

CROP POST HARVEST PROGRAMME

**Development of tools for ethical trading of horticultural exports by
resource poor groups – Phase 2**

R7468 (ZB0160)

PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

1 July 1999 – 30 June 2001

Collaborating Institutions: Agro Eco Consultancy & Centre for Applied Social
Sciences, University of Zimbabwe

Project Leader: Man-Kwun Chan

Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich

SECTION A EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A very brief summary of how the outputs of the project contributed to the purpose, the key activities and highlights of dissemination outputs. (Up to 500 words).

Many of the major European supermarkets are developing ethical codes of practice as a result of growing consumer concern about food production methods and their impact on poor people and the environment. These codes can help improve the environment and the lives of poor people in third world countries if they are implemented sensitively and with real commitment from all stakeholders along the supply chain. However, if handled insensitively, codes at best will have little effect, and at worst can harm rather than help poor people. Building on the first phase (1998-99), this project has been working with private sector and civil society organisations in Europe (mainly UK) and Africa (mainly Ghana and Zimbabwe) to develop approaches and tools that will allow direct participation of poor people in developing and implementing ethical codes of practice in the export horticulture sector.

The project has developed **models and methods** for drawing up and implementing codes of practice in ways that benefit poor people. Models and methods developed include:

- how to build stakeholder awareness and support for codes of practice;
- how to build multi-stakeholder institutions for developing and implementing codes;
- how to develop practical criteria, indicators and verifiers that meet the priorities and constraints of workers, smallholders and employers/exporters;
- how to carry out an integrated social and environmental audit on small to medium scale farms, where there are few formal management systems and record-keeping is not well practised;

The project has generated **knowledge** in the following areas:

- a set of example indicators and verifiers for measuring compliance against social and environmental standards, that are appropriate to African export horticulture, practical, and reflect the real interests of workers and smallholders as well as being acceptable to employers/exporters;
- a systematic assessment of the level of compliance of smallholder vegetable farmers in Zimbabwe to codes of practice, and management recommendations for improving and monitoring smallholder compliance;
- a better understanding of future strategies, options and constraints vis-à-vis the further development of codes of practice for the benefit of poor people.

The Project has made a significant contribution towards making the content and implementation of existing codes more sensitive to the priorities and constraints of developing country stakeholders. This has been demonstrated by uptake of Project findings by those developing and implementing codes, including national trade associations in Ghana and Zimbabwe and other African trade associations who are members of the COLEACP Harmonised Framework initiative, the UK Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI), and importers.

Dissemination outputs include 2 BBC World Service radio programmes, an interview on the popular Breakfast Show on Ghanaian TV, and the preparation and extensive dissemination of a set of briefing sheets, each targeted at a different stakeholder in the fresh produce supply chain (growers, exporters, trade associations, importers, supermarkets and other standard-setting bodies).

SECTION B PROJECT BACKGROUND

B.1 Administrative data

Period under report: July 1999 – June 2001	Project Leader/Institution: Man-Kwun Chan, Natural Resources Institute
NRIL Contract Number: ZB0160	Collaborating institution(s): Agro Eco Consultancy, The Netherlands; Centre for Applied Social Sciences (CASS), University of Zimbabwe
DFID Contract Number: R7468	Target Institution(s): Trade associations in Ghana (Horticultural Association of Ghana, Sea Freight Pineapple Exporters of Ghana) and Zimbabwe (Horticultural Promotion Council), UK and other European importers and supermarkets, other European standard-setting bodies (e.g. ETI, EUREP GAP)
Project Title: Development of tools for ethical trading of horticultural exports by resource poor groups	Start Date: July 1999 End Date: June 2001
Research Programme: CPHP	Budget (i.e. Total Cost): £215,000
Production System: peri-urban interface	

SECTION C: EVALUATING THE IDENTIFICATION & DESIGN STAGE

Please describe the importance of the livelihood constraint(s) that the project sought to address and specify how and why this was identified.

In recent years there has been growing interest in codes of practice, which has developed as a result of public concern about social and environmental implications of the global supply chains of multinational companies, and has been fuelled by campaigning organisations and the media. But for those involved in development work, there have been concerns about whether or not codes really bring benefits to those they are set out to help i.e. poor people. In response to this concern, the Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme (NRET) organised a series of informal consultations and focus group discussions with African exporters and growers, importers, supermarkets and alternative trading organisations. The focus groups identified a need to explore whether or not these concerns were founded, and decided that the most appropriate sector for an initial case study would be the fresh produce sector. In consequence, Phase 1 of this Project was set up to identify the priorities, values and constraints faced by workers and smallholders involved in horticultural exports in Africa, and compare these with the social and environmental issues covered in emerging codes of practice developed by the European supermarkets.

Findings from Phase 1 did indeed highlight some significant differences between the actual priorities of workers and smallholders, and the social and environmental standards included in existing European-lead codes. Moreover, while carrying out the research, discussions with exporters and growers reinforced the initial concerns that codes were being implemented in a way that created extra burdens on growers and exporters. Discussions also revealed the lack of well-developed methods for implementing codes, in particular how to measure and monitor compliance. These concerns were raised again in each of the three end of Phase 1

workshops, where participants were asked to identify in more detail the specific roles that research could play to assist in addressing these concerns. The outputs of Phase 2 were drawn directly from the research priorities identified during these workshops.

The development of codes of practice during the two year period of implementing Phase 2 has been rapid, and by the end of the Project early code adopters have gone a considerably way towards institutionalising and implementing their codes. In particular, the development of EUREP GAP has been important. A growing number of European supermarkets have signed up to EUREP, and the scheme is now being rolled out to cover suppliers from non-European and developing countries. At the beginning of Phase 1, people were doubtful whether codes of practice would really every be implemented, and whether any more than a handful of supermarkets would ever adopt them. By the end of Phase 2, all the major UK supermarkets have adopted a code, in Europe as a whole an estimated 20-30% of supermarkets (by market share) have now adopted EUREP GAP or similar codes. Exporters and growers in developing countries who are supplying the supermarkets, including those in Ghana and Zimbabwe, have been given deadlines to comply with EUREP GAP. Whether or not EUREP GAP and other codes are applied in a way that benefits workers, smallholders and growers is therefore becoming an increasingly important issue for all those involved in exporting to the EU.

If relevant, how and to what extent did the project team understand and work with different groups of farmers?

In both Ghana and Zimbabwe, the Project team conducted a stakeholder analysis before field work took place, which included an assessment of the different types of farmers involved in export. Based on the results of the stakeholder analysis, the selection of case study companies and farms was made with the aim of including a cross-section of different types of farmers in the research. In both countries, we worked with different-sized farms from the really large-scale commercial set ups to smaller commercial farms, and also with smallholders. In Zimbabwe, we worked with groups of smallholders who were supplying the case study companies/exporters. In Ghana, we worked with some independent smallholders as well as small-scale outgrowers for the case study companies. In Ghana, smallholders and their interests were an integral part of the field work since a large proportion of export volumes (40%) is sourced from smallholders. In Zimbabwe, where smallholder supply is less widespread, smallholders were made the specific focus of the last tranche of field work (October 2000 to March 2001).

One area where it was difficult to be representative was in terms of getting a balance of “unenlightened” as well as “enlightened” farmers. At the beginning of the project, especially in Ghana, few farmers considered social and environmental issues to be part of their “business”, and many had not even heard of a code of practice. Due to the highly participative nature of the research, involvement in the Project entailed a considerable commitment for the case study company in terms of time inputs. Given the commercial nature of these companies, it was unrealistic to expect collaboration from companies who were not in some way interested in ethical trade. The case study companies were therefore necessarily selected from those who were more forward-thinking, and because they had some interest in the issues felt they had something to gain from taking part in the research.

For all case study farms, the local researchers made numerous visits to the farms and interacted closely with all types of workers through group discussions, interviews and other participatory exercises, and so developed a very thorough understanding of both the social and the technical conditions on these farms.

Did the project work with a specific target institution? Which one? [Why was it selected as a target institution?] And how did they plan for the future adoption of project outputs at the design stage? Please describe the strategy the project team agreed upon with the target institution(s).

Zimbabwe

The key target institution in Zimbabwe was the Horticulture Promotion Council (HPC), which is the official trade association for horticultural exporters and growers. As mentioned earlier, HPC has its own code of practice which was already being developed prior to the inception of the Project. During the course of Phase 2, other agricultural export industries became interested in joining the HPC Code. A decision was therefore taken to expand the scope of the Code to incorporate other agricultural products, and an independent body – the Agricultural Ethics Assurance Association of Zimbabwe (AEAAZ) was set up to oversee the development and implementation of the code. Following the ETI tripartite model, AEAAZ includes trades union and NGO as well as private sector representation. In the latter part of the Project, therefore, links were also established with the AEAAZ.

The end of Phase 1 workshop in Zimbabwe was organised jointly with HPC. HPC and its members were therefore involved in drawing up the research recommendations during the workshop, which were distilled into the outputs for Phase 2. Furthermore, HPC were consulted at all key stages in the work plan, so they were involved in deciding on specific activities and focus for the field work. Thus from the start, we made sure that project outputs were directly relevant to HPC, therefore maximising chances for adoption. No specific strategy was agreed for uptake, but the basic premise was that the research would assist in the development of the HPC's own code of practice. The nature of the relationship was based on mutual benefit – we tried to make the research relevant to the needs of HPC and its members (the industry), HPC helped facilitate the research and assisted in dissemination of results to the wider industry.

Ghana

In Ghana the choice of a target institution was less clear, due to the disparate and weak organisation of the export horticultural industry compared to the situation in Zimbabwe. While the Horticultural Association of Ghana (HAG) represents the industry by name, its membership is limited to the pineapple sector, and even then not all pineapple growers and exporters are members. A competing organisation is the Sea Freight Pineapple Exporters Association of Ghana (SPEG) which has been more effective as an institution but only represents pineapple exporters who freight by sea. A third organisation – the Vegetable Producers and Exporters Association of Ghana (VEPEAG) – represents the vegetable sectors. Since none of these represent the industry as a whole, it was difficult to opt to work solely with one of these umbrella organisations without alienating the others. Through consultation with the relevant associations and with individual exporters and growers, the Project team decided to set up an informal Ethical Trade Working Group which comprised representatives from HAG and SPEG (who are themselves exporters), the Export Promotion Council, and the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MOFA), and two smallholders.

When the Project was set up, no-one had heard of codes of practice or ethical trade, and no-one was convinced that it was something that needed to be taken seriously. It was therefore understood that the Working Group (WG) was an experimental set up, where HAG, SPEG and their members would learn more about what was involved through representation on the WG. This would then allow them to judge for themselves whether or not it was something they wished to take forward. From the Project's point of view, the WG was a mechanism for eliciting regular discussion and feedback from relevant stakeholders on the research process and findings, and also served as a pilot institutional model for building awareness and

support for a code of practice from which generic lessons for institutional-building could be drawn.

[How and why were collaborating institutions selected?] How were they involved in the design of this project and why did they collaborate?

Agro Eco Consultancy

Agro Eco is a Dutch consultancy firm specialising in the promotion and support of organic agriculture. Bo van Elzaker – the consultant working on the Project – was involved from the beginning of Phase 1. NRI were interested in recruiting him onto the project team in view of his extensive experience as an organic inspector and consultant. NRI felt that he could provide useful guidance to the Project on interpretation and application of the environmental aspects of codes, and also on the practical aspects of designing and implementing certification and auditing/inspection systems. Agro Eco initially chose to take part in Phase 1 because they saw it as an opportunity to branch out from organics into a different but related area. After Phase 1, Bo had become sufficiently interested in the Project and the issues it was exploring to decide to remain closely involved through Phase 2. Since he was involved in Phase 1, he was very much part of setting the agenda for Phase 2. Throughout Phases 1 and 2, he has always been an invaluable source of new ideas, and has helped to ensure that project outputs have been practical and focused.

Zimbabwe

In Zimbabwe, formal collaboration was between NRI and the Centre for Applied Social Sciences (CASS) of the University of Zimbabwe. CASS then sub-contracted consultants to work on this Project (we agreed with CASS that we could select our own consultants). We went through a pretty rigorous selection process, both for the collaborating institution, and for selection of individual consultants. To select the institution, we held a series of meetings with several likely institutions, and also sought advice from NRI colleagues. CASS were interested to be involved in the Project because they saw it as an opportunity to expand their portfolio of projects into a new area of research which they felt was growing in importance on the development scene. While ethical trade and codes of practice were new subjects for CASS, the Project nevertheless fitted within their general focus and area of expertise.

For selection of the consultants, we gathered names of potential consultants based on recommendations from local institutions and other contacts, and formally interviewed 6 or 7 individuals. The interviews gave an opportunity for both sides to assess each other, and the 2 eventual consultants were selected for their competence, reliability and interest in the research area.

CASS itself was not involved in the design of the project. The individual consultants were given a fixed set of objectives/outputs for the Project, but they were closely involved in designing the specific activities and methods used in the research (for further details, please see section below on the **monitoring system**).

SECTION D EVALUATING THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

How was participation achieved among the different stakeholders (the lead institution, the collaborating institution(s), the target institution(s), the CPHP and, where relevant, farming communities) in the research process?

Participation between NRI and collaborating institutions

The process of building and maintaining participation between NRI and the collaborating institutions and consultants is described in **Section E**, above, and below under the section on **monitoring systems**.

Participation of other stakeholders

In addition to the collaborating institutions, a large range of stakeholders participated to varying degrees in the research, in each of Ghana, Zimbabwe and the UK. Broadly speaking, there were 3 tiers of stakeholders who were involved in different ways. The **first tier** were stakeholders of the case study companies in Ghana and Zimbabwe, namely different types of workers (casual and permanent, men and women, general workers and supervisors, farm and packhouse, young and old), smallholders supplying the company, and employers/owners and managers (the exporters). Representatives of all these first tier stakeholder groups were closely involved in the field research. All groups were directly involved in developing and refining each of the tools and models developed by the Project. Phase 1 research gave the Project a sound understanding of the needs, priorities and constraints faced by these stakeholders. In Phase 2, all tools and models were developed with the principle aim of maximising the extent to which these needs and priorities could be met.

The **second tier** of stakeholders were institutions or secondary stakeholders who chose to take an active part in the research process, namely HPC in Zimbabwe, and members of the Ethical Trade Working Group, HAG and SPEG in Ghana, i.e. the “**target institutions**”. They assisted in selecting appropriate case study companies, advised on the focus and implementation of the research, and were engaged in an informal but regular process of two-way feedback with the NRI team throughout the length of the Project. The process of identifying and building participation with second tier stakeholders/target institutions has already been discussed under **Section 3**, so is not included in the analysis below.

The **third tier** of stakeholders – a much larger group – were institutions who were informed by the Project about the study and its aims, saw that the subject was of interest, but didn't want or were not able to take an active role in the research. Participation tended to be at the level of attending the annual workshops in each country. While their participation was marginal, their involvement was nevertheless very important to the Project, since the multi-stakeholder workshops provided a broad-based sounding board for work-in-progress, and provided feedback and guidance that helped to define or refine the following year's activities.

The processes of building participation are explained by country, below.

UK/Europe

Individuals and companies who took part in the initial focus groups (importers, supermarkets, industry associations and ATOs) were invited to attend each of the annual workshops in London. Emerging key players such as ETI and EUREP were also added to the list of invitees when new contacts were made during the course of the Project. The aim of the workshops was not only to inform the industry stakeholders of the latest Project findings, but also to get feedback from the industry in terms of a “reality check” on methods being developed, and guidance on research and dissemination priorities for the coming year.

CPHP management were invited to attend each of the workshops in London.

Zimbabwe

Third tier stakeholders

A stakeholder analysis was conducted at the beginning of Phase 2 to identify other secondary stakeholders with an interest or involvement in labour or environmental standards, and/or in the protection of smallholder interests. On the basis of this, the local Project team arranged meetings with representatives from key organisations, including: the General Agricultural and Plantation Workers Union of Zimbabwe (GAPWUZ), the Agriculture Labour Bureau (Employers' Organisation), the National Employment Council (NEC) – the arbitrating body between GAPWUZ and ALB, Environment 2000 (environmental NGO), Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe (local NGO working to improve labour conditions on commercial farms) and relevant government ministries and departments (Standards Board, labour, environment and agriculture). The purpose of these meetings was partly to raise awareness about the Project and its aims, to find out about related work being done in the country and key lessons from their experience, and to provide an open door for further collaboration if the organisation wished to pursue it. They were also invited to attend the annual workshops.

Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI): Collaboration with ETI was built up over a period of time, initiated through discussion between the UK-based NRI Project team and the UK-based Chairperson of the Zimbabwe pilot. See below for further details.

Crop Post Harvest Programme (CPHP): Part of the local consultants' terms of reference was to keep the Zimbabwe CPHP field co-ordinator informed of Project developments. The consultants attended CPHP Zimbabwe meetings and gave presentations on Project aims and findings.

First tier stakeholders

The Project worked with three case study companies during Phase 2. All 3 companies had also been involved in Phase 1. The choice was made to continue with these companies since a lot of ground work had been done in terms of raising awareness about ethical trade and creation of an understanding amongst workers and managers about the specific aims of the Project.

The initial process of selecting case studies during Phase 1 involved a number of different steps. First of all, the Project team established the following selection criteria:

- the companies in question are open towards the consideration of social and environmental issues, and are willing to take part in the study;
- representation of the whole range of production systems (small-scale outgrowers, large-scale outgrowers, exporters' own farms and packhouses);
- a mixture of companies including those who have been involved for some time in horticultural exports, and those who were relative new-comers.

On the basis of these criteria, four commercial exporting companies and two smallholder outgrower schemes were selected in consultation with the Horticultural Promotion Council (HPC). Introductory meetings were then arranged with each of the company managers. HPC's endorsement was important, since the companies were suspicious of our motives. On HPC's advice, we prepared a one-page summary of the research objectives and proposed activities and faxed this to each of the managers prior to the meetings. At each introductory meeting, we were accompanied by an appropriate HPC representative which helped lend credibility to the research project.

Some of the company managers were not willing to make a commitment to take part in the Project until they had seen a work plan which detailed how much time would be taken up by the field work, and with whom we wished to consult. We therefore prepared work plans and clear criteria for selection of a cross-section of different types of workers and smallholders who we wished to include in the field work. We requested that we would be able to work with the same individuals throughout the field work. The managers were not happy for us to select the individual workers, so we asked them to make the selection based on our criteria.

A series of introductory meetings were then arranged with different groups of workers and smallholders to introduce the concepts of codes and ethical trade, and explain the purpose of the research. Considerable time was spent finding appropriate ways to introduce the concepts to different groups of stakeholders. The concepts are complex and abstract, and with the history of antagonism between (black) workers and (white) managers, it was important to set the correct tone in order to gain the trust of both sides.

Thus, the process of building participation was carefully planned and orchestrated. The investment was however crucial to the success of the Project, since gaining the trust of the stakeholders was essential for releasing accurate and comprehensive information on often highly sensitive and political issues such as labour conditions.

Ghana

Third tier stakeholders

In Ghana, stakeholders were identified through consultation with various institutions and individuals – TechnoServe and AMEX International (both USAID funded NGOs), the Department of Crop Services (Ministry of Food and Agriculture), Ghana Export Promotion Council (GEPC), HAG and SPEG. On the recommendation of these institutions, the Project team arranged further meetings with the Ghana Ports and Harbour Authority (GAPOHA), AFGO (private company who deals with handling of airfreight at Kotoka International Airport), airlines (Air Ghana, British Airways, KLM, Lufthansa), Ghana Standards Board, General Agricultural Workers' Union (GAWU), Ministry of Labour and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). All were invited to attend the Project workshops. The team also made visits to Tema port and Kotoka airport to inspect freight handling facilities and shipping.

In terms of the participation of CPHP, the lead local researcher in Ghana was also the local CPHP field co-ordinator for West Africa, so it was felt that formal arrangements for participation were not necessary.

First tier stakeholders

As with Zimbabwe, Phase 2 “inherited” a number of companies and smallholders which had collaborated with the Project during Phase 1 (7/8 companies), and the Project decided to continue working with the same companies for similar reasons as in Zimbabwe.

At the start of Phase 1, few exporter/producers were prepared to give up their time to talk to the research team. Many were suspicious of the NRET programme and it took a good deal of time and explanation to convince them of the potential benefits of the work. Even so, many remained sceptical. Exporters who showed most interest and support for the concept of ethical trade were chosen for the case studies. This means that the research team worked with the most enlightened and progressive members of the horticultural export industry, who are not necessarily representative of the industry as a whole. The choice of exporters also determined the choice of farm workers, as those exporters with whom the research team established a good rapport allowed access to their workers.

There was a much wider choice of smallholders and outgrowers to select from. Many smallholders wanted to air their grievances against the exporters and the NRET project provided a forum for doing so. The farmers finally selected for the case study belonged to five associations being assisted by TechnoServe. TechnoServe staff provided the initial introduction between the farmers and research team, which “legitimised” the presence and objectives of the team. Associations of farmers were chosen in preference to individuals because data could be collected more quickly and accurately than relying on individual informants, and also provided a means of cross-checking and verification.

As in Zimbabwe, great care was taken in terms of how the concept of ethical trade was introduced to different stakeholders. While some exporters were to some extent familiar with codes of practice, the concept of ethical trade was completely new to smallholders and farm workers. The phrase “ethical trade” was not used as it was a complicated concept to communicate effectively. Instead, practical examples of criteria and indicators from existing codes were used to demonstrate the kind of impact which the implementation of a code of practice might have on the Ghanaian horticultural export industry e.g. better pay and working conditions for workers and more transparent contracts between smallholders and exporters. It is noteworthy that whilst the social impact of code implementation was readily understood, environmental impact was a much more difficult concept for all stakeholders to appreciate, as many environmental issues are not readily visible and have no direct or immediate effect.

With exporters, smallholders and workers alike, winning their trust did not happen overnight and was built up over repeated visits and discussions with the same individuals.

For the final tranche of field work (the pilot audits), due to time constraints we restricted the exercise to 2 exporters and their outgrowers, who were selected out of the original case study group based on their level of interest in the work.

What were the major changes that took place during the implementation period. For each one, explain why they came about and how well do you think the project team managed them?

Rapid development of codes of practice

One of the key challenges for the Project was maintaining the relevance and “cutting edge” position of the research, given the rapid development and implementation of codes of practice, both in Europe and Africa in general, and the development of the HPC/AEAAZ code in Zimbabwe in particular. This involved ensuring that the research was not duplicating work being done elsewhere on the one hand, and making sure on the other hand that research results were disseminated as quickly as possible to enable them to be used by the industry as codes were being developed and implemented. At the project evaluation meeting held on the 23rd May 2001, team members confirmed that they felt the Project had managed to keep abreast of changes and made use of opportunities that had arisen during the course of Phase 2.

Through regular contact with the target institutions and other key players in the industry, the Project team remained in touch with key developments in the industry, and responded to threats of duplication (e.g. ETI in Zimbabwe – see below) and to new challenges as they arose (e.g. the decision to conduct the smallholder compliance study in Zimbabwe). The annual workshops allowed research findings to be shared relatively rapidly with industry and other key stakeholders. However, half way through Phase 2 the Project team recognised the need for further dissemination of research findings using channels and formats that would reach a larger number of industry stakeholders. It was in response to this that the Project team decided to seek extra funds for preparation and dissemination of the briefing papers.

Establishment of ETI horticulture pilot in Zimbabwe

Around the time that Phase 2 was being established, ETI decided to set up a pilot on the horticulture industry in Zimbabwe, the aim of which was to develop and test approaches to monitoring and verification on commercial farms against the ETI Base Code. Because of the similarity between the ETI pilot and our Project, this immediately created difficulties for our work in Zimbabwe. Through a series of meetings with the ETI Zimbabwe pilot chairperson and others in London, we negotiated distinct but complementary roles for the ETI pilot and the NRI Project. Because the objectives of the ETI work were fixed, we agreed to drop our original intention to test auditing approaches on commercial farms in order to avoid duplication with ETI. While the joint planning was helpful, this did not prevent a large amount of confusion amongst the horticulture industry in Zimbabwe, who despite many attempts to explain the differences could not distinguish between ETI and the NRI Project. By the end of Phase 1 the NRI Project had built up a good rapport with HPC and some of the exporters. Unfortunately for the Project, this suffered with the establishment of the ETI pilot, since ETI had the perceived advantage of having stronger links with the supermarkets. For this reason, HPC to a degree lost interest in the NRI Project, even although they continued to collaborate with us.

However, while the departure of Elias from the Project (see below) was a blow to the Project, we managed to turn this to our advantage by successfully recruiting Diana Auret to take Elias' place. Diana, as well as being a sociologist with extensive experience of improving labour standards on commercial farms, was also the Chair of the local ETI Working Group that had been set up in Zimbabwe. This was an important political move which improved the relationship between ETI and NRI in Zimbabwe, and also re-established the status of the Project in the eyes of HPC and AEAZ. It also provided the Project with a direct "uptake pathway" for the research findings.

In the project evaluation meeting, the lead researcher in Zimbabwe – Dr. Rufaro Madakadze – said that while the NRI-ETI relationship had often been difficult, she felt the Project had dealt with it as well as was possible, and that the decision to recruit Diana as a consultant had been a very positive move.

Departure of Elias Madzudzo

Elias Madzudzo was one of the 2 researchers we had recruited at the beginning of Phase 2, and was a real asset to the Project. He applied for and was offered an overseas post in autumn 2000 (with a salary being offered several times higher than the salary paid by the Project). As the only social scientist on the Zimbabwe team, this was a potential blow to the Project since there was little time to recruit and train another researcher (only 9 months left before the end of the Project), and we anticipated that it would be difficult to find someone else of the same calibre. As explained above, in the event the Project team managed to turn the situation to its advantage. Since Diana was already very familiar with the issues through her central involvement in the ETI work, little work needed to be done in terms of getting her "up to speed". Moreover, the nature of the contract with CASS allowed us the flexibility to work with Diana, and allowed a contract to be arranged in a relatively short space of time.

Worsening national political situation in Zimbabwe

The worsening political and security situation in Zimbabwe was a serious threat to the continuation of the Project, especially given that much of the field work was taking place on white-owned commercial farms. Fortunately for the farms and the Project, horticultural farms tended to be left alone by the war vets so were less at risk from occupation. The UK Project team decided to suspend field work for some time while consultations were held with the local Project team, CPHP management, HPC and the individual exporters to decide whether or not to continue the research in Zimbabwe. Given that all parties were happy to continue

the research, and given the decision to focus the remaining field work in the safer smallholder areas (resettlement schemes and communal areas), we decided to complete the field work. Informal feedback indicated that in fact the political situation had brought employers and employees closer together, and also that promotion of the Code of Practice became more important as a way of maintaining the image of the horticulture sector both nationally and internationally.

Nevertheless, the Project team decided to cancel the second workshop in Zimbabwe since the local researchers felt that it would put participants at unnecessary risk. It was for this reason that alternative dissemination plans were put in place.

Changes in HAG management in Ghana.

There was a change of leadership within HAG during Phase 2, which included several months in a transitional phase where future management and activities were unclear. This was a set back to the efforts made by the local team in building institutional support for the research and the draft national code of practice. Nevertheless, during this period the Project maintained links with HAG and individual exporters, and with the appointment of the new President HAG commitment to the work was eventually strengthened. This was assisted by the fact that at about this time several exporters (members of HAG) were beginning to receive pressure from their buyers to comply with various social and environmental standards. Moreover, by this time the local research team had acquired a good understanding of the informal as well as formal institutional structures within HAG and the pineapple industry, so were able to find ways of maintaining the relationship with HAG.

What were the strengths and weaknesses of your monitoring system? How did you use and how useful was the information provided by your monitoring system?

No formal monitoring system was adopted by the Project. However, effective monitoring and evaluation throughout the Project was ensured via the following mechanisms :

- informal but very regular correspondence between the UK project team and the research teams in Ghana and Zimbabwe via email and telephone. This allowed unexpected problems, or new opportunities, to be discussed and acted upon relatively quickly;
- country visits were made by the UK team to Ghana and Zimbabwe at each key stage in the project, in order to work with the local teams in designing and planning the next stage of research. Project planning was therefore a participative and iterative process, with each stage of research depending on an evaluation of successes and failures of previous stages, and demand/interest/opinions from key stakeholders. The country visits also provided an opportunity for team members to share general learning and latest thinking on ethical trade and codes of practice in Europe/Africa;
- a full day team evaluation and planning meeting was organised after the first UK workshop (mid-project), involving the Ghanaian and Zimbabwean teams as well as the UK team and Agro Eco. The Ghana and Zimbabwe researchers attended both UK workshops, and at least one member of the NRI UK team attended each of the Zimbabwe and Ghana workshops, to ensure that all research teams were kept up to date with key stakeholder opinions in each country;
- A final project evaluation workshop involving lead researchers from Ghana and Zimbabwe, all UK-based team members and Agro Eco was held on the 23rd May 2001, the day after the final UK workshop. The conclusions drawn at this meeting provide the basis for key sections in this report.

SECTION E EVALUATING YOUR ACTIVITIES

This section should include a summary analysis of all the research activities (studies, surveys etc.) conducted to achieve the outputs of the project set against their respective OVIs in your project LogFrame.

Output 1: Model institutional framework for implementing ethical trade developed, tested and analysed

Testing and analysis of South-South institutional framework (from OVI)

The process for establishment of the **Ghana Ethical Trade Working Group** has already been discussed in earlier sections. In order to support the institutional analysis, a review of relevant applied sociological theories on organisational change and institutional development was conducted, and summarised into an analytical framework for the Project. Minutes were also kept of each Working Group meeting. On the completion of the draft Code, the local research team conducted a critical evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the Working Group model, using the analytical framework developed. Options for development of a formal national institutional structure have also been discussed and assessed, in relation to the auditing model being developed, and through break-out group sessions at the final Ghana workshop.

In **Zimbabwe**, activities under Output 1 were restricted to analysis only, with the emphasis on providing a critical evaluation of the development of ethical trade-related institutions already in existence, in particular the local ETI working group, HPC and later the AEA AZ. Methods of data collection included one-on-one meetings with a range of secondary stakeholders (see above), and participation in ETI working group meetings. The local research team kept project diaries, recording events and issues relevant to the institutional analysis on a regular basis. Based on the analytical framework, the local research team conducted a thorough stakeholder analysis incorporating an assessment of the interests, constraints and opportunities of relevant institutions in engagement with development and implementation of the national code of practice. This included an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the ETI working group model, which included membership from the industry, the union (GAPWUZ) and development NGOs (including Save the Children Fund UK).

Testing and analysis of South-North institutional framework

Establishment of formal linkages between Southern producers and the Northern market is not within the capacity of the Project. However, drawing on the experiences of HPC and of other African exporting countries who have developed their own national codes of practice, the Project team has analysed the advantages and disadvantages of national producer codes, and assessed the options for linking these to European market standards such as EUREP. This has included discussion with key stakeholders of appropriate benchmarking processes, apportioning of auditing and monitoring responsibilities, and cost-sharing options.

Output 2: Tools for implementing ethical trade developed and tested

Development of indicators and verifiers which address the needs of poor producers and workers; and development and documentation of the methodology

Development of indicators and verifiers for measuring compliance against the broad social and environmental standards in European codes of practice took place with 4 case study companies in Zimbabwe, and 7 companies in Ghana. In both countries, an important aspect

of the research methodology was to collect data through **repeated visits** to the same stakeholder. In Ghana, for example, 6 or 7 visits were made to each exporter. This was crucial to the success of the research because it enabled trust to be built up between the researchers and the stakeholders, and was also necessary since each session had to be kept reasonably in order to avoid disruption to the running of the business.

The research process made use of a range of **participatory rural appraisal (PRA) tools** to facilitate workers and smallholders to identify and prioritise their own indicators and verifiers. PRA exercises were held separately with each stakeholder group to ensure that any differences in interests and priorities would be highlighted, and to ensure that respondents were amongst “peers” and therefore felt at ease to talk openly. For example, in Zimbabwe stakeholder groups were divided as follows:

<u>Typical groups for field work on indicators and verifiers in Zimbabwe</u>
Packhouse 5-10 general workers (male and female) 5-10 supervisors and quality controllers 5 managers
Commercial farm 5-10 reapers 6 supervisors and foremen 1 field manager
Smallholders 10 female smallholders 10 male smallholders

The key PRA tools used **were semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and ranking**. Different tools were selected and used for different stakeholders. In general, ranking was used with all stakeholders

While social indicators and verifiers were easily identified through interviews and discussions with workers and smallholders, **environmental indicators and verifiers** were more difficult to identify through these techniques since stakeholder awareness of environmental effects is typically low. Supplementary methods were therefore used to identify environmental indicators and verifiers. In Ghana, a check-list of possible environmental hazards was drawn up by the Project’s environmental specialist (Bo van Elzakker) based on observations during preparatory field visits with the research team. The list not only stated potential problems and possible criteria, but also advised on remedial measures to be taken. This helped to give the local research team an understanding of how certain problems can be dealt with. Where stakeholder interviews were not forthcoming, environmental indicators and verifiers were there identified with the help of this environmental list and through field observation.

Additional social and environmental verifiers were also identified through discussions with management to determine what documentation was available, direct assessment of

documents, and researchers' own suggestions based on their practical knowledge of the local farming and packing operations.

In both countries, the initial sets of indicators and verifiers identified were then refined through a process of iteration involving all key stakeholders. In **Zimbabwe**, indicators and verifiers identified by workers, smallholders and the research team were presented to the management of the individual company. The management were then given the chance to propose amendments, if they considered any to be unrealistic, unacceptable, and/or impractical. Any amendments suggested by management were then presented back to the relevant stakeholder group (workers or smallholders) when further modifications were made as necessary.

In **Ghana**, the initial set of principles, criteria, indicators and verifiers identified from field work with the case study companies were summarised into a set of matrices – or the draft code. This was then reviewed section by section by the multi-stakeholder Ethical Trade Working Group, over a series of a dozen meetings. Many indicators were clarified and modified through the suggestions of the group and the draft code was shaped into a more practical, coherent format.

Throughout the process in both countries, the practicality of indicators and verifiers for the purposes of effective monitoring and verification was also considered. The Project conducted a review of best practice on development of indicators and verifiers (e.g. work done on social indicators by the New Economics Foundation, work done by the CIFOR on social and environmental indicators for sustainable forest management) and summarised key attributes that define a good indicator and verifier. These were used for the assessment of the practicality of indicators and verifiers being developed, and are summarised in below:

Practical issues governing the selection of appropriate indicators and verifiers

1. How relevant are indicators and verifiers to different stakeholders (e.g. are they acceptable to both workers and management, to both exporters and smallholders and to both consumers and exporters)? To be credible, a code must have the support of as wide a spectrum of stakeholders as possible.
2. How easy is it to measure, record and interpret a verifier and how reliably is it related to the indicator?
3. What information is readily available on the farm which can be used as indicators and verifiers (both direct and proxy)? If existing documentation can be used, it will save a lot of additional work for both the stakeholder and the inspection team.
4. How cost effective is the chosen means of verification? (This is influenced by a number of attributes e.g. ease of measurement, degree of integration i.e. ability to measure more than one indicator, embeddedness in system).
5. How time consuming is the chosen means of verification? (Time spent on verification has cost and human resource implications and will affect the implementability of the code).

Design and field-testing of integrated social and environmental auditing approach for small to medium-scale farms (Ghana)

The first step was to develop a **draft audit protocol** based on existing best practice. The draft audit protocol was drawn up based on a review of inspection methodologies used in organic certification, the social auditing approach developed by the ETI Zimbabwe pilot, the SA 8000 guidance document for auditors, and environmental auditing methods used for EMAS. Drawing on applicable aspects of these methodologies, we then adapted the protocol to take into account conditions on Ghanaian farms, and to allow for use of more participatory methods of data collection that we had found to be effective in the Project's previous fieldwork.

Pilot audits were then conducted by the two local field researchers (Seth Gogoe and Richard Tweneboah-Kodua) against the Ghana draft Code of Practice on two exporter's farms and their outgrowers. While the pilot audits had a wider range of objectives compared to a standard audit, nevertheless the pilot audits included all aspects of a "real" audit, including preparation and "signing off" of the audit report by the exporter. This allowed the team to carry out a critical assessment of the practicality of the approach, in particular assessing the number of "man-days" it took to complete a full audit. The objectives of the pilot audits were to:

- inform and educate the operator, management, workers and outgrowers about the rationale and content of the Code of Practice and the audit process
- test and refine indicators
- identify appropriate verifiers
- develop and refine the audit methodology
- assess compliance with the draft Code

Auditing was not completed for either of the two exporters due to time constraints. Nevertheless, it has been possible to draw conclusive and important lessons from these pilots. After completion of the pilot audits, a critical evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the auditing approach was carried out with the "audit team", and clear recommendations developed as to how the approach could be improved.

Output 3: Development of an awareness-raising strategy

Development of the strategy

The project used a **stakeholder approach** to identify an appropriate awareness-raising strategy, based on the premise that each stakeholder has different "awareness-raising" and information needs, and different communication channels, media and formats work for different stakeholders. We therefore made a separate assessment for each key stakeholder group, envisaging that the overall strategy may incorporate distinct "sub-strategies" for each stakeholder group. The target groups for our awareness raising strategy were: workers, smallholder, commercial growers/exporters, Southern trade (producer) associations, European importers, supermarkets and other standard-setting bodies.

Workers and smallholders

An awareness-raising approach for smallholder and workers was developed mainly through direct consultation and "learning by doing". Before Project field work could be initiated, the

purpose of the Project had to be explained to smallholders and workers, and this involved explaining and raising awareness about codes of practice. Often this included providing general information about the marketing chain and descriptions in particular of supermarkets and European consumers, since their knowledge of these areas was often vague. Thus the approach was developed through testing out different ways of explaining the concept to different groups of smallholders and workers, and refining it based on feedback. Appropriate channels for communication were also identified through the field work, and in the case of smallholders from knowledge of dissemination and extension methods used in agricultural development work.

Commercial growers and exporters

The strategy for this group was developed through consultation with secondary stakeholders, in particular trade (producer) associations, and through “learning by doing”. For those who are not yet convinced about the need for complying with codes, the emphasis of awareness-raising needs be on providing a business case for compliance. For those who are already implementing a code, the emphasis should be on providing support on implementation, e.g. highlighting difficult areas of the code and providing practical recommendations and examples of how to tackle them. Channels of communication were identified with reference to a survey that was done by another NRET project (assessment of impact of EU MRL legislation on developing countries), which reviewed communication channel most used by developing country exporters and producers to gain information on European market standards.

European importers, supermarkets and other standard-setting bodies

The strategy for this group was developed based on the results of a telephone survey. The survey identified a sample of well-informed individuals representing these different stakeholder groups, and asked the respondents to identify appropriate formats for communication of research findings, and the most popular and trusted channels/sources of information for finding out about new developments in the fresh produce industry.

Dissemination and awareness-raising activities (implementation of the strategy)

N.B. the Project’s contractual obligations were restricted to the dissemination of the specific Project outputs, and to the development of the awareness raising strategy. In practice, the Project undertook additional dissemination activities beyond its contractual obligations, and was actually able to partially implement the awareness-raising strategy developed.

General awareness-raising about codes of practice

As well as disseminating specific project findings, the Project achieved a significant amount in terms of raising awareness about ethical trade and codes of practice in a general sense. For Southern stakeholders, the Project provided background information about what codes of practice entail, and provided periodic updates on market requirements of different European companies and standard-setting bodies over the length of the Project. The Project also contributed to building the capacity of smallholders and exporters, through provision of practical advice to smallholders and exporters in Ghana about how to reach compliance with codes. These awareness-raising and capacity building activities were judged to be necessary in order to keep stakeholders – especially exporters – on board in carrying out the research.

For Northern stakeholders, the Project was able to disseminate basic information about conditions on African farms and how these affected their ability to comply with codes. The Project also helped to raise awareness about the priorities and concerns of Southern stakeholders, through channels such as the UK workshops, VINET and participation in ETI.

BBC In the Field radio programmes

The Project collaborated with the BBC World Service to produce 2 radio programmes as part of the In the Field series. These programmes introduced listeners in Asia and Africa to the concept of ethical trade and highlighted key constraints and opportunities in the implementation of codes in developing countries. The Project team was responsible for developing the outlines of the two programmes, and also carried out all of the interviewing in Ghana. This involved attendance by the Project leader at a training course at the BBC, and subsequent training of local researchers in Ghana to use the interview equipment.

Briefing papers

A set of five briefing sheets were developed with the assistance of an external journalist/editor. These sheets summarise key issues arising from Phase 1 and the first year's research under Phase 2. Each briefing note has been prepared with a particular type of business in mind, tailored to address the issues that are most relevant to that type of business. The five types of business targeted by the briefing sheets are:

1. Growers and exporters
2. Grower/exporter associations
3. European importers
4. European supermarkets
5. Other European standard-setting bodies

Each briefing note:

- is no more than 6 pages long;
- prioritises key issues which need to be tackled by each type of business, and provides practical suggestions for tackling them; and
- provides further sources of information on key topics.

Assessment of smallholder compliance

The field work for this assessment was carried out on three smallholder schemes supplying the three case study companies. The schemes were selected in order to cover a cross-section of different types of scheme, capturing variation in the level of control, capacity-building and support provided by the exporter, and the level of organisation of the smallholder group. 6 research assistants were hired to assist the lead researchers (Rufaro Madakadze – horticulturalist, and Diana Auret – sociologist) in the data collection.

The aim of the study was to assess the extent to which smallholders comply with (a) the COLEACP Harmonised Framework, and (b) the AEAAZ Code of Practice, and to provide management recommendations on how compliance can be monitored and improved. A checklist was drafted which summarised the major aspects of the 2 codes, and used to guide the field work. A range of participatory data gathering tools were used, including semi-structure interviews, focus group discussions, village and seasonal mapping, ranking exercises and transect walks. Respondents were drawn from male and female smallholders, workers, children, farmer committee members, extension staff and exporter's staff employed on the schemes (where relevant).

Cost of compliance study

Due to interest expressed by a range of stakeholders in an assessment of the cost of compliance, the Ghana team decided to make an initial attempt to carry out an assessment based on data they could obtain from the collaborating farms. A model (spreadsheet) was developed by the team to collate cost of production figures, since exporters did not use a standard format for accounting. The team then collected data on costs of production on the 7 farms where they were already conducting field work on criteria, indicators and verifiers. On the basis of these figures, informed estimates were made of likely changes that would need to be made by the exporters in order to reach compliance with code requirements.

SECTION F EVALUATING PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

The nature of the purpose-level and output-level OVIs in the project logframe (drawn up by the previous project leader) make it difficult to evaluate project effectiveness based on the format of headings and sub-headings proposed. In order to provide a logical and meaningful evaluation of project effectiveness, I have therefore selected the relevant questions from the proposed sub-headings and have structured this section around these.

Were all the anticipated outputs achieved, and if not what were the reasons?

The following anticipated outputs were all achieved:

- Model institutional framework for implementing ethical trade developed, tested and analysed;
- Indicators addressing the needs of poor producers and workers developed and tested;
- Verifiers addressing the needs of poor producers and workers developed and tested;
- Cost-effective tools for monitoring and verification developed and tested;
- Strategy for building stakeholder awareness of ethical performance developed.

The only anticipated output that was not achieved was the “development of criteria for hitherto unconsidered stakeholders in the value chain”. This was a deliberate decision made by the Project team. As mentioned above, the *modus operandi* of the Project from its inception has been to respond to private sector priorities within the boundaries of NRET’s mission of maximising benefits of ethical trade for workers and poor producers. As a direct result of feedback from stakeholders during the course of the Project, other outputs contributing to the overall Project purpose were prioritised above the development of criteria for secondary stakeholders. It was therefore decided to focus limit resources on delivery of prioritised outputs.

The additional outputs produced in response to stakeholder demand are listed below, with the justification for their inclusion. Details of the actual activities are described in Section E, above.

Assessment of smallholder compliance

Conclusions drawn at the mid-project workshops and informal discussions with key stakeholders highlighted the urgency of exploring the application of codes to the smallholder sector. There was growing anxiety about exporters reducing their reliance on smallholder suppliers, due to concerns that smallholders would find it more difficult to comply with codes compared to larger scale farmers. There was therefore a perceived risk that smallholders may be excluded from the export supply chain if no action was taken to defend and support them. Key stakeholders particularly in Zimbabwe prioritised further research into this smallholder issue over the development of criteria for secondary stakeholders. Since issues surrounding the impact of codes on smallholders fits well within the priorities of DFID and NRET, the Project team decided to divert limited resources to an in-depth assessment in Zimbabwe of the extent to which smallholders do an can comply with codes of practice.

Cost of compliance study

Demand for figures on the cost to suppliers of compliance with codes came from individual exporters in Ghana, Zimbabwe and other African countries where NRET was working. This

issue was also raised at the mid-Project UK workshop by other key stakeholders including DFID. The Ghana team felt that data collection for this exercise could logistically fit in well with the field work on development of indicators and verifiers. Moreover, the work on indicators and verifiers was time consuming for the exporters and their workers, and did not yield immediate benefits to the research participants. Therefore, the team felt that in order to maintain the interest of collaborating exporters in the Project, it was important to be able to offer something that was of immediate interest to the exporters. Many of the exporters only keep rudimentary accounts of their businesses, and they were very interested to learn more about their own costs of production, and how their costs compared against those of their competitors. Thus the cost of compliance study served a dual purpose.

Additional dissemination activities

One of the challenges of this Project was being able to disseminate findings rapidly in order to meet demand from industry stakeholders, while at the same time ensuring the quality and confidentiality of research findings. Given the commercially sensitive nature of much of the information collected by the research team, the Project had to be extremely careful about how the information was disseminated. If at any time the commercial collaborators suspected that the Project was disseminating confidential information, they would have immediately withdrawn their co-operation. This meant that most internal project reports could not be circulated without considerable editing (assimilation of results so that particular findings could not be attributed to a specific company). Thus significant resources needed to be devoted to processing the “raw material” into dissemination outputs that were at once accurate but also acceptable to the companies collaborating in the study. At the same time, we felt that it was important to devote resources to dissemination because the rapid development of codes of practice during the Project period provided a good opportunity to influence the agenda, if research findings could be disseminated effectively.

Quality and relevance of outputs as perceived by their intended users

Establishment and analysis of South-south institutional framework for implementing ethical trade

The **intended users** of the framework and lessons are Ghanaian and Zimbabwean horticulture industry associations, horticulture industry associations in other African and possibly other developing countries who have or are interested in developing a national code or scheme, and other institutions who are involved in supporting the development of national codes or schemes (e.g. ETI, local NGOs, donors).

The institutional analysis is not a rigorous sociological study. However, in terms of its intended users the analysis made by the Project and the lessons drawn are sound and relevant. Neither the institutional model developed by the Project in Ghana, or the ETI/HPC model we studied in Zimbabwe, can be simply transferred and applied to another country – an effective model has to build on the strengths and weaknesses of existing institutions, and this will always vary from country to country. However, the analyses revealed important generic lessons that are relevant to and can be used by all those involved in developing or supporting national codes or schemes.

For example, a common lesson from both countries was that pro-active steps need to be taken to ensure **representation of worker interests** in the code and its implementation. In both countries, involvement of the official trades unions was problematic. Only a small proportion of horticultural workers are union members (mostly male permanent workers only), so it cannot be assumed that unions represent the interests of the majority of workers. Moreover, employers and sometimes even the workers do not trust the unions, so one

cannot insist on their involvement in codes/schemes without risking alienation of other key stakeholders. In developing countries, trades unions also often have very limited capacity.

Different solutions were found in the two countries. In Ghana, the Ethical Trade Working Group chose to start off without the involvement of the union, but to involve them at a later stage once the industry representatives felt more comfortable with the idea of the code. Worker interests were represented on the Working Group by the research team, who had conducted extensive consultation with all categories of workers on their priorities and conditions. In Zimbabwe, the local union was included from the start in the ETI working group, but substantial logistical support and capacity building needed to be provided to them to allow their effective participation in the group.

The **Ghana** experience also provides a practical example of an effective institutional model for developing and raising awareness and support for a code, which can be applied whether or not the horticulture industry is well organised/has an effective representative body. However, it also highlights the fact that a national code or scheme cannot be fully formalised and implemented unless it has an institutional home, which has authority in the eyes of the majority of exporters and growers, and has access to necessary resources for implementation.

Analysis of the ETI experience in **Zimbabwe** highlights that effective involvement of local stakeholders in the process of code development and implementation depends very much on (a) their institutional capacity (financial resources, knowledge, expertise) and (b) individual “champions” within stakeholder organisations who are committed to the development of a code and have the ability to pursue it.

Analysis of options for South-North institutional frameworks

The **intended users** of this analysis are Southern horticultural industry associations who have or are developing national codes, European supermarkets and other code development/standard-setting bodies such as ETI and EUREP GAP, and other organisations involved in supporting the development of codes.

The discussion and analysis of options for linking Southern producer codes to European market standards is highly relevant to the intended end users. More and more horticulture exporting countries in Africa and other developing countries are developing and implementing their own national codes, yet the specific mechanisms for gaining market recognition, benchmarking, cost-sharing and verification are still being debated. The Project’s analysis of these issues is therefore very timely.

Development of indicators and verifiers addressing the needs of poor producers and workers

The **intended users** of the indicators and verifiers are those individuals/organisations responsible for development of monitoring and verification systems for codes of practice, auditors, and those responsible for monitoring code compliance within exporting/producing companies.

All the indicators developed in Zimbabwe and Ghana were developed through in-depth participatory research with the intended beneficiaries i.e. workers and/or smallholders. One can therefore be confident that they address the needs of all groups of workers and smallholders. All the indicators and verifiers were also cross-checked and modified where required by managers/employers, so are relevant and acceptable to employers/exporters as well as to the employees/suppliers. In Ghana, the indicators and verifiers were field tested through pilot audits on two exporting companies and their small-scale outgrowers. These pilot audits revealed that while some of the indicators and verifiers were practical for

auditors, others were too vague (indicators) and/or unavailable (written verifiers often not available). The sets of indicators and verifiers developed by the Project can therefore be used as a pool or source of potential indicators and verifiers, but that they need to be further field-tested to ensure clarity and ease of use.

Design and field-testing of integrated social and environmental auditing approach for small to medium-scale farms (Ghana)

The **intended users** of the auditing approach are those individuals/organisations responsible for development of monitoring and verification systems for codes of practice, and auditors (including local auditors, relevant sections of international auditing companies, and those responsible for social and environmental auditing of suppliers in supermarkets and importing companies).

The auditing approach developed by the Project has drawn on best practice within existing social and environmental auditing approaches, and has also been field-tested on pineapple farms in Ghana. The approach therefore combines the rigour of standard auditing practice, while at the same time is adapted to the conditions found on developing country farms, where there are limited formal management systems and record-keeping. More work could be done on increasing the efficiency of the audit approach and on testing specific participatory data-gathering tools. Nevertheless, the overall approach has been shown to produce reliable results, was seen as useful by the management of the company being audited, and generated immediate improvements in code compliance. Moreover, participants at the UK workshop – which included representatives from European importers and supermarkets – found the approach acceptable, if cost-effectiveness was improved and the auditing system was verified by an internationally recognised verification body.

Development of awareness-raising strategy

The **intended users** of the awareness-raising strategy are all those involved in developing and promoting codes of practice, including those developing national producer codes, Southern and Northern NGOs, researchers and donors.

The awareness-raising strategy was developed by assessing the needs and key sources of information used by each key stakeholder group. The awareness raising strategies for exporters, growers and importers were the strongest, and more work could be done on development of specific strategies for supermarkets and consumers.

Assessment of code compliance in the smallholder sector

The **intended users** of the smallholder study are exporters, importers and supermarkets who source directly or indirectly from smallholders.

The study was systematic and involved both quantitative and qualitative assessment of compliance on 3 different smallholder schemes, representing the different types of schemes existing in Zimbabwe. Although the study was limited to smallholders growing vegetables in Zimbabwe, the main field researcher (Seth Gogoe) in Ghana confirmed that the majority of the findings were on a general level representative of the conditions on smallholder pineapple farms in Ghana. The findings and recommendations are clear and practical, and are likely to be used in particular by relevant exporters and those responsible for implementation of national codes.

How have the outputs been made available to intended users?

Outputs have been made available to intended users in a variety of ways, drawing on lessons from the awareness-raising strategy developed by the Project. The dissemination methods used included:

- **Multi-stakeholder workshops:** 2 in London, 2 in Accra (Ghana) and 1 in Harare (Zimbabwe). Participants were drawn from the fresh produce industry (worker representatives, smallholders and other growers, exporters, importers, supermarkets), trade associations, NGOs, trades unions, relevant government departments, donors, European standard-setting bodies, and the press;
- **Briefing papers:** These cover findings from Phase 1 and the first year of research under Phase 2. They were mailed to all horticulture contacts on the NRET database (about 250), included in the delegate packs for all participants at the UK Fresh Produce Consortium 2001 Convention (120), distributed to all participants at the UK and Ghana end of project workshops, and put up on the VINET Website.
- **BBC World Service programmes:** Two 15 minute programmes covering some of the key issues arising from the Project were broadcast to a large number of listeners in Africa, South Asia and East Asia. The programmes are also available on the **BBC Website**.
- **Booklet accompanying the BBC World Service radio series:** There is a double page spread on each of the radio programmes. Several hundred copies have already been produced and distributed, are available free of charge from the BBC, and will be sent (at my request) to all the Development Education Centres in the UK.
- **Ghana and UK workshop reports:** These summarise the presentations and discussion points from the end of project workshops, and provide sources of further information. They will be distributed to all participants and other invitees who were interested but unable to attend (approx. 150 individuals in total).
- **Press coverage in Ghana:** The end of project workshop was covered on 3 national TV news bulletins, on 2 Accra radio news bulletins, and in 2 national newspapers. The local research leader, Stephanie Gallat, and one of our collaborating exporters, Edward Twum, were invited to a 15 minute interview on the popular TV "Breakfast Show" where they discussed the future of the Ghanaian horticulture industry and the code of practice.
- **Detailed, company-specific findings fed back to relevant companies:** Company-specific findings e.g. key areas of compliance and non-compliance, were fed back individually to companies (managers, and where appropriate workers) through meetings and reports.

Have target institutions adopted or are likely to take up the research outputs and how have they done this or plan to do this?

General

- **ETI:** Because of our work in Zimbabwe, the Project team was invited to join the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) Zimbabwe pilot working group, and through this channel has contributed to ETI thinking and development.

- **COLEACP Harmonised Framework:** Two Project team members (Man-Kwun Chan and Mick Blowfield) were instrumental in writing the labour and smallholders standards for the current version of the COLEACP Harmonised Framework, which aims to provide a common framework for African and Caribbean national horticulture codes. At present 12 national codes are signed up and have agreed to align their own codes to the Framework. The labour and smallholder standards and their interpretation draw directly from the findings from this Project.
- A **major international distributor of fresh fruit and vegetables** wrote to the Project Leader to express appreciation for receiving the Project briefing sheets and support for the recommendations, and asked for further copies to distribute to all their suppliers in the Caribbean and Pacific region.
- **Kenya Flower Council:** The Chairman of KFC wrote to the Project Leader to express support for the conclusions and recommendations in the briefing sheets, and on the basis of this requested further information about Project findings to assist in the revision of the KFC code of practice.

Ghana

- **Horticulture Association of Ghana:** The results from field work on development of criteria, indicators and verifiers were summarised into a draft Ghanaian code of practice. The Horticulture Association of Ghana (HAG) have now stated the intention to adopt this draft Code for the Ghanaian export horticulture industry. The Project has had a large part to play in raising awareness and support for a national code, as well as having developed the draft code itself.
- **EUREP GAP Working Group:** An informal working group of leading horticultural exporters in Ghana has recently been set up by the American NGO Amex International to support the implementation of EUREP GAP in Ghana. On the basis of her work on this Project, Stephanie Gallat has been asked by this group to co-ordinate the interpretation and implementation of EUREP GAP's social chapter.

Zimbabwe

- **Zimbabwe national code (AEAAZ code):** The implementation of the Zimbabwe national code – which was established by HPC prior to the initiation of the Project – has also been influenced by the Project findings. The food safety and environmental criteria, indicators and verifiers developed by the Project were used in revising the Zimbabwe code's Self Audit Questionnaire for growers.
- **Support for smallholders:** As explained in Section D above, the Project decided to recruit the Vice-Chairman of the AEAAZ as a consultant to work on the smallholder compliance study. Influenced by the findings from this study, she has persuaded AEAAZ to seek specific funding for training and supporting smallholders on code compliance.

Project impact on livelihoods of workers and smallholders

Ghana

- **Awareness-raising:** The Project had a significant impact in terms of raising awareness about codes of practice and ethical standards, and changing attitudes of pineapple exporters *vis-à-vis* treatment of workers, smallholders and the environment. The Project also helped to raise awareness with smallholders and the horticultural trade associations (HAG, SPEG and VEPEAG).

- **Capacity-building:** The Project contributed to building the capacity of exporters, trade associations and smallholders, in terms of improving their understanding of the steps required to achieve compliance with ethical codes of practice.
- **Smallholder-exporter relations:** The Project's role in facilitating better communication between the various stakeholders in the industry also helped to improve relations between exporters and smallholder suppliers;
- **Improvements in working conditions:** The field work also influenced collaborating exporters/employers to make real improvements to working conditions, including: granting of permanent employment status to long-term casual workers, with associated benefits; building toilets, and using fewer toxic pesticides e.g. discontinuing the use of nematicides.
- **Environmental improvements:** The field work also led to improved environmental performance, e.g. change to contour planting, reduced pesticide use.

Zimbabwe

- In Zimbabwe, the Project succeeded in raising awareness about codes of practice amongst workers, smallholders and management within the case study companies, leading to a better understanding of what codes are about and why they are important. In some cases, the research approach – where each workplace is viewed as made up of different interest groups – helped to initiate or improve dialogue between different levels of the worker-management hierarchy.
- Phase 2 did not have any significant impact in terms of practical improvements in workers' or smallholders' conditions, although it should be noted that Phase 1 did have a greater impact in terms of changing attitudes of employers and generating some improvements to worker and smallholder conditions.
- In general, the Project had less impact in Zimbabwe compared to Ghana, due in part to the establishment of the ETI horticulture pilot in Zimbabwe after we had initiated Phase 1, and also to the greater awareness amongst exporters about codes of practice prior to the establishment of the Project.

	Signature	Date
Collaborating institution *
Project leader	Man-Kwun Chan	30 th June 2001

**** Much of the content of this report was taken from information gathered at an internal project evaluation meeting on the 22nd May 2001, which was organised with the specific aim of providing material for this report. Both the lead researchers from Zimbabwe and Ghana, the consultant from Agro Eco, as well as the key UK-based NRI staff all participating in this meeting. Most of the assessments made in this report are therefore based on joint evaluations made by the team as a whole.***

NOTES ON ANNEXES

Annex I Project Logical Framework

See below.

Annex II Analysis of expenditure over implementation period

In the CPHP Report Template, reference is made to “modified format needed”. No reporting format has been provided to the Project Leader. If necessary, the analysis of expenditure can be completed once the reporting format is provided.

Annex III Results of end of project workshop

A report of the UK end of Project workshop will be forwarded separately to CPHP (the reports are currently being printed).

Annex IV Target Institution’s workplan for adopting project outputs

None of the target institutions have developed formal workplans. However, details of adoption of project outputs are included in Section F of the report.

Annex V Feedback on the process from collaborating institution(s) and farmers (where appropriate)

Feedback from collaborating institutions was formally sought and assessed during the Project Evaluation Meeting on the 22nd May 2001. In the CPHP Report Template reference is made to “criteria needed” for reporting on feedback. If necessary, feedback can be summarised once the appropriate criteria are provided by CPHP management.

Annex VI List of publications

See below.

Annex VII A catalogue of data sets and their location

The project did not generate any quantitative datasets. All key results are included in project reports and publications, as listed under Annex VI.

ANNEX I: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
GOAL			
Poor people benefit from new knowledge applied to food commodity systems in peri-urban interface areas.	By 2005 in at least two NRD core countries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Export of two or more selected fruit, vegetable or beverage crops increased by 20%. Volume and real value of sales increased by 20%. 	Reports of target institution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National production statistics. Evaluation of crop post-harvest programme reports. 	Enabling environment (policies, institutions, markets, incentives) for the widespread adoption of new technologies and strategies exists.
Purpose			
Strategies developed and promoted which improve food security of poor households through increased availability and improved quality of horticultural foods and better access to markets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be completed by Programme Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be completed by Programme Manager 	To be completed by Programme Manager

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
OUTPUTS			
<p>1. Model institutional framework for implementing ethical trade developed, tested and analysed.</p> <p>2. Tools for implementing ethical trade developed and tested.</p> <p>3. Strategy for building stakeholder awareness of ethical performance developed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional framework for North-South and South-south stakeholders tested and analysed in Ghana by 2001. • Indicators addressing the needs of poor producers and workers, incorporated into 2 national/international codes of practice by April 2001. • Criteria identified by the project to address the needs of poor producers and workers, incorporated into 3 national/international codes of practice by August 2000. • Organisations involved in implementing ethical trade have access to tested and evaluated tools for monitoring and verification by August 2000. • UK, Ghana and Zimbabwe initiatives have criteria for hitherto unconsidered stakeholders in the value chain by August 2000. • Needs assessment completed and presented to UK and Africa consultative groups by January 2000. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation by stakeholders • Uptake of model in other countries • Written analysis of framework • Peer reviewed article • 6-monthly update report to consultative groups • Uptake of tools by national and international organisations engaged in implementing ethical trade • Stakeholder evaluation • Project reports • Peer reviewed publication • 6-monthly update report to consultative groups • Needs assessment report • Uptake of strategy by private sector and funding agencies 	<p>Commercial interest in ethical trade remains strong</p> <p>National economic and political environment continues to be supportive of export horticulture</p> <p>National and international ethical trade initiatives continue to develop</p> <p>National economic and political environment remains positive</p> <p>Secondary stakeholders can be influenced by primary stakeholders</p> <p>ETI continues to work in Zimbabwe</p> <p>Other organisations/programmes willing to invest in implementing the strategy</p>

ACTIVITIES	INPUTS		
I.1. Agreement of framework and participating organisations in Africa and the UK. I.2. Identification of institution building programme, milestones and indicators. I.3. Implementation of programme. I.4. Mid-term appraisal of institutional model. I.5. Revision of model based on I.4. I.6. Final appraisal of model.	Total Budget: £215,000 Staff Costs £114,306 Overheads £49,056 Cap. Equip. T&S: Overseas £41,125 UK £6,254 Miscellaneous £11,680 Inflation Yr. 2 £2,579 TOTAL COSTS £215,000		
2.1 Fieldwork to identify appropriate indicators and their verifiers for criteria used in ethical codes of practice. 2.2 Dissemination of indicators and verifiers to national and international standard-setting bodies. 2.3 Consultation with stakeholders not included in Phase I to identify criteria for the ethical value chain. 2.4 Presentation of criteria to the UK and Africa consultative groups. 2.5 Design and testing of approaches to monitoring and verification. 2.6 Analysis of the cost and practicability of approaches from 2.7 with the UK and Africa consultative groups. 2.7 Seminar to disseminate Phase I findings.			
3.1 Awareness raising needs assessment. 3.2 Presentation of strategy to UK and Africa consultative groups, and to potential funding agencies.			

ANNEX VI: LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Papers in peer reviewed journals

BLOWFIELD, M.E. (2000) Ethical sourcing: a contribution to sustainability or a diversion?. *Sustainable Development*, November 2000.

BLOWFIELD, M.E. (in press) Ethical supply chain management - progress in the horticulture industry. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*.

Internal reports, Back to Office Reports (BTORs), informal reports of workshops

General

N.B. Back to Office Reports have not been included

CHAN, M.K. (2001) Facing the challenge: applying codes of practice in the smallholder sector. Report of a workshop organised by the Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme, held at the Horticultural Halls, London, on 21st May 2001. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme (Natural Resources Institute, Chatham). 35 pp. (workshop report)

Ghana

GALLAT, S. (2001) Ghanaian Horticulture Code of Practice: where to from here? Report of a workshop organised by the Natural Resources and Ethical Trade programme, held at the Miklin Hotel, Accra, on 5th June 2001. 9 pp. (workshop report)

VARIOUS (2000) Code of practice for the export horticulture industry: Ghana. Draft version November 2000. Developed by the Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme with support from the Ghana Working Committee on Ethical Trade, Accra. 17 pp. (working document)

CHAN, M.K. and VAN ELZAKKER, B. (2000) Draft audit protocol, November 2000. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme (Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, and Agro Eco Consultancy, Bennekom). 11 pp. (working document)

GALLAT, S., GOGOE, S, TWENEBOAH-KODUA, R., and VAN ELZAKKER, B. (2001) Test auditing the Ghana draft code, May 2001. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme (Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, and Agro Eco Consultancy, Bennekom). 16 pp. (internal report)

GALLAT, S., GOGOE, S, TWENEBOAH-KODUA, R., and VAN ELZAKKER, B. (2001) Report on audit findings for Prudent Farms. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme (Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, and Agro Eco Consultancy, Bennekom). 16 pp. (confidential report)

VAN ELZAKKER, B. and GOGOE, S. (2001) The Cost of Compliance with codes of good agricultural practices: the Ghana pineapple case. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme (Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, and Agro Eco Consultancy, Bennekom). 14 pp.

Zimbabwe

MADAKADZE, R. and MADZUDZO, E. (1999) Methodology for Identifying Indicators and Verifiers and Preliminary Narrative Report. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme

(Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, and Centre for Applied Social Sciences, Harare). 18 pp. (internal report)

MADAKADZE, R. and MADZUDZO, E. (2000) Stakeholder analysis. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme (Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, and Centre for Applied Social Sciences, Harare). 10 pp. (internal report)

MADAKADZE, R. and MADZUDZO, E. (2001) Project diary. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme (Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, and Centre for Applied Social Sciences, Harare). 10 pp. (internal report)

MADAKADZE, R. and MADZUDZO, E. (1999) Summary tables showing key constraints and associated criteria, indicators and verifiers identified by stakeholders in the export horticulture trade in Zimbabwe. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme (Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, and Centre for Applied Social Sciences, Harare). 30 pp. (internal report)

MADAKADZE, R. and AURET, D. (2001) Study on smallholder compliance: report on methodology and summary of findings. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme (Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, and Centre for Applied Social Sciences, Harare). 18 pp. (internal report)

MADAKADZE, R. and AURET, D. (2001) Study on smallholder compliance: report on research findings. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme (Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, and Centre for Applied Social Sciences, Harare). 18 pp. (internal report)

Briefing notes, synopses, factsheets, booklets, leaflets

CHAN, M.K., DIXON, D. and BOCKETT, G. (2001) Producer-exporter associations and codes of practice. Briefing note. 300 copies. 5 pp. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme, Natural Resources Institute, Chatham. Kent. U.K. [Field] (Briefing note)

CHAN, M.K., DIXON, D. and BOCKETT, G. (2001) Codes of practice – what do they mean for third world exporters and producers? Briefing note. 300 copies. 5 pp. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme, Natural Resources Institute, Chatham. Kent. U.K. [Field] (Briefing note)

CHAN, M.K., DIXON, D. and BOCKETT, G. (2001) Applying codes of practice in third world countries – what can importers do to help? Briefing note. 450 copies. 6 pp. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme, Natural Resources Institute, Chatham. Kent. U.K. [Field] (Briefing note)

CHAN, M.K., DIXON, D. and BOCKETT, G. (2001) Applying codes of practice in third world countries – what can supermarkets do to help? Briefing note. 450 copies. 6 pp. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme, Natural Resources Institute, Chatham. Kent. U.K. [Policy] (Briefing note)

CHAN, M.K., DIXON, D. and BOCKETT, G. (2001) Applying codes of practice in third world countries – what can standard-setting bodies do to help? Briefing note. 300 copies. 6 pp. Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme, Natural Resources Institute, Chatham. Kent. U.K. [Policy] (Briefing note)

Newsletters, newspaper articles

GHANAIAN TIMES (2001) Find new markets for agric produce – MOFA, GEPC urged. *Ghanaian Times* (8th June 2001). (Newspaper article)

DAILY GRAPHIC (2001) Farmers ask for support. *Daily Graphic* (6th June 2001). (Newspaper article)

Workshops, seminars, open days, training courses, oral presentations, performances

N.B. There may be additional presentations and seminars reported in the 1999/2000 annual report that have not been included in this list.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ETHICAL TRADE PROGRAMME (2001) Facing the Challenge: Applying Codes of Practice in the Smallholder Sector. Royal Horticultural Halls, London. 21st May 2001 [40 participants] (workshop)

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ETHICAL TRADE PROGRAMME (2001) Ghanaian Horticulture Code of Practice: where to from here? Miklin Hotel, Accra. 5th June 2001. [70 participants] (workshop)

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ETHICAL TRADE PROGRAMME (2000) Workshop to present and review Project findings with local stakeholders, Ghana. Miklin Hotel, Accra, March 2000. (workshop)

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ETHICAL TRADE PROGRAMME (2000) Workshop to present and review Project findings with local stakeholders, Zimbabwe. Holiday Inn, Harare. March 2000. (workshop)

CHAN, M.K. (2001) Ethical trade – a pen sketch. Natural Resources International, Chatham, U.K. 7th February 2001. [20 participants] (oral presentation)

REISS, G. (2001) NRET presentation. Fresh Produce Consortium Convention 2001: Facing the Challenge of Change. Belton Woods Hotel, Grantham, U.K. 19th March 2001. [approximately 120 participants] (oral presentation)

BLOWFIELD, M.E. and CHAN, M.K. (2000) Review of social and environmental standards for horticulture. COLEACP Workshop, Kampala, Uganda. 12-15 September 2000. (oral presentation)

BLOWFIELD, M.E. and CHAN, M.K. (2000) Lessons on auditing ethical supply chains. COLEACP Workshop, Kampala, Uganda. 12-15 September 2000. (oral presentation)

BLOWFIELD, M.E. and CHAN, M.K. (2000) Criteria and indicators for smallholder producers. COLEACP Workshop, Kampala, Uganda. 12-15 September 2000. (oral presentation)

CHAN, M.K. and VAN ELZAKKER, B. (2000) Tools for managing good agricultural practice in supply chains - what works, what doesn't and the unknown. *Natural Resources Ethical Trade (NRET) workshop on developing good agricultural practice for African horticulture, London. 4 April 2000.* (oral presentation)

BLOWFIELD, M.E. (2000) The challenge of shifting from ethical production to ethical supply chains, and what that means for different stakeholders. *Natural Resources Ethical Trade (NRET) workshop on developing good agricultural practice for African horticulture, London. 4 April 2000.* (oral presentation)

Radio, TV recordings

CHAN, M.K., GOGOE, S. and TWENEBOAH-KODUA, R. (2001) Ethical Trade Programme 1. Radio programme. *"In the Field" BBC World Service*. 14 February (various times depending on region) 15 minutes. [International]. (Radio)

CHAN, M.K., GOGOE, S. and TWENEBOAH-KODUA, R. (2001) Ethical Trade Programme 2. Radio programme. *"In the Field" BBC World Service*. 21 February (various times depending on region) 15 minutes. [International]. (Radio)

GALLAT, S. (2001) National news bulletin. *Ghana Television (GTV)*. 5th June 2001 (19:00). Ghana [national]. (Television)

GALLAT, S. (2001) National news bulletin. *Ghana Television (GTV)*. 5th June 2001 (22:30). Ghana [national]. (Television)

GALLAT, S. (2001) National news bulletin. *Joy FM*. 6th June 2001. Ghana [local]. (Radio)

GALLAT, S. (2001) National news bulletin. *Greater Accra Radio (GAR)*. 6th June 2001. Ghana [local]. (Radio)

GALLAT, S. and TWUM, E. (2001) Interview on Ghana horticulture code of practice and ethical trade. *"The Breakfast Show" Ghana Television (GTV)*. 12^{th(?)} June 2001. Ghana [national]. (Television)

Electronic media

CHAN, M.K., DIXON, D. and BOCKETT, G. (2001) Producer-exporter associations and codes of practice. Website. <www.nri.org/vinet/>

CHAN, M.K., DIXON, D. and BOCKETT, G. (2001) Codes of practice – what do they mean for third world exporters and producers? Website. <www.nri.org/vinet/>

CHAN, M.K., DIXON, D. and BOCKETT, G. (2001) Applying codes of practice in third world countries – what can importers do to help? Website. <www.nri.org/vinet/>

CHAN, M.K., DIXON, D. and BOCKETT, G. (2001) Applying codes of practice in third world countries – what can supermarkets do to help? Website. <www.nri.org/vinet/>

CHAN, M.K., DIXON, D. and BOCKETT, G. (2001) Applying codes of practice in third world countries – what can standard-setting bodies do to help? Website. <www.nri.org/vinet/>