Informal markets in sub-Saharan Africa

- Provide food and income to millions
- Hazards are common but do not always translate into risks
- Farmers, traders and retailers are all risk managers
How to deal with informal markets? Ban or promote?

Previously unsuccessful: regulation/inspection

- lack of prerequisites to meet standards
- lack of enforcement of standards
- vested interests

Compromise: professionalize, not criminalize
Gaps in understanding how to manage food safety in informal markets

Where to intervene?
- Intervention on farm
- Intervention at market

How to intervene?
- Technological (i.e. aflasafe™, resistant based variants)
- Institutional (i.e. T&C milk traders)

Technically effective?

Cost-effective?

Contribution to improved food safety and nutrition?

How many beneficiaries do we reach?

Will they take up the intervention?
Impact Pathway for agHealth interventions

Problem analysis

- Problem area to be addressed
- Causes
- Underlying knowledge-related causes

Context analysis, research questions & intervention design

Impact pathway

- Impacts
- Outcomes
- Outputs
Impact pathway for agHealth interventions to improve food safety

- Reduced prevalence/incidence of FBD
- Reduced exposure to FBD
- Changes in capacity and behaviour of people who buy, prepare and consume food
- Changes in capacity and behaviour of market agents such as traders, processors, or retailers
- Changes in capacity and behaviour of farmers and livestock keepers
- Changes in capacity and behaviour of input supplies

Interventions targeted at these outcomes could improve the **quality of food produced and available on the market.**

Will these translate into impacts on health outcomes?
Theories of change (ToC) for A4NH food safety work
To understand impact logic of potential interventions

Builds on research & experience

Explains how intervention is expected to work on institutional level

Identifies underlying assumptions

Improved diet quality

More, safer milk, meat and fish consumed by target beneficiaries

Women maintain or increase control of income and assets

Reduced exposure to food-borne diseases

Increased quality of animal products sold

More equitable distribution of the benefits from quality animal products

Consumers

Enabling Environment

Producer Supply

Trader Supply

Gender
Two examples of a training and certification (T&C) intervention targeted at value chain actors

Smallholder Dairy Project (Omore et al., 2005) → India
  • dairy, Kenya, 1997-2006, funded by DFID

Training of meat processors (Grace et al., 2012) → Ethiopia
  • meat, Nigeria, 2009, funded by CAPRi and others
Why target raw milk traders??
1. Sector and value chain analysis, piloting best-bet interventions

2. Training & certification of milk traders (BDS model)


(Leksmono et al., 2006, Kaitibie et al., 2009)

Omore et al., 2005; Omore and Baker, 2011

www.smallholderdairy.org
Sustainable impact?

- 2009: 4,000 traders (15%) registered
- Documented change in practices
- Economic-wide impact of policy change (US$28m/year)
- Scheme still running but needs followup: policy buy-in, duplicated NGO efforts, vested interests of formal sector

http://pubs.iied.org/17316IIED.html
Training of meat processors in Ibadan, Nigeria (2009)

• Interactive training workshop for 68 representatives sent by 22 butchers associations

• Participants provided with training materials and equipment

• Immediate (short-term) impact

• Cost-effective

Grace et al., 2012 (TAHP):
https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11250-012-0207-0
https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11250-012-0208-0
## Status of the evidence for T&C intervention (milk traders or butchers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to food borne disease decreases</td>
<td>Currently fresh foods are mostly unsafe (hazards)</td>
<td>Fair to strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most fresh foods are bought in wet markets</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food is safer</td>
<td>Practices are effective</td>
<td>Fair short-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value chain agents change practices</td>
<td>Practices are feasible and generate benefits</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VC agents and consumers are motivated</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value chain agents buy in to scheme</td>
<td>VC agents can access training</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials and approaches are effective, relevant</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value chain agents are reached by scheme</td>
<td>Most VC agents can be reached</td>
<td>Weak to fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy environment can be made enabling</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps

- More rigorous evaluation of incentives for the trained actors
- Follow up to see if outcomes persist in longer term
- Test the approach in other food value chains
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