; agriculture remains crucially important to rural livelihoods and the wider economy; and its contribution to both is limited by the difficulties that farmers face in accessing remunerative markets. Second, NGOs in both countries are showing increased interest in agricultural marketing as an intervention area. The research is especially timely in Uganda, where agricultural commercialisation ranks very high within government's development agenda. Farmer organisations and non-government



providers of agricultural extension services are seen as playing a central role towards this goal.

Marked differences in socio-economic, cultural and policy environments in India and Uganda also informed the choice of study countries. It was hoped that these differences would make the project findings relevant to a large number of countries.

### **The focus on NGOs and CBOs**

The focus on NGOs and CBOs is justified not only by their growing interest and potential role in agricultural marketing, but also by their weaknesses in this area. NGOs and CBOs often lack the expertise and contacts to develop sustainable and replicable marketing interventions. This represents a lost opportunity. While examples of successful marketing interventions and good practice exist, these are largely confined to large and well-resourced international organisations. Several problems have undermined NGO marketing initiatives, including poor understanding of markets and how commercial channels may serve social (livelihood) goals; insufficient resources to adequately develop capacity at the producer level; distrust of commercial sector players; and a “legitimate” focus on remote areas and poor farmers.

### **Collaboration with different groups of farmers**

The project worked with organisations assisting smallholder farmers in marketing their produce. The profile of farmers supported by these organisations varied considerably, ranging from poor and semi-subsistence to wealthier and more commercially oriented. The poorest in rural communities in India and Uganda rarely have surplus produce for sale and therefore are rarely targeted by organisations intervening in marketing. Self-help groups of women belonging to landless and marginal farming households in India are the exception, since some of the case study organisations are promoting small-scale agricultural trade and processing as an income generating activity.

Farmers were interviewed as part of the research process. This provided critical insights into case study interventions, their impact and sustainability. It also helped the research team understand how farmers’ marketing needs differ according to location, gender, household resources, type of crop grown, and so on. Good practice interventions must account for these differences.

### **Collaboration with target institutions**

The project targeted three types of institutions:

- NGOs and CBOs implementing agricultural marketing interventions or intending to become involved in this area were the primary target institutions;
- government agencies with a mandate to develop agricultural markets and enhance farmer incomes, either through policy or programme interventions; and
- donor agencies funding agricultural marketing interventions and engaged in relevant policy reform processes.

Project partners in India – AME and CMS – were responsible for identifying suitable case studies and developing the analysis under the supervision of NRI. AME is an affiliate of ETC in the Netherlands and works with an extensive network of local member NGOs in southern India. It identified agricultural marketing (especially of organic produce) as an area of interest for future intervention. CMS is a well-known consultancy firm with experience in market-related research, often on behalf of NGOs and donor agencies, thereby having an interest in contributing to and learning from the project. Their substantive involvement was considered critical to future sharing and adoption of project outputs because of their role in providing advice to target institutions and extensive contact networks.

The National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) was the project partner in Uganda. Its interest in the research was motivated by a desire to learn lessons that could be integrated into the on-going reform of national agricultural extension services, which emphasises market-oriented production and privatisation of service provision. Its role was to assist in the development of research objectives, choice of case studies, and stakeholder mobilisation.

Other target institutions in India and Uganda (NGOs, projects, government institutions, and donor agencies) were to play a role in identification of areas of concern, selection of case studies, and provision of information.

Case study NGOs were expected to contribute to the preparation and writing up of case studies in order to facilitate learning and encourage ownership and adoption of project outputs. Uptake of project outputs would rest largely with participating NGOs and organisations involved in the funding or implementation of agricultural projects in the study and other developing countries. These organisations were to be targeted through various dissemination activities.

## **Section D      Evaluating the implementation process**

Project implementation went according to plan, with very few changes being introduced during the research.

Thirteen case studies were developed. Nine involved small local NGOs, often operating in relatively restricted geographical areas. The other four comprised a large co-operative, two large national NGOs, and one donor-funded project. This choice reflected the interest shown in the research and a conscious effort to work with organisations that lacked the resources to access expert advice. Most studied interventions supported CBOs such as farmer associations and self-help groups, and therefore the findings are highly relevant to the latter.

It was envisaged that staff from participating organisations would be active in the writing up of case studies. However, after several consultations and two inception workshops a decision was taken not to involve them in this particular task. It became apparent that most case study organisations were not best placed to critically assess their own initiatives and most lacked the expertise to undertake high-quality analysis. (The latter was actually one of the project justifications). In addition, many collaborating organisations expressed an interest in having independent analysts assessing their interventions. Only one organisation in India was directly involved in developing a case study of its own interventions.

Still, participating NGOs made invaluable contributions to the project. Project documentation was supplied. Logistical and staff support was provided during fieldwork. Their role in the selection of fieldwork areas and in introducing the research team to farmers and other stakeholders proved very important. Likewise, participation in discussions with project staff and comments on draft versions of the case studies were very enriching and served as a learning exercise to all organisations involved. Participation in inception and dissemination workshops achieved similar results.

Partner organisations were in regular contact with NRI project staff through e-mail correspondence, exchange of documentation and draft reports, and meetings. In India they led the case study work. In Uganda this activity was carried out by NRI staff.

Other target institutions were involved through direct consultations, e-mail, and inception and dissemination workshops. Contact with these stakeholders was most intense in Uganda. For example, project staff liaised closely with DFID's Natural Resource Advisor. Particular interest was shown in the implications of the research to the reform of agricultural extension services, and NRI was encouraged to probe deeper into this issue. Focused discussions were also held with different funding agencies (e.g. ACDI/VOCA and DANIDA), various donor projects (e.g. FEWS/NET and IDEA), many non-participating NGOs and farmer associations (e.g. AT, CARE and Uganda National Farmers Federation), government departments and agencies (e.g. PMA and Ministry of Agriculture), and several agribusiness firms (e.g. ICEMARK, Sulma Foods and UGT).

Close interaction with project stakeholders helped sharpen the research agenda. In Uganda the need for further consultation of the commercial sector was identified during the second project year. In addition, one case study was dropped due to the perceived lack of interest

from the case study organisation during fieldwork. In India new case study questions were added in the second year, implying further field visits and additional discussions with participating NGOs and farmers. Some studied interventions were found to be of doubtful relevance and therefore dropped, while other interesting experiences were added to the list of case studies.

## **Section E      Activities**

Activities were linked to outputs. The analysis below is structured accordingly. With the exception of activity 4.3, which is currently being finalised, all planned activities were completed. Two new activities (1.5 and 3.4) were added due to their relevance to the project.

### **Activities linked to output 1 - Improved information on agricultural marketing constraints faced by poor farmers in remote areas**

#### *1.1 Lesson learning from existing experience of agricultural marketing interventions*

A literature review was carried out by Heather Kindness and Ann Gordon and published as NRI Policy Paper Series Number 13 (March 2001). This paper reviews a wide range of project experiences in developing countries; draws good practice lessons; and identifies knowledge gaps.

#### *1.2 Preliminary information gathering and networking in India and Uganda to identify NGOs and CBOs with relevant project experience and interests*

Visits were made to Uganda (April and June 2001) and India (June and September 2001) to discuss the project with different organisations; learn about their activities; consider the relevance of these activities to the project; and assess the potential interest of consulted organisations in contributing to the research. Internal visit notes were prepared.

#### *1.3 Initial workshops with relevant organisations in India and Uganda to identify key concerns and candidate case studies/action research, and plan project activities*

Inception workshops were held in Uganda (June 2001) and India (September 2001). The Uganda workshop gathered thirty-four participants. The number of participants in the India workshop was 23. Organisations represented included NGOs, farmer organisations, government agencies and departments, donor agencies and projects, and financial institutions. Key concern areas were identified and existing experiences reviewed. Potential collaborations were discussed. Some NGOs agreed to have their interventions studied. Workshop proceedings were published and shared with participating organisations and other stakeholders.

#### *1.4 Case studies of existing marketing interventions*

Thirteen case studies were developed – nine in India and four in Uganda. NRI staff conducted fieldwork and prepared the case studies in Uganda. The two Indian partner organisations undertook these activities in India under the supervision of NRI. Case study NGOs facilitated fieldwork. NGO target beneficiaries participated through focused discussions. Individual case study reports were delivered as agreed and used in the preparation of the final project report.

Case study areas of intervention included: support to groups involved in marketing; promotion of linkages between farmer groups and buyers; dissemination of market information; assistance to food processing and marketing; and provision of inventory credit services. The choice of case studies reflected marketing interventions that are common in

developing countries and the interests of project target institutions in India and Uganda. The case studies provided useful insights into good and bad practice, and the capacity building needs of implementing agencies and supported farmer organisations. The case studies also illustrated differences in approach between Indian and Ugandan organisations.

The number of case studies in Uganda was lower than initially expected. The relatively small number of NGOs involved in food marketing and processing interventions contributed to this outcome. The intensification of the internal conflict in the North, where three possible case studies were located, also played a role. Two interesting experiences in input marketing were identified but fell outside the project focus. One pilot inventory credit intervention was due to start in the south-western region and discussions were held with the implementing agency to include it in the project, but the initiative did not go ahead as planned because of insufficient donor funding.

However, the small number of Ugandan case studies enabled greater depth of analysis and facilitated more intense interaction with participating organisations and key informants. Numerous discussions were held with project farmers, traders and processors, implementing organisations, funding agencies, and other informants in government and the donor and NGO community.

### *1.5 Analysis of the marketing and policy context in India and Uganda*

A review of the agricultural marketing and policy environment in India and Uganda was conducted. Although this activity was not part of the project log frame, it was felt that an improved understanding of the context surrounding the studied interventions was required. The Indian review (January 2003) was conducted by CMS and used as an internal working document, whereas the Ugandan report (August 2002), prepared by NRI, was distributed amongst country stakeholders.

## **Activities linked to output 2 – Guidelines for best practice by CBO/NGO helping rural communities develop sustainable marketing interventions**

### *2.1 Lesson learning from existing experience and literature*

See activities 1.1, 1.4 and 1.5. Lessons were learned and translated into good practice guidelines.

### *2.2 Action research with NGOs and CBOs to develop sustainable interventions*

See activity 1.4.

Case study NGOs provided support and guidance to project staff and provided insights into the studied initiatives. Their target clients (e.g. farmers) participated in field discussions, thereby helping the project team to understand NGO activities, problems and achievements, and sustainability issues. They also proposed interventions that would assist them to access markets on better terms.

In Uganda several meetings were held with the four case study organisations to discuss the implications of the research to their work and assess how current interventions strategies can be improved with a view to enhance impact and sustainability. All showed a keen interest in learning from failures as well as successes, viewing the research as an opportunity to access independent and experienced advice. Some are already taking steps to implement project outputs (see section F – purpose).

Some exceptions aside, Indian organisations were less open to outside advice and somewhat uncomfortable with having their interventions assessed. As a result, many were reluctant to provide certain information and requested not to be identified in project reports for fear of negative publicity. Draft case study reports were shared with all of them. Some provided comments to the drafts. Most participated in the dissemination workshops.

### *2.3 Identification of longer-term initiatives not suitable for funding under existing project*

The project identified two types of initiatives for future funding:

- **Studies.** Funding agencies should consider sponsoring market studies that provide information on constraints and opportunities to different stakeholders (farmers, producer associations, traders and processors, NGOs, government and donor agencies). Such information is particularly lacking in India. Emphasis should be given to sub-sectors that are important to the poor and have growth potential. In India there was special interest in non-timber forest produce, organic products, milk and its derivatives, spices, vegetables, and so on. This type of studies are particularly relevant to NGOs and CBOs, which often lack the expertise and resources to undertake or commission detailed market surveys.
- **Training.** Capacity building in the area of agricultural marketing and processing is needed and could contribute decisively to bridge the gap between knowledge and practice. As the research demonstrated, the potential role of NGOs and CBOs in agricultural marketing is largely unrealised. Initiatives in this area could involve the organisation of seminars to disseminate good practice, preparation of training manuals dedicated to specific topics, training of trainers and various organisations, and production of radio programmes targeting farmers and farmer organisations.

NRI will soon develop proposals for developing some of these initiatives.

## **Activities linked to output 3 – Identification of type of support needed by NGOs and CBOs to respond to these needs**

### *3.1 Concluding workshops*

Dissemination workshops were held in Uganda (January 2003) and India (March 2003). Both workshops were much better attended than the inception ones (59 and 42 participants respectively), an indication that the project succeeded in mobilising country stakeholders and that the research was of interest to them. NGO/CBO capacity building needs in the marketing sphere and strategies to address these needs were discussed during the two workshops (see

section F – outputs). Workshop reports were prepared and disseminated among participants and other targeted organisations.

### *3.2 Collaboration on case studies and action research as a means of identifying NGO capacity building needs*

Close interaction with participating NGOs/CBOs and beneficiary clients and case study analysis confirmed the initial hypothesis that organisations intervening in marketing often lack the expertise to develop commercially sustainable interventions. Capacity building needs were identified as a result of these activities (see section F – outputs).

## **Activities linked to output 4 – Dissemination of project results**

### *4.1 Preliminary dissemination through participation of relevant organisations in project*

Participation of case study and partner organisations offered an opportunity to discuss and disseminate specific project findings (see section F – purpose).

### *4.2 Participating organisations and other organisations with appropriate experience and contacts advise on appropriate wider dissemination channels*

Recommendations for future dissemination activities emerged from the India and Uganda workshops. For example, in Uganda there were suggestions for holding district-level workshops targeting local government and non-government stakeholders. Likewise, in India workshop participants suggested holding similar workshops at national and state level. They also recommended developing training initiatives on market and financial analysis and business development targeted at NGOs. In India it was felt that greater involvement of the private sector, farming community, government institutions and donor agencies in future workshops would be desirable.

### *4.3 Preparation of dissemination outputs, including journal article, publication in NRI policy series and shorter, wider audience grey literature articles*

A review of the literature was published in the NRI policy series and some 75 copies were so far distributed in India and Uganda. Four workshop proceedings were distributed to participants, representing approximately 80 organisations. The final research report was distributed to a similar number of organisations in India and Uganda, to bilateral and donor agencies, and to other relevant stakeholders in different countries.

A paper for publication in the NRI policy series is under preparation. Different versions for publication in an international journal (e.g. Development Policy Review, Development in Practice or Journal of Small Enterprise Development) and an Indian journal (e.g. The Economic and Political Weekly) are also under preparation. Specialised magazines (e.g. AME newsletter in India, Farmers Voice in Uganda and LEISA publication) have been identified and will soon be targeted.



#### *4.4 Participation in international workshops*

NRI was invited to make a presentation on best practices for commercially sustainable NGO/CBO marketing interventions at an international workshop held in Berlin on 19-21 November 2002. The workshop was titled “Fostering Rural Economic Development” and was sponsored by GTZ, DFID, the World Bank and CTA. M.S. Ashok (CMS) and Tiago Wandschneider (NRI) presented preliminary research findings from India and Uganda. Project staff will explore similar future opportunities to disseminate outputs.

## **Section F Evaluating project effectiveness**

### **Project purpose**

While it is too early to fully assess project achievements, experience so far strongly suggest that the project purpose is likely to be largely reached (rating 2).

The project purpose was to develop commercially sustainable and replicable NGO/CBO marketing and processing interventions which improve farmers' livelihoods. Two outcomes were required to achieve the project purpose: i) identification of appropriate interventions and practices; and ii) proper implementation of proposed interventions and adoption of recommended practices by target institutions. Dissemination and training initiatives are critical if the latter is to be attained.

Demand for this kind of project was confirmed by the strong interest shown by many collaborating organisations and other stakeholders in learning from the research. The evaluation of concluding workshops by participants serves as a good illustration (details are provided in the workshop proceedings). All the participants in India and Uganda that filled in the workshop evaluation forms judged the project to be "very relevant" or "quite relevant" to their work. The quality of presentations by project staff was rated between "good" and "very good" by the great majority of workshop attendants. Some of the interventions during the concluding plenary sessions highlighted the quality of the project.

Final workshops not only disseminated and improved project findings, but also contributed to strengthen contacts between relevant stakeholders. A few examples illustrate this:

- In Uganda case study organisations welcomed the opportunity to liaise with donor agencies and have their interventions disseminated to a wide audience.
- In the same workshop ACDI/VOCA and NAADS discussed potential problems associated with joint funding of the FOODNET market information activities. This was the first time that the three organisations discussed this issue together, and it was decided that they should meet soon to co-ordinate activities and avoid duplication.
- In India most participating NGOs were exposed to the BASIX market linkage activities for the first time. The interest generated led to initial discussions on possible partnerships.
- The Indian workshop exposed the lack of dialogue and co-operation between government agencies and NGOs. Representatives of both sides expressed an interest in furthering collaborations and discussed strategies to achieve this goal.

Feedback from Uganda on potential adoption of project outputs is very encouraging. Case study organisations have shown strong interest in integrating identified good practice into their existing and future agricultural marketing interventions, and some have already taken appropriate steps. Furthermore, NAADS and the PMA have been very keen in learning from

the research and incorporating relevant lessons into the on-going reform of extension services and the wider programme for the modernisation of Ugandan agriculture.

Some examples are presented below to illustrate this optimism:

- CEDO was advised to charge for the marketing services provided to farmer groups in order to ensure the sustainability of such services under tight budget constraints. This recommendation has already been incorporated in its new business plan. CEDO was also receptive to the recommendation that it needs to strengthen its market linkage promotion efforts.
- VEDCO was planning to support the formation of farmer fora but was advised to wait until the right conditions were in place. Its staff seemed to agree with this prescription. Farmer fora would be responsible for providing extension and marketing services to “VEDCO” groups. However, the organisation is currently supporting a very small number of marketing groups and few specialise in the same commodities. In a given area there must be a reasonable number of groups with a common interest to justify the formation of second-tier organisations. Moreover, existing groups do not yet seem to have the management, organisational and business skills to successfully form higher level bodies. VEDCO was advised to encourage expansion in group membership, further develop the capacity at primary group level, and increase the number of groups with which it works.
- FOODNET was advised to intensify its efforts in market information dissemination at the micro level, and to search for additional funds in order to develop the proposed activities. The organisation is presently in contractual negotiations with NAADS to provide improved services in selected areas.
- Identified good practices for farmer group development and market information dissemination are also being taken on board by an on-going collaborating project between NRI and FOODNET. This collaboration includes the preparation of a training manual for extension agents working with marketing groups and building their capacity to access and process market information. Radio programmes targeting farmer groups are also being produced. These initiatives are paying special attention to the experience of one case study organisation (CEDO).
- The independent analysis by the project regarding the FOODNET market information system was well received by ACDI/VOCA. The favourable assessment of this service by the project and the conclusion that its sustainability is crucially dependent on future resource allocations from government and/or donor agencies may influence a decision by ACDI/VOCA to continue funding the system.

In India there seems to be greater resistance to external ideas and change. The extent to which this perception is true cannot be properly assessed at such an early stage after project completion. Still, the fact that some participating NGOs showed an interest in collaborating with BASIX, whose innovative approach to market linkage promotion was reviewed during the dissemination workshop, is encouraging. Moreover, the fact that one of the project

collaborators (AME) is a network of NGOs with an interest in organic farming enhances the chances that some project findings will feed into future marketing interventions in this area.

It will take some time before a proper assessment of wider adoption of project outputs in the study countries and elsewhere can be made. There are however some positive signs:

- In India, CARE and the DFID-funded rural livelihood programmes in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa have expressed interest in collaborating with NRI to build their capacity in the marketing sphere and develop interventions in this area. This is likely to involve market studies and capacity building activities.
- In Uganda the French Co-operation showed interest in integrating research findings into a dairy project which provides support to milk marketing and farmer associations.
- FAO has also shown a keen interest in the project findings following a presentation at an international workshop in Berlin.
- Finally, NRI project staff is currently collaborating with NGOs in Bangladesh (CARE Bangladesh) and Mozambique (CARE Mozambique). The former is implementing marketing initiatives targeting small and marginal farming households in northwest Bangladesh. The latter is developing market-oriented production and processing of cassava and sweet potato in southern Mozambique, with CPHP funding. These and other future collaborations offer further opportunities to put project findings into practice.

Future dissemination activities within the two study countries and internationally are likely to enhance project outreach significantly and lead to wider adoption of the findings.

### **Project outputs**

All project outputs were achieved (rating 1).

The project had four intended outputs: i) improved information on agricultural marketing constraints faced by poor farmers in remote areas; ii) best practice guidelines for agricultural marketing interventions targeting such farmers; iii) identification of capacity building needs of NGOs and CBOs developing such interventions; and iv) dissemination of project results to participating NGOs and other relevant organisations.

*Output one: Improved information on agricultural marketing constraints faced by poor farmers in remote areas*

Various papers and reports prepared under the project analysed the marketing constraints faced by resource-poor and remote farmers in developing countries generally, and in India and Uganda more specifically. Remote areas were defined as those where, for reasons of geography or infrastructure, there are few buyers to purchase farmers' produce and where there appears to be little present demand for more diverse farmer outputs. The following aspects deserve special mention:

- Small farmers in many areas of India and Uganda face numerous constraints that result in high transaction costs and risks, thereby discouraging production and trade and depressing farm-gate prices. The small scale and dispersed nature of household production is particularly significant, especially when combined with distance to key markets and under-developed road infrastructure and transport services. Other contributory factors include an excessive concentration of sales during the immediate post-harvest period due to liquidity and storage constraints; deficient and non-standardised produce quality; and limited access to marketing information. Such structural constraints are sometimes exacerbated by inadequate government intervention in agricultural markets.
- In Uganda, liberalisation and stabilisation policies have not addressed the structural causes behind market failure. They have reduced or solved problems associated with inefficient parastatal marketing boards, high taxation of export crops such as coffee, and overvalued exchange rates. However, the withdrawal of the state from marketing has exposed the weaknesses of an incipient and risk-averse agribusiness sector as well as the inadequacies of the environment under which it operates.
- In India food markets are characterised by social barriers to entry; massive debt polarisation; dependency of poor farmers on credit from traders; collusive behaviour among traders; and inefficient and inequitable state procurement and regulatory policies.
- While NGOs are not well equipped to deal with all the causes of market failure, they can play several important roles. For example, they can contribute to addressing asset (including information and knowledge) and organisational constraints at the household and community level; link producer groups to specific buyers or markets; and lobby on behalf of farmers or help them getting organised to demand improved policies, infrastructure and services.

*Output two: Guidelines for best practice by CBOs and NGOs helping rural communities develop sustainable marketing interventions*

Project case studies comprised various types of marketing interventions – farmer group formation and development for marketing; market linkage promotion; provision of marketing information; development of processing activities; and delivery of inventory credit services. Literature reviews, inception and concluding workshops, and case study reports provided detailed insight into good practice in these different areas of intervention. Most collaborating organisations were NGOs, but since these were often working with CBOs, the findings are relevant to both.

General intervention principles and good practice guidelines for the different intervention areas were produced. As an illustration, the three tables below present some general intervention principles that are conducive to effective and sustainable interventions and summarises good practices identified and disseminated by the project in the area of marketing groups and market information. Space limitations do not allow for a nuanced presentation of the practical implications of gender, crop choices, location, and group typologies. The final project report provides additional insight into these spheres.



General intervention principles (to achieve impact and sustainability)	Rationale	Examples of interventions and strategies
<p>1 Generate benefits along the supply chain (win-win solutions/ outcomes)</p> <p>2 Follow market-oriented, demand-driven approaches.</p> <p>3 Address the knowledge, information, organisational and asset constraints that prevent producers from accessing markets on favourable terms.</p> <p>4 Wherever feasible and relevant, address downstream and upstream constraints in the supply chain that limit market access.</p>	<p>1 To be sustainable marketing interventions must benefit farmers as well as crop buyers. For example, buyers will not pay increased prices and/or expand purchases unless they experience consistent improvements in produce quality and/or a reduction in transaction costs.</p> <p>2 Reliable and remunerative markets should be identified prior to the intervention. Farmers should be assisted to produce what the market wants. Supporting them to sell whatever is produced, without due consideration for market requirements (type of product, quality, volumes, place, delivery time, etc) will not generate the expected benefits.</p> <p>3 NGOs are well placed to tackle constraints at the household and community level. They are generally less able to address wider constraints (e.g. poor roads, inadequate policies) due to limited resources and capacity to influence policy decisions.</p> <p>4 Constraints along the marketing chain impact negatively on prices and demand in a given area. For example, local traders and processors may have poor access to market information and credit and be poorly linked to downstream markets and buyers. While NGOs tend to work directly with farmers, also targeting other actors can be a very cost-effective option. For instance, strategic support to traders/processors can benefit large numbers of farmers by generating increased demand and competition for their produce.</p>	<p>1 Promote group marketing; develop marketing linkages; improve produce quality through better production and post-harvest management practices; provide market information; etc.</p> <p>2 Allocate adequate resources to market surveys and intelligence activities. Disseminate relevant information to farmers. Develop links to markets and buyers. Provide extension services.</p> <p>3 Provide training, advice and information. Link farmers to input suppliers, traders and processors. Support group development. Improve access to credit (promotion of links to financial institutions, group savings and loan activities, inventory credit services, etc).</p> <p>4 Carry out sub-sector studies to understand constraints along the supply chain and the needs of different players. Develop the capacity of traders and buyers with a view to generate benefits at farmer level. Develop inventory credit services open to traders. Provide market information to produce buyers. Link traders and processors to producers and downstream</p>

<p>5 Emphasise facilitation and capacity building roles.</p>	<p>5 Facilitative approaches have the potential to address some of the underlying causes of poor market access and are conducive to sustainability. They tend to generate win-win outcomes.</p> <p>Ideally, NGOs should empower farmers to produce and market on their own.</p> <p>NGOs rarely have the resources and expertise to deliver all the required services farmers need. They should specialise in areas where they can develop a comparative advantage.</p> <p>Direct involvement in input delivery, transport, produce marketing and credit supply is expensive. Moreover, access to these services may cease once the intervention is phased out. Sustainability will be further compromised if direct intervention crowds-out commercial service providers.</p> <p>Direct involvement in marketing activities is often attractive to NGOs and farmers since it provides a quick-fix solution to market access problems. However, it rarely addresses the causes of low prices. Furthermore, NGOs tend to be poorly equipped to run commercial activities successfully.</p> <p>It must be acknowledged that facilitative approaches may fail to address market access problems in very remote areas, where providers of key services are absent or in very limited numbers. The challenges associated with low value food crops may also be considerable.</p>	<p>markets. Link local input suppliers to wholesalers/manufacturers and farmers.</p> <p>5 Develop links between farmers and relevant service providers. Develop the capacity of service providers. Deliver training and advisory services to farmers. Provide market information.</p>
--	--	---



<p>6 Use subsidies selectively and strategically.</p>	<p>6 Excessive use of subsidises is costly and undermines sustainability. It can also distort farmer motivations for participating in the initiative.</p> <p>Subsidies are best when required for a limited period of time. This is often the case when training and linkage activities are subsidised.</p> <p>Time-bound subsidies may be justified when farmers are expected to bear significant risks arising from the innovative or demonstrative nature of a particular activity or technology.</p> <p>Subsidies are particularly dangerous when used to reduce the price farmers pay for private goods and services (input supply, transport, trading).</p> <p>Ultimately, supported economic activities must be viable in a non-subsidised environment.</p>	<p>6. A phasing-out plan must be established and adhered to from the onset.</p>
<p>7 Develop partnerships with relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>7 NGOs cannot address all farmer needs on their own. They need to acquire core competencies and specialise, and look for complementary inputs from the private sector, other NGOs, and local and national government agencies. They must also ensure that the key services are being offered once the intervention expires.</p> <p>Partnerships can also play a crucial in building the capacity of NGOs in specific areas. Partnerships between small national NGOs and large international NGOs are one example.</p> <p>Dialogue with government may enable NGOs to influence public policy and investment processes.</p>	<p>7 Develop joint interventions with other organisations. Link producers to various service providers. Engage in (formal or informal) dialogue with key stakeholders. Set up multi-stakeholder advisory committees. Participate in cross-sector and sub-sector policy fora. Learn from others. Contribute to capacity-building of key institutions.</p>
<p>8 Develop interventions over an appropriate</p>	<p>8 NGO interventions often fail because the time allocated is insufficient to</p>	

<p>timeframe</p> <p>9 Avoid over-optimistic expectations of client capacities</p> <p>10 Adopt a flexible and pro-active approach</p> <p>11 Adapt monitoring and evaluation systems to the nature of marketing interventions</p>	<p>implement planned activities effectively and achieve objectives.</p> <p>9 NGOs often have unrealistic expectations of what their clients (usually resource-poor farmers) can achieve over a given timeframe. Such expectations are sometimes informed by inadequate use of participatory methods.</p> <p>Examples of over-ambitious strategies include developing of new, unsustainable market channels; targeting markets which have very stringent requirements relative to farmer capacities; and advising farmer organisations to undertake activities which are beyond member capacities and resources.</p> <p>10 Markets are constantly changing. What was a good marketing option yesterday may no longer be. At the same time, new marketing opportunities are always emerging. As the capacity of farmers improve so does their ability to develop new activities and target more profitable markets.</p> <p>11 NGOs often lack appropriate monitoring and evaluation systems. Poor monitoring systems undermine their capacity to identify problems and opportunities throughout the intervention, and to introduce corrective measures as needed. Inadequate evaluation systems do not allow NGOs to understand the impact and likely sustainability of their interventions, learn from successes and failures, and devise appropriate replication and scaling-up strategies.</p>	<p>Identify farmer needs and potential capacities, as well as the range of available opportunities and options, before designing the intervention.</p>
---	---	--

**Support to farmer group formation and development for marketing and processing**

Good practice guidelines	Rationale	Strategy/activities	Qualifying remarks
<p>1 External organisations should encourage small membership size (say 15 to 30 members) during the initial stages.</p> <p>2 These organisations should encourage an expansion of membership as group co-operation proves successful and group capacity develops.</p> <p>3 Leadership building should be an important component of support to farmer groups.</p>	<p>1 Small numbers facilitate face-to-face interaction between members, limit co-ordination and management costs, reduce the scope for conflict, and facilitate dispute resolution.</p> <p>2 Increased numbers enhance economies of scale and bargaining power.</p> <p>3 Good leadership is critical to group success. Good leaders command respect within the community and their group and promote transparent management. They tend to be entrepreneurial. Good leadership is especially important during adverse times, when the incentives to remain in the group are lower.</p>	<p>1 Play an awareness raising and advisory role. Organise exposure visits.</p> <p>2 Provide advice.</p> <p>3 Help group members understand the roles and responsibilities of elected leaders. Facilitate vision setting. Assist members to develop participatory and transparent election rules. Train leaders.</p>	<p>1 Small membership limits the scope for taking advantage of economies of scale in marketing and processing, and reduces the bargaining position vis-à-vis buyers. The stronger the management and organisational capacity of the group the greater the extent to which larger numbers become manageable.</p> <p>Ultimately, group composition should be left to the discretion of members.</p> <p>2 Founding members are often reluctant to accept new members, since they have played no role in the initial development stages.</p> <p>3 There are limits to which an external agency can influence the quality of leadership.</p>

<p>4 Participatory and transparent management should be encouraged.</p> <p>5 Support organisations should develop literacy and numeracy skills in groups in which a large proportion of members are illiterate.</p> <p>6 Strengthening management, organisational and business skills should be central to interventions aimed to develop marketing groups.</p> <p>7 Homogeneous membership should be encouraged.</p>	<p>4 Participatory and transparent management contribute to group success. Member participation in selection of leaders and management decisions is instrumental to accountability, trust building and conflict minimisation.</p> <p>5 Literacy and numeracy are important determinants of participation and transparency, enabling members to check minutes and records and better understand business practices.</p> <p>6 The greater the group management, organisational and business development capacity the more ambitious and (potentially) remunerative the strategies and activities the group is able to develop.</p> <p>7 Homogeneous groups (women groups, kinship or caste-based groups, member proximity due to neighbourhood, members producing and marketing the same crops, etc) tend to show greater cohesiveness. Homogeneous membership is conducive to shared group vision and objectives, trust building and conflict minimisation.</p>	<p>4 Facilitate vision setting and the development of transparent rules and clear functions. Train members in record keeping. Organise exchange visits.</p> <p>5 Impart training or contract the services of specialised organisations.</p> <p>6 Support groups to develop a simple functional structure and clear roles and responsibilities of members. Assist the group to develop a common vision and strategy. Train members in record keeping, accountancy, market intelligence activities, assessment of risks and opportunities, etc.</p> <p>7 Provide advice.</p>	<p>5 Improving literacy and numeracy among group members is time-consuming and requires considerable resources.</p> <p>7 Ultimately, group composition should be left to the discretion of members.</p>
---	--	--	---

<p>8 External organisations should advise members to concentrate on few, simple and mutually beneficial activities, at least during the first few years of group existence.</p> <p>9 Care should be taken before encouraging groups to acquire assets such as processing and transport equipment and common storage infrastructure.</p> <p>10 Emphasise joint input and output marketing activities (and sometimes processing activities) but members should manage production on an individual basis.</p> <p>11 Groups should be encouraged to mobilise internal resources.</p>	<p>8 Groups with few and simple activities tend to over-perform multi-purpose groups. Group objectives and activities should be in accordance with group capacity. The latter is generally poor. Initial success strengthens group cohesion.</p> <p>9 Joint asset ownership places a management and co-ordination burden that many groups find difficult to cope with. It may also give rise to intra-group conflicts.</p> <p>10 The benefits of collective production are doubtful since no obvious economies of scale arise from such activity. At the same time, collective production increases management and co-ordination costs and may give rise to intra-group conflicts.</p> <p>11 Members' financial contribution is important, being an indication of commitment towards the group and enabling more active intervention in markets, for example by enabling value addition or transport to distant markets.</p>	<p>8 Offer advice. Promote exchange visits.</p> <p>9 Provide advice.</p> <p>10 Provide advice. Organise exposure visits.</p> <p>11 Offer advice.</p>	<p>8 As group capacity increases, members may be able to engage in more complex activities.</p> <p>9 Joint processing and storage activities can be remunerative and successfully developed by cohesive and well managed groups. Storage is especially important to the activities of marketing groups. Joint ownership of certain assets may therefore be justified. The same cannot be said of expensive transport equipment, whose ownership is rarely cost-effective.</p> <p>10 Joint production in a small commonly owned plot may contribute to raise unity and group spirit. However, the bulk of members' production should be carried out in individual household plots.</p> <p>11 Significant financial contribution requirements are likely to exclude poor farmers from participation.</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>12 Care should be taken before deciding whether to assist group formalisation (registration).</p>	<p>12 The impact of formalisation on group performance is unclear. It may improve access to public and private services as well as state resources. It may also enable the group to engage in contractual relations with buyers. At the same time, it may give rise to increased state interference in group activities, which can significantly compromise performance.</p>	<p>12 Provide advice.</p>	<p>12 A decision on whether to promote formalisation should depend on the type of group. Formalisation is likely to be more beneficial to larger and more commercially oriented groups.</p>
<p>13 Promotion of business linkages between marketing groups and input suppliers/crop buyers should be emphasised from an early stage.</p>	<p>13 The performance of groups in input and output marketing critically determines the economic benefits accruing to members and therefore their willingness to remain in the group and invest time and resources in joint activities.</p> <p>Agribusiness firms with strong business relationships with groups can help overcome management and entrepreneurial skill shortages by providing access to inputs (sometimes on credit), markets and technical assistance.</p>	<p>13 Identify reliable and honest input suppliers/buyers with an interest in developing business relations with supported groups. Inform group of buyer needs and requirements, and inform buyers of group activities and capacities. Facilitate contact and dialogue between farmers and input suppliers/crop buyers. Arbitrate conflicts that may arise. In short, play an honest broker role between groups and commercial operators.</p>	<p>13 Development of market linkages is a challenging task in countries where the agribusiness sector is weak. The challenges are greater in the case of remote areas and low-value food crops.</p> <p>In the specific case of contract farming, it should be noted that the groups involved in such arrangements may be less able to respond to emerging market opportunities elsewhere in the economy and their performance is largely dependent on the business success of the private partner.</p>
<p>14 Training should be provided to enable groups to assess the advantages and disadvantages of different production cum marketing options.</p>	<p>14 Successful marketing is a necessary (although not sufficient) condition for good group performance and sustainability.</p>		

<p>15 Group members should be assisted to satisfy market/buyer produce requirements.</p> <p>16 Linkages to service providers in areas such as extension and credit should be promoted wherever relevant and feasible.</p> <p>17 External support agencies should avoid subsidising asset acquisition, input purchases and crop sales.</p>	<p>15 Meeting market/buyer needs are crucial if groups are to succeed in marketing.</p> <p>16 Access to financial, technical and other services is crucial to farmers. Links to service providers reduces intervention costs and contributes to sustainability.</p> <p>17 Subsidisation increases intervention costs and reduces outreach; may undermine group sustainability once support is withdrawn; and distorts incentives for participation. Farmers should co-operate in marketing when such strategy enables them to overcome common problems. Expectations that group ventures will enable access to grants and subsidies from external agencies should never be the main motivation behind participation in groups.</p>	<p>15 Train members in market prospecting activities, assessment of cost and revenue implications of production and marketing choices, and analysis of marketing risks.</p> <p>Market and buyer surveys to understand needs (volumes, delivery periods, quality, etc). Communicate these needs to producers. Provide advice on crop and variety choices. Deliver training on production and post-harvest management practices.</p> <p>16 Supply information on existing service providers, range of services offered, and conditions to access these services. Liaise with service providers to encourage them to work with supported farmer groups.</p> <p>17 Make it clear from the beginning that subsidies will not be provided so as to avoid creating expectations among group members.</p>	<p>15 Target markets and buyers should be chosen by farmers in consultation with external support agencies, taking into account potential benefits, costs and risks, as well as group resources and capacity.</p> <p>17 Provision of subsidies in the mentioned areas may be justified in certain circumstances; for example, when groups are expected to bear significant risks arising from the innovative or demonstrative nature of a particular activity or technology. However, such subsidies should be time-bound and used selectively and strategically.</p>
---	--	---	---

<p>18 Effective support to formation and development of marketing groups requires a holistic approach.</p> <p>19 Considerable human and financial resources and time should be devoted to the task of building successful marketing groups.</p> <p>20 Farmer fora should be promoted but only when constituting primary groups have achieved a reasonable stage of development.</p> <p>(Most of the above principles are also relevant to the development of farmer fora and higher-tier organisations).</p> <p>21 Farmer fora should represent a relatively restricted number of</p>	<p>18 Facilitation of appropriate internal group dynamics, development of management and business capacity, promotion of market-oriented production and post-harvest practices, and strengthening of market links are all important to group performance and sustainability.</p> <p>19 Promotion of sustainable marketing groups is a skill and resource intensive task requiring a flexible, coach-like approach. It involves service provision in areas such as capacity building, technical assistance and advice, facilitation, and market intelligence.</p> <p>20 Farmer fora can potentially enhance economies of scale in marketing and processing; lead to improved access to services; and increase the lobbying capacity of group members. However, the capacity requirements of these organisations widely exceed those of member groups and should not be underestimated.</p> <p>21 Regular inter-group communication is critical to good functioning farmer fora.</p>	<p>18 Recruit staff with relevant skills; build staff capacity through training; contract out service provision requiring specialised expertise not available internally; form complementary partnerships with other agencies; develop links between project clients and providers of different services; etc.</p> <p>19 Allocate sufficient financial resources to the intervention; plan interventions over an appropriate timeframe; sequence activities and support; develop clear entry and exit strategies; recruit staff with relevant skills; build staff capacity through training; contract out certain services; develop partnerships; link project clients to service providers.</p>	<p>18 NGOs rarely have all the required expertise to provide effective support in all critical areas.</p>
---	--	--	---



neighbouring groups (say between 5 and 10), at least during the initial stages.			
---	--	--	--

### Provision of market information services

<p>1 The type and frequency of marketing information collected and disseminated depends on the target client.</p> <p>2 Considerable resources are needed to collect, process, and disseminate relevant information regularly and accurately.</p> <p>3 While the type of dissemination channels should depend on the target clientele, the use of multiple channels increases outreach</p>	<p>1 Different users (farmers, traders, processors, projects, government institutions, etc) have different information needs. For example, while buyers need to know selling prices in different markets, farmers need information on buying prices in these same markets.</p> <p>2 The impact of marketing information services depends not only on the relevance and quality of data, but also on its speedy processing and dissemination through wide-reaching channels. The way the data is presented is crucial.</p> <p>3 Local radio can be an efficient vehicle for targeting large number of farmers, especially when local languages are used. Extension agents can be particularly effective but are an expensive option and outreach potential may be relatively limited. Written media may be less effective since many farmers are illiterate and newspaper circulation in many rural areas is poor. Written media can be more effective</p>	<p>1 Assess the information needs of target clients before developing the service.</p> <p>2 Develop a good network of field data collectors; use new technologies to gather and process field information; staff data processing and dissemination units adequately; etc.</p> <p>3 Develop various and complementary information products. Develop partnerships with organisations working with farmers to disseminate marketing information.</p>	<p>1 Hard choices will need to be made regarding the range and frequency of data collected according to resource availability.</p>
---	---	---	--

<p>4 Current data (e.g. prices) are critical to information users but so is historical information.</p> <p>5 An indication of future price trends for specific crops should be provided.</p> <p>6 Targeting traders and processors as recipients of marketing information can benefit farmers indirectly and should therefore be considered</p>	<p>in the case of traders and processors. Mobile text messaging is a non-traditional, but potentially very efficient and effective way of disseminating information to traders and processors. Likewise, through e-mail information can be passed on to selected users (traders, processors, institutions) cheaply and quickly.</p> <p>4 For example, spot price data can help producers decide where to sell and negotiate with buyers. Seasonal price data can help farmers decide whether to store and sell later, and whether to plant early or late maturing varieties. Historical price data can help them decide the mix of crops grown based on price trends.</p> <p>5 Information on future price trends can assist farmers to make informed planting decisions. It can also help government and non-government organisations anticipate potential food insecurity crises.</p> <p>6 Improving the availability of marketing information to traders and processors can benefit producers and consumers by increasing spatial arbitrage (moving produce from low-price to high price areas) and</p>	<p>4 Analyse time series data to produce easy to understand information on seasonal and historical price trends.</p> <p>5 Provide indications of future price trends based on informed analysis. Sources of information include weather forecasts, official production projections, expected deficit and surplus in neighbouring countries, and available international price projections.</p> <p>6 Provide marketing information services to farmers as well as crop buyers.</p>	<p>4 Good data analysts are required. Organisations which do not have the required skills can hire specialist consultants.</p> <p>6 NGOs may be reluctant to follow this option since they normally prefer to service farmers.</p>
---	--	---	--

<p>as an option.</p> <p>7 While crop price data is critically important, other relevant information also deserve attention.</p> <p>8 Develop partnerships with organisations working with farmers and educational programmes to enhance outreach and impact.</p> <p>9 Develop special efforts to target marketing groups so as to improve impact.</p>	<p>temporal arbitrage (storing during low-price periods and selling during high-price periods).</p> <p>7 For example, informed planting and marketing decisions by farmers require information other than crop prices. This includes information on input prices; type and location of input suppliers; market requirements with respect to quality and other produce attributes; type and location of buyers; marketing arrangements; road conditions; and availability and cost of transport.</p> <p>8 Farmers often lack the capacity to understand marketing information. Even when they understand it, they often have limited capacity to use this information to change production and marketing strategies. Reasons for this include unavailability of family labour, poor access to finance and inputs, inability to cope with risk, limited bargaining power, and small surplus for sale.</p> <p>9 Marketing groups can generally make better use of marketing information than individual farmers as a result of better access to inputs, economies of scale in transport, greater scope to negotiate with buyers, etc.</p>	<p>7 Provide a wide range of marketing information.</p> <p>8 Develop partnerships with relevant organisations and agencies to help farmers understand marketing information and to address some of the constraints they face in using the information. Train partners so that they can play an effective role. Develop educational radio programmes.</p> <p>9 Train and use development organisations working with farmer groups. Train farmer groups to assess the advantages and disadvantages of different production cum marketing options.</p>	<p>7 The wider the range of information collected and delivered the higher the cost of the service. If resources are limited, it is preferable to concentrate on a narrower range of information and ensure that it is collected regularly and reliably, and quickly processed and disseminated.</p>
---	--	---	--

<p>10 Market information service providers are well positioned to play a role in market intelligence service delivery and should venture into this area.</p>	<p>10 These organisations are knowledgeable about production systems, domestic and external markets, development organisations, and market players. They should use this knowledge to alert others about market opportunities and market linkage possibilities.</p>	<p>10 Provide relevant information to and develop partnerships with commercial operators, NGOs and government agencies. These actors can play a role in linking different players in product chains.</p>	
<p>11 Organisations managing market information systems should develop cost-recovery measures early on during the intervention.</p>	<p>11 Cost-recovery reduces the financial burden on government and external donor agencies and increases the likelihood that they will continue funding the system. Indeed, own revenue generation is an indicator of existing demand for the service.</p>	<p>11 Look for sponsors; negotiate publication of marketing information in newspapers free of charge; charge commercial and institutional clients for information provided through e-mail and other targeted media; negotiate with mobile phone operators revenue sharing formulas for information delivered through text messaging; charge for advertisements in radio slots and programmes where marketing information is made available; negotiate reduced fees for radio slots; etc.</p>	
<p>12 Avoid developing market information systems based on the assumption that after some time (say five or ten years) the service will be able to continue running without government and/or donor funding.</p>	<p>12 Full cost-recovery is unlikely and developing the system based on this premise will eventually lead to deteriorating quality (and impact) due to acute resource constraints. Marketing information is a pure public good, especially when disseminated through channels such as radio. Charging smallholder farmers for this information is neither realistic nor desirable.</p>	<p>12 Plan future costs and revenues realistically and negotiate external funding accordingly.</p>	
<p>13 Market information systems</p>	<p>13 Past experience of government-run market</p>		<p>13 Funding agencies usually have</p>

<p>should be managed by an independent and well-resourced technical team, even when the service is hosted within a government department or ministry.</p>	<p>information systems is very poor.</p>		<p>unrealistic expectations regarding the possibility for cost-recovery. This has often led to the under-resourcing of market information systems.</p>
---	--	--	--

*Output three: Identification of the type of support needed by CBOs and NGOs to improve their capacity to respond to farmer needs in the marketing sphere.*

Farmer associations and self-help groups were the main CBOs studied under this project. Most of these organisations would benefit considerably from improved skills in the following areas:

- Organisation and management (vision setting, development of participatory decision-making processes, establishment of clear roles and responsibilities, leadership, record-keeping, management of accounts, distribution of proceeds and savings among members, etc)
- Agricultural and post-harvest management practices (choice of varieties, input use, timing individual members' production, storage, grading, packaging, processing, bulking-up, etc)
- Business development (collection and processing of marketing information, identification of market opportunities, cost-benefit and risk analysis, negotiation with buyers, etc)

The type of support required varies according to the capacity building needs. Coaching-like and flexible advisory services are an adequate means to impart organisation and management skills. Knowledge in production and post-harvest management can be transferred through extension and training activities. Linkage, training and advisory services can address business development needs and strengthen group capacity in this area. Exposure visits are relevant in all these three areas.

Since most case study case study organisations were small and local NGOs, it is not surprising that significant capacity building needs were identified throughout the project. Marketing is a relatively new to these organisations and rarely a core intervention area. Initiatives in this area are often a reaction to the concerns expressed by farmers rather than part of a strategic intervention framework. Marketing interventions are seldom informed by proper analysis of constraints and opportunities, or an evaluation of alternative intervention strategies and their respective cost-effectiveness and sustainability implications. Monitoring and evaluation activities should be adapted to the specific nature of marketing initiatives but most often this is not done. The capacity to fine tune interventions, understand impact and sustainability, and learn from experience suffers as a result.

Unsurprisingly, many case study NGOs (especially in India) have poor understanding of how different types of marketing interventions serve social goals. Extreme views on the negative role of the commercial sector are common and undermine opportunities for developing mutually beneficial links between farmers and buyers. There is a tendency in India for NGOs to play a direct (interventionist) role in marketing systems, as opposed to a more facilitation role, but the required expertise is often lacking. This leads to excessive use of subsidies, which undermines sustainability and outreach. Over-estimation of farmer capacities is also common, reflecting poor use of participatory approaches. These problems are less present in Uganda due to wider awareness of the need to develop the commercial sector and greater donor influence.

Capacity building initiatives targeted at NGOs should achieve the following outcomes:

- improved knowledge regarding marketing interventions and supply chains;
- better understanding of the private sector, its needs and potential contribution to improving farmer incomes and livelihoods;
- stronger contacts between these organisations and the commercial sector;
- enhanced skills in assessment of market constraints and opportunities;
- increased capacity to analyse the costs, benefits and risk implications of different intervention strategies;
- enhanced ability to integrate production and post-harvest interventions;
- awareness of different exit strategies; and
- improved capacity to monitor and evaluate marketing interventions.

Focused workshops and seminars can play an important awareness raising role and can contribute to strengthening contact networks, but significant capacity building can only be achieved through targeted training initiatives. Exposure visits can also prove very effective. Ultimately NGOs must become more professional and specialised. The proposed actions can contribute significantly to this objective.

*Output 4: Project results disseminated to NGOs/CBOs and other relevant organisations.*

See sections E and F (project purpose) above.

	Signature	Date
Collaborating institution		
Project leader	_____	_____
	_____	_____

## **ANNEXES**

- I Project Logical Framework**
- II Analysis of Expenditure over Implementation Period**
- III Results of End of Project Workshop**
- V Feedback on the Process from Collaborating Institutions**
- VI List of Institutions**
- VII A Catalogue of Data Sets and Their Location**



# I Project Logical Framework

**NRIL Contract Number  
ZB0258  
DFID Contract  
Number:R7941**

## **SUSTAINABLE NGO/CBO AGRICULTURAL MARKETING INITIATIVES LOGFRAME**

<b>Narrative Summary</b>	<b>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>	<b>Important Assumptions</b>
<b>Goal</b>			
Poor people benefit from new knowledge applied to food commodity systems	<p>By 2002, increased number of poor households, in two target countries, who use improved storage and agro-processing techniques in an environmentally sustainable manner</p> <p>By 2002, increased numbers of poor households, in two target countries, benefit from improved marketing and credit systems</p> <p>By 2005, increased contribution to nutrition of poor households from own produced food</p> <p>By 2005, increase in income from sale of fresh and processed crops by poor households, in two target countries</p>	<p>National and local adoption rate surveys</p> <p>National food security data</p>	
<b>Purpose</b>			
To develop commercially sustainable and replicable NGO/CBO agricultural marketing and processing interventions which improve poor farmers' livelihoods	<p>Project participants continue initiatives commenced under the project</p> <p>Adoption of recommended interventions by other organisations reached through dissemination activities</p>	<p>Final technical report of project</p> <p>Subsequent feedback from other organisations</p>	
<b>Outputs</b>			
<p>1. Improved information on the nature of agricultural marketing constraints faced by poor farmers, particularly in remote or disadvantaged areas</p> <p>2. Guidelines for best practice by NGOs/CBOS helping farmers develop sustainable marketing strategies</p>	<p>Literature review, initial consultations, workshop and collaborative studies give preliminary indication of constraints 12 months after beginning of project, confirmed by project end.</p> <p>Recommendations developed by research team, including collaborators and project participants during course of research and workshops</p>	<p>Literature review</p> <p>Project reports and dissemination outputs;</p> <p>Information used to inform subsequent action research</p> <p>Project reports and dissemination outputs;</p> <p>NGOs/CBOs start to adopt some of the lessons in their approach to</p>	<p>Marketing constraints in more disadvantaged areas are amenable to sustainable interventions</p> <p>Project purpose achievable despite likelihood that some recommendations can only be validated under a second phase</p>

<p>3. Identification of the type of support needed by NGOs/CBOs to improve their capacity to respond to these needs</p> <p>4. Project results disseminated to NGOs/CBOs and other relevant organisations</p>	<p>(preliminary results generated in Year 2 and confirmed in Year 3)</p> <p>Needs identified by research team, including collaborators and project participants during course of research and workshops (preliminary results generated in Year 2 and completed in Year 3)</p> <p>Dissemination strategy reflects suggestions of participating organisations on appropriate dissemination channels/format (Year 3)</p>	<p>marketing interventions</p> <p>Project reports and dissemination outputs</p> <p>NGOs/CBOs start to strengthen capacity in this area (by providing training or seeking funding for it)</p> <p>Final technical report and dissemination outputs.</p> <p>Feedback received from target audiences</p>	<p>Needs identified are realistic in terms of resources (funding, skills, time-frame) needed to strengthen capacity</p>
Activities	Inputs	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>1.1 Lesson-learning from existing experience of agricultural marketing interventions</p> <p>1.2 Preliminary information gathering and networking in India and Uganda to identify NGOs/CBOs with project relevant experience/interests</p> <p>1.3 Initial workshops with relevant organisations in India and Uganda to identify key concerns and candidate case studies/action research, and plan project activities</p> <p>1.4 Case studies of existing marketing interventions (also contributes to output 2)</p>	<p>£174,448 (£204,976 incl Vat)</p>	<p>1.1 Synthesis of existing lessons drawn from the literature and existing experience</p> <p>1.2 Report of preliminary consultations</p> <p>1.3 Workshop proceedings</p> <p>1.4 Case study reports</p>	<p>Unrest in border areas of Uganda does not escalate to prevent field work or significantly disrupt marketing activity</p>
<p>2.1 Lessons drawn from the literature and existing experience</p> <p>2.2 Action research with NGOs/CBOs to develop sustainable interventions</p> <p>2.3 Identification of longer-term initiatives not suitable for funding under existing project</p>		<p>2.1 Indicated by MOV 1.1</p> <p>2.2 Action research reports</p> <p>2.3 Longer-term initiatives proposed – for possible funding by CPH programme or other sources</p>	
<p>3.1 Concluding workshop (contributes to all four outputs)</p> <p>3.2 Collaboration on case studies and action research also helps identify NGO capacity-strengthening needs</p>		<p>3.1 Workshop proceedings</p> <p>3.2 Reports of case studies and action research</p>	
<p>1.1 Preliminary dissemination achieved through participation of relevant organisations in project</p> <p>1.2 Participating organisations and other organisations with appropriate experience/contacts advise on</p>		<p>4.1 Project reports, workshop proceedings etc</p> <p>4.2 Workshop proceedings</p> <p>4.3 Publication and distribution of dissemination outputs</p>	

appropriate wider dissemination channels/format			
1.3 Preparation of dissemination outputs including journal article, publication in NRI policy series, and shorter wider audience grey literature articles.			

Note: Outputs should be numbered 1, 2, 3, etc. Activities should relate to these outputs and be numbered 1.1, 1.2, ...2.1, 2.2, ....etc.

### 20b. Complete an activity chart over the life of the project

The activities listed in the logframe (and in 19a) should be listed in the first column for the year(s) in which they will be undertaken. Place a cross in each month where appropriate. Also mark when proposed overseas trips are scheduled, with institution(s) to be visited and the person(s) undertaking the trip. If the project is approved, the project leader will be expected to generate a milestone chart at the beginning of each financial year for that coming financial year. A milestone is defined as a specific significant intermediate output, the delivery of which is necessary within the agreed timeframe for achievement of the terminal output(s) for the project.

#### YEAR 1

#### MONTH

Activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Preliminary research/networking/contacts										X	X	X

#### Overseas travel

To	By	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
India	AG												X
Uganda	AG											X	
Uganda	HK											X	

#### YEAR 2

#### MONTH

Activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Initial workshops	X	X										
Case studies and write-up			x	x	x	X	x	X	x	x	x	X
Action research and write-up			x	x	x	X	x	X	x	x	x	X

#### Overseas travel

To	By	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
India workshop	AG and HK	X											
Uganda workshop	AG and HK		X										
India	AG					X					X		
Uganda	AG							X					
Uganda	HK				X				X				X

#### YEAR 3

#### MONTH

Activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Final work on case studies and action research	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Workshops								X	X			

Production of publications and other dissemination outputs									X	X	X	X	X	X
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Overseas travel**

To	By	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
India workshop	AG and HK								X				
Uganda workshop	AG and HK									X			
India	AG	X				X							
Uganda	HK			X				X					

## II Analysis of Expenditure over Implementation Period

<b>Year</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>	<b>2001-2002</b>	<b>2002-2003</b>	<b>2000-2003</b>
Fees	16,170	51,289	55,693	123,152
Operating costs	5,950	21,223	23,798	50,971
<b>Total</b>	<b>22,120</b>	<b>72,512</b>	<b>79,491</b>	<b>174,123</b>

### **III Results of End of Project Workshop**

#### ***A. Workshop held at Hotel Africana, Kampala, Uganda 29 January 2003***

The purpose of the one-day workshop was to present, discuss and build upon preliminary findings from research project on best practices for agricultural marketing initiatives by Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) and Community-Based Organisations (CBOs). The workshop aimed to inform relevant policy processes and project or programme interventions within Uganda. Fifty-nine people attended the event representing NGOs, government institutions, donor agencies, producer organisations and agribusiness firms.

Presentations by research team members were followed by panel group discussions, in which guest speakers offered additional insights into the topics under review. Active discussions during the plenary and working group sessions further enhanced research findings and provided guidance for the preparation of the final research report and future dissemination activities.

The workshop assessed the role of farmer groups and possible strategies to build their capacity as well as that of organisations supporting their development. The experience of FOODNET in providing market information services was also shared during the workshop, and ways to improve the effectiveness of such services and to ensure financial and institutional sustainability were examined. Discussions were informed by on-going policy and institutional reform processes, in particular the Programme for the Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) and the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS).

The key note speech was by Dr. Willie Odwongo, and it placed the research within the Uganda context, with special emphasis on the PMA and its marketing and agro-processing strategy. Three presentations were also made by research team members. There were a number of panel and plenary discussions, including the role of NGOs and CBOs in agricultural marketing; best practices for farmer group formation and development; and best practices for the development of effective and sustainable marketing information systems. Three working group discussions, looked at NAADS and best practices, ways to benefit farmers through private sector development initiatives, and stakeholder roles in the provision of marketing information.

During the concluding sessions a number of issues were raised including the need to publish research findings in an international journal and specialised publications in India and Uganda; the need for additional dissemination activities and the need to place emphasis on targeting NGOs and farmer groups. A comparison was made with the Indian component of the research. It was felt that Ugandan NGOs intervening in the marketing sphere are generally more aware of best practices than their Indian counterparts. The latter tend to follow very interventionist approaches, despite having limited experience and expertise in agricultural marketing and processing. As a result, several case study interventions in India have proven problematic in terms of cost-effectiveness and sustainability prospects. In closing the discussion, Dr. Ann Gordon from Aga Khan Foundation commented on the day's rich discussion of farmers' groups and highlighted some important issues that require further analysis.

These included the considerable diversity in farmers' groups; the lack of attention paid to the role of farmers' apex organisations as larger-scale and potentially more sophisticated players in agricultural markets; the need for more work on the contribution that groups can make to marketing in remote areas, where farmers have fewer options and where the development of appropriate strategies to improve livelihoods is particularly challenging. Finally, the serious and long-term nature of the required capacity building for groups was stressed, the danger of short cuts jeopardising intended outcomes, and with it, the need for development practitioners to carefully monitor the processes and results, in order to learn and more widely disseminate emerging good practice in this important area.

### ***B. Workshop held at Bangalore, India 27-28 March 2003***

This two day workshop, held at the Ecumenical Centre, Bangalore had three main objectives:

- Disseminate, discuss and improve research findings
- Inform policy processes and relevant project and programme interventions at various levels
- Identify channels and strategies to bridge the gap between existing knowledge and practice

There were 42 participants representing NGOs, donor-funded rural livelihood projects, government agencies, and research and management organisations from India. There were 2 participants from Uganda.

Following a brief introduction to the research project, some key issues related to agricultural marketing were presented. Findings from the Ugandan and Indian case studies were shared and discussed. The experiences of BASIX in agricultural marketing and of INDOCERT in organic certification were also presented. Presentations were followed by plenary discussions, where participants were encouraged to share their individual experiences. Group discussions were held on key issues that emerged during the two days. Participants were divided in four thematic working groups, covering policy advocacy; orientating NGOs towards agricultural marketing; promoting backward and forward linkages; and from local to global market opportunities. Group views, findings and recommendations were presented and discussed in the final session.

At the end of the workshop participants were given the opportunity to express their views on workshop-related issues. Some of the issues raised were:

- NGOs involved in marketing issues should form a network and exchange information on a regular basis. Successful experiences need to be disseminated.
- Documentation is required to share experiences across states. However, it is important to remember that government policies differ from state to state.
- A workshop on capacity building of NGOs for marketing could be held in the future.
- Workshops such as the present one should invite experts and representatives from the private sector. There is a clear need for greater interactions between NGOs and the commercial sector.
- The government (e.g. departments of rural development, agriculture, horticulture, watershed development and agricultural marketing) should also be better

represented at future workshops. NGOs should participate in government planning processes. Moreover, NGOs and government institutions could work together to improve the outreach of specific government schemes.

- In future events of this kind, farmers could be invited to make a presentation.
- NGOs should work with tribal communities to certify and develop markets for their products.



## **V Feedback on the Process from Collaborating Institutions**

In an attempt to receive feedback from participants on various aspects of the workshop, a short questionnaire was distributed to the participants at each of the workshops. The analysis of the respondents' answers are summarised below.

### **A. Uganda Workshop**

The content and presentation of the workshop was rated by most as “good”, with some “average” and some “excellent” marks given. However, the incorrect printing of the layout of question 1 created some confusion for most participants.

Although many people felt that no important topics were missing, a few thought that some important topics had been left out of the discussions. Below are some of the comments made:

- What is the correct time to form associations?
- Need to look at gender issues arising in marketing interventions
- How to provide finance to market farmers' produce without depending on donors. This would make farmers demand other necessary services which are now being forced on them
- Need to examine support to private service providers
- NRI seemed to be pushing two workshop topics into one (a) market information and (b) groups, whereas both are workshop topics on their own!!!
- Need to look at agro-processing for value addition leading to higher prices especially for perishables
- Need for a better understanding of group sustainability, relationship of groups to crops, and gender in groups

The relevance of the workshop to participants' work was rated between “very relevant” and “quite relevant”. Perceptions on the content of the presentations were mixed: many people thought it was about right while some felt that it was too general and a few felt it was too detailed. There were also varied reactions regarding the mixture of presentation and discussions: most people thought the balance was about right while a few thought there were too many discussion sessions and plenary presentations.

General aspects of the workshop arrangements were evaluated mostly as good to average, although some “excellent” answers were given. The overall assessment of the workshop was “good” to “excellent”.

Comments on the workshop in general or suggestions for similar events varied from general comments to specific suggestions:

- “I would like the NRI staff to maintain their excellency both in their presentation and their discussions and helping Ugandan farmers achieve good quality food standards, thus increasing their agricultural expertise hence development.”
- “How are we as NGO going to be involved in dissemination of the best practices talked about in this workshop?”
- “Biodiversity preservation and reclamation of declining natural resources”

- “Found the workshop relevant to my work in market information. Especially enjoyed the private sector view and frank views from John Magnay, UGC? It would have been ideal to have a participant to represent “informal” traders who are key players in the agriculture sector.”
- “Would like access to other NRI reports.”
- “The workshop was very useful and informative. Since farmers are the target group, let’s hope they will be involved in the future.”
- “If you don’t get participants to introduce themselves in plenary, it would be useful to circulate a list of participants and their institutional homes for information during the workshop. Discussants should be discussants not presenters.”
- “Institutionalising (marketing information system) in farmers organisations for sustainability.”
- “There appears to be more emphasis on NGOs roles and less on roles of farmer organisations in marketing and market information. This does not argue well for sustainability of the NGO interventions after their departure.”
- “Provide handouts from other presenters.”
- “I feel case studies needed to involve more NGOs doing similar work because challenges are different for different environments.”

## **B. India Workshop**

### **1 Content and presentation**

Most participants ranked the content and presentation of the different workshop sessions as “excellent” (1) or “good” (2). The overall average for content and presentation ranged between 1.60 and 2.40.

	<b>Content</b>	<b>Presentation</b>
<b>Session 2</b>		
Issues in Agricultural marketing	1.65	1.61
<b>Session 3</b>		
Uganda Case Studies	1.84	1.85
<b>Session 4</b>		
Finding from the Indian case studies	2.13	2.33
<b>Session 5</b>		
Other Indian experiences	2.23	2.36
<b>Session 6</b>		
Working groups	1.65	1.94

(Key: 1-Excellent, 2-Good, 3-Average, 4-poor)

### **2 Missing topics**

While almost half of the participants considered that no important topic was missing from the workshop programme, 53% expressed a different view. Below are some of the issues participants felt could have been addressed or better developed during the workshop:

- marketing of non-timber forest produce, with a special focus on poor tribal communities and individuals;

- views from policy-makers and government officials;
- the sustainability of facilitative and interventionist NGO marketing interventions;
- the role of NGOs in the development of forward and backward marketing linkages;
- the links between micro-credit and marketing;
- local markets; and
- the legal framework regulating interventions by different stakeholders.

### **3 Relevance of workshop presentations and discussions to participants' work**

All the participants agreed that the workshop presentations and discussions were relevant to their work. About half considered them “very relevant”.

	<b>Very Relevant</b>	<b>Quite Relevant</b>	<b>Not Relevant</b>
<b>% of participants</b>	52.9	47.1	0

### **4 Overall evaluation of the content of the presentations and discussions**

Concerning the content of the presentations and discussions, two thirds of the participants considered it to be “about right”.

	<b>Too general</b>	<b>Too detailed</b>	<b>About right</b>
<b>% of participants</b>	11.8	20.6	67.6

### **5 Mix of presentations and discussions**

More than two-thirds of the participants felt that the balance between presentations and discussions was about right. Almost one-third thought that there were too many discussion sessions.

	<b>Too many plenary presentations</b>	<b>Too many discussion sessions</b>	<b>About right</b>
<b>% of participants</b>	31.3	0	68.7

### **6 Workshop organisation**

The organisation of the workshop (venue, audio-visual equipment, helpfulness of staff and refreshments) was positively evaluated by a significant majority of participants. Yet, about 30% felt that advance contact and information about the event was inadequate (average or poor).

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Poor</b>
Contact and info in advance	30.3%	39.4%	27.3%	3.0%
Venue	35.3%	55.9%	8.8%	0%
Audio visual	47.1%	47.1%	5.8%	0%
Helpfulness of staff	47.1%	47.1%	5.8%	0%
Refreshments	17.6%	67.6%	14.8%	0%

## **7 Overall assessment of the workshop**

Almost all participants (97.1%) were satisfied with the workshop as a whole, and 14.7% rated it very highly (excellent).

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>poor</b>
<b>% of Participants</b>	14.7	82.4	2.9	0

## **8 General comments and suggestions for similar future events**

### **Comments**

Several participants noted that the time available during the two days did not allow for a full discussion on the whole range of issues concerning agricultural marketing and the role of NGOs. They felt that one additional day would have been justified. As a result of time constraints, not enough time was devoted to plenary discussions. Some participants expressed an interest in similar events where the lessons from marketing initiatives could be shared to a wider audience.

Another issue raised was the need for more background information on the workshop, which would help participants understand the questions under discussion and make informed interventions.

Several participants also felt the need for greater participation of donor agencies, policy-makers and government institutions.

### **Suggestions**

Suggestions for future workshop topics included capacity building of NGOs for improved market analysis and effective marketing interventions; post-harvest management; and marketing of organic produce and non-timber forest products. Some participants also recommended holding the current workshop in other parts of India to expose a wider audience to the research findings.

## VI List of Publications

Kindness H and Gordon A., 2001 Agricultural marketing in developing countries: the role of NGOs and CBOs. Policy Series 13. Chatham UK: NRI pp. i-v, 1-54.

Wandschneider T and Gordon A. (eds), 2001, Sustainable NGO/CBO agricultural marketing initiatives: proceedings of a workshop held at Mukono, Uganda 19-20 June 2001 pp. i-iii, 1-36

Gordon A., Virendar Khatana, Ashok M.S. and Wandschneider T (eds), 2001, Sustainable NGO/CBO agricultural marketing initiatives: proceedings of a workshop held at Bangalore, India 24-25 September 2001 pp. 1-45.

Gordon A., Virendar Khatana, Ashok M.S. and Wandschneider T (eds), 2001, Sustainable NGO/CBO agricultural marketing initiatives: proceedings of a workshop held at Bangalore, India 24-25 September 2001 pp. 1-45.

Marter A. and Wandschneider T., 2002 The role of NGOs and CBOs in marketing in Uganda: The potential in remote regions and in reaching the poor, NRI Report No. 2699 Chatham UK pp.1-34

Wandschneider T and Spilsbury J. (eds), 2003, Sustainable NGO/CBO agricultural marketing initiatives: proceedings of a workshop held at Hotel Africana, Kampala, Uganda 29 January 2003 pp. i-ii, 1-46

Mallikarjuna Y.C. and Nataraj R.T. 2002, Six Indian Case Studies. Internal document

Pattabiraman S 2002 Three Indian Case Studies. Internal document

Ashok M.S., 2003 Agricultural Marketing in India: the Context. Internal document

Wandschneider T (ed.) 2003, Sustainable NGO/CBO agricultural marketing initiatives: proceedings of a workshop held Bangalore, India 27 and 28 March 2003 NRI Report No2381. Chatham UK pp. i-ii, 1- 39

Wandschneider T, Ashok M.S , Greenhalgh P. ,Mallikarjuna Y.C., Nataraj R.T. and Pattabiraman S 2003, Best practices for sustainable NGO/CBO agricultural marketing interventions: lessons from India and Uganda. NRI Report No. ??? Chatham UK pp.1-93

## **VII A Catalogue of Data Sets and Their Location**

The data collected were qualitative and hence no data sets are available.