

⑥ MANAGING CODES in the SMALLHOLDER SECTOR

This is one of a series of papers produced by the Natural Resource and Ethical Trade Programme (NRET) of the Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich. The papers cover key themes relevant to the implementation of codes of practice in the fresh produce industry, with a focus on developing countries. They draw on findings from a 3-year NRET research project which looked at how the impact of codes on workers and smallholders could be improved. Themes covered are: the case for national codes; developing multi-stakeholder institutions; integrated social & environmental auditing; managing codes in the smallholder sector; building awareness and support for codes; and developing criteria, indicators and verifiers. For copies of the papers, please contact NRET at the Natural Resources Institute, Chatham Maritime, Kent ME4 4TB, U.K., email: nret@gre.ac.uk, or download from the Internet at: <http://www.nri.org/NRET/nret.htm>

Who is this paper for?

This paper is primarily aimed at exporters who source from smallholders, supermarkets with their own codes of practice, and other code bodies who are responsible for developing and promoting codes e.g. EUREP, the UK Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI), the Kenya Flower Council (KFC).

Purpose of this paper

- To describe current levels of code compliance with regard to labour and environmental standards on smallholder farms, and relationships between exporters and their smallholder suppliers;
- To set out opportunities and constraints to improving compliance on smallholder farms;
- To provide practical recommendations on managing codes in the smallholder sector, for (a) exporters, and (b) supermarkets and other codes bodies.

Executive Summary

Characteristics of smallholder farms: Smallholder farming systems are characterised by minimal resources and capital, low levels of education, poor access to knowledge and information, and informal labour arrangements that are quite different from those found on commercial farms.

Smallholder compliance with environmental standards: Smallholder farming systems are generally more environmentally friendly compared to commercial farms, due to smaller plot size, more crop diversity, and lower use of inputs. Awareness and knowledge of environmental issues is low. Chemical usage is a problematic area, with many non-compliances, although the situation is often just as poor on commercial farms. Some of these non-compliances can be dealt with through appropriate training, but others are more difficult to tackle because they stem from smallholders' general lack of resources.

Smallholder compliance with labour standards: Non-compliances can be found in many areas, and knowledge of labour legislation is poor. However, many workers are paid the equivalent or above the minimum wage, employment security is no worse than on commercial farms (possibly better), and although children are employed, this is mostly done in accordance with national legislation. Facilities (water, sanitation, accommodation, health and emergency) are generally poor, but no worse than those available to the smallholder employers themselves. Overall, workers on smallholder farms have more power to negotiate pay, terms and conditions compared to workers on commercial farms.

Relationships between exporters and smallholders: Problems currently exist in all areas. However, most can be dealt with through improved communication, logistics and training.

Recommendations for exporters: Clear division of responsibilities between exporter and smallholders; invest in good training; provide clear incentives to smallholders for code compliance; consider ways of reducing reliance on pesticides on smallholder farms; set progressive targets and provide financial assistance with key capital investments; set up robust monitoring system.

Recommendations for supermarkets & code bodies: Make sure that trade-off between worker welfare and smallholder welfare is taken into account. Keep record-keeping requirements as simple as possible; allow for flexible interpretation of labour standards for specific labour characteristics found on smallholder farms; allow longer lead times for compliance; educate consumers & pressure groups about smallholder conditions; and provide positive incentives for sourcing from smallholders.

Introduction

Many of the major European supermarkets and importers are now implementing codes of practice as a result of growing consumer concern about food production methods and their impact on poor people and the environment. Codes are aimed at producers, and set standards on food safety, worker welfare, environmentally friendly production, and relationships between exporters and outgrowers. Exporters and growers supplying supermarkets in all parts of the world are now being asked to comply with these codes.

Experience shows that codes can help improve the environment and lives of workers in third world countries, if they are implemented sensitively and with real commitment from supermarkets, importers and producers. However, codes also bring with them extra problems and costs for producers. Well-managed large-scale producers are likely to be able to meet these without too much problem. In contrast, there is mounting concern that smaller farms – in particular family-run smallholdings – would find it much more difficult to comply with existing code requirements, and that this will threaten their continued involvement in export horticulture.

Some feel a modified version of existing codes for the smallholder sector is necessary, in order to keep smallholders in the market. However, many oppose this outright, saying that the credibility of the code will be compromised, since it could be interpreted as having “double standards”. Why should workers on smallholder farms not have the same rights and conditions as those working on commercial farms? At the same time, if smallholders are asked to comply with codes without recognition of their specific characteristics, many smallholders – who often themselves barely earn enough to feed their families – may be pushed out of the export market. Is this ethical?

Characteristics of smallholder farming systems

It is important to note that the term “smallholder” is used to describe a very broad range of producers, and has different connotations depending on where you are. In the export horticulture industry in Zimbabwe, the term “smallholder” is used to describe indigenous (black) farming households in communal or resettlement areas. In terms of ethnicity, wealth, and land tenure, the Zimbabwean smallholder is clearly distinguishable from the commercial grower. In contrast, in the export pineapple industry in Ghana, the term “smallholder” is used to refer to pretty much any grower who does not export directly. Smallholder farms are generally smaller than exporter farms. However, many “smallholders” are retired professionals who are reasonably wealthy and have sizeable farms. The line between “smallholder” and commercial grower is therefore rather blurred.

For the purposes of this paper, the term “smallholder” will be used to refer to farms that are owned or managed by families, with a strong reliance on family labour, limited use of hired labour, and little or no mechanisation. This working definition is chosen because it encompasses a significant proportion of those involved in export production, and reflects the most vulnerable group of producers when it comes to the implementation of codes.

Minimal resources and capital

Smallholders are characterised by low levels of resources and capital. That is, they have minimal if any cash savings, few capital possessions and therefore poor access to credit (no collateral). So making any type of capital investment is difficult, however small. Often, smallholders even struggle to get enough cash together to buy basic agricultural inputs such as fertiliser and pesticides for the cropping season, never mind protective clothing or a vehicle for transporting produce to market.

Low education levels

Another characteristic of smallholders is low levels of education. Many will only have been to primary school, and not to secondary school, so understanding written materials such as pesticide labels is a problem. Even in Zimbabwe, where national literacy rates are relatively high for sub-Saharan Africa, the NRET research team found that only about 60% of smallholders growing for export were literate. This clearly has implications for the extent to which smallholders can deal with the record-keeping requirements of codes.

Poor access to information and knowledge

Compared to larger-scale farmers, smallholders typically have poor access to information and knowledge. Communications infrastructure in rural areas in developing countries is poor, so smallholders are unlikely to have access to a telephone or television, let alone a computer. While governments often provide some form of agricultural extension services for smallholders, their capacity is often severely limited, so few smallholder actually benefit. Moreover, extension services tend to concentrate on staple crops rather than horticultural crops. Unlike many commercial growers, smallholders will not be able to afford paying for private information or consultancy services. All these constraints are moreover compounded by low literacy rates, which restricts their ability to interpret any written information that does reach them.

Distinct labour arrangements

When it comes to labour standards, it must be recognised that the kinds of labour arrangements typical of smallholder communities is very different from those found on large-scale commercial farms. For a start, the smallholder and his/her household members for the most part work full time on their farms, alongside any employed workers. Household members aside, many of the hired workers may also be relatives or neighbours of the smallholder. Methods of payment for hired labour are often in kind rather than cash, and reflect the nature of the relationship between smallholder and employee. For example, the smallholder may be part of a local labour exchange group; members of the group come and help him harvest his crop. Rather than pay them cash, he pays for their services by helping them harvest their own crops. Moreover, unlike on commercial farms, both employers and employees may have recourse to community institutions (e.g. council of elders) when there is a dispute about payments.

These characteristics all influence the extent to which codes can be applied in the smallholder sector. In the next 3 sections, we look at how these characteristics affect compliance against standards on environmental performance, labour conditions and exporter-outgrower relationships, drawing on findings from a detailed study done with 3 different smallholders schemes supplying the export horticulture market in Zimbabwe.

Compliance with environmental standards

FINDINGS FROM ZIMBABWE STUDY

Environmental awareness: There is generally a low level of environmental awareness amongst smallholders involved in the export market. However, in some areas their performance against environmental standards is better than on many commercial farms. This is because other conditions and constraints faced by smallholders dictate more environmentally friendly practices (see below).

Generally low levels of inputs (compared to commercial farms): On the 3 smallholder schemes studied, smallholders applied at or below the recommended application rates for fertilisers and pesticides on their export crops, although some farmers overapplied both fertilisers and pesticides on their local market crops. In general, however, smallholders tend to use lower levels of inputs compared to commercial farms, often significantly below recommended rates. This is because smallholders simply cannot afford to pay for larger quantities of pesticides and fertilisers, and they have greater difficulty in actually getting hold of the relevant inputs.

Water: In general you are much less likely to find excessive harvesting of water on smallholder farms. On 1 of the 3 schemes, smallholders collect water for irrigation from wells and rivers, using buckets. This is typical of many smallholder farms. Collecting water by bucket is a laborious task – there is little incentive to over-irrigate your crop! However, there may be problems of water quality since the water sources used are unprotected from pollutants.

Soil erosion management: On all 3 schemes, there appears to be little problem with soil erosion, with positive measures taken to ensure protection against erosion. These included appropriate plot layout, small fallow patches between individual plots, and contour ridges which drain run-off away from the cropping areas. It is not clear how typical this is of other smallholder areas, but in general the smallholder farming systems are less prone to soil degradation compared to large-scale farms, due to multiple cropping systems and smaller plots.

Maintenance of biodiversity: The study did not find any specific measures that were taken by smallholders to conserve biodiversity. However, the prevalence of multiple cropping, smaller plot size and fallow patches are all more likely to encourage greater diversity than found on commercial farms.

Chemicals (pesticides): Overall, this is a problematic area. Farmers do recognise the need for a responsible person to carry out spraying (spraying is mainly done by farmers themselves or their spouses, sometimes older sons and permanent workers, but never by casual/contract workers). Also, the use of outdated chemicals is limited for export crops. Moreover, while some pesticides are stored in the house, these tend to be only small quantities, since large quantities are stored by the exporter or scheme management in pesticides stores.

Otherwise, there are serious non-compliances in all other aspects of pesticide handling and use, although it should be noted that the situation is often just as bad on commercial farms. Apart from one scheme, few farmers had received training in the use and handling of chemicals by the exporters, although some farmers had benefited from such training provided by government extension staff and other commercial organisations. Many current practices are due to inadequate training and awareness amongst farmers and workers. However, the general lack of resources faced by smallholders is also partly responsible for certain practices (e.g. inadequate protective clothing, lack of antidotes for pesticide poisoning, re-use of large pesticide containers for holding water and paraffin because they can't afford to buy new water/paraffin containers, lack of separate pesticide stores). These aspects are more difficult to tackle – training is not enough. Moreover, low levels of literacy and inappropriate language used on pesticide labels also exacerbates the ability of smallholders to understand and follow recommended practices.

Opportunities and constraints

The starting point is that the farming systems found in the smallholder areas are more environmentally friendly when compared to commercial farms, due to smaller plot size, more crop diversity, and generally lower use of inputs. Although knowledge and awareness of environmental issues is currently low amongst smallholders, there is scope for substantial improvements in environmental practice through better awareness-raising and training.

However, ensuring safe and appropriate use of pesticides will always be more difficult with smallholders than with large-scale farmers. Some problems can be tackled by appropriate training, but it is difficult to get around other problems that are associated with smallholders' general lack of resources. This suggests that there is a need to find ways of reducing pesticide dependency on smallholder farms – see section below on **Recommendations for Exporters**.

Compliance with labour standards

FINDINGS FROM ZIMBABWE STUDY

Little awareness of labour legislation: In the 3 smallholder schemes included in the study, there was little or no awareness of labour regulations amongst the farmers. However, in many cases this does not mean that regulations are not actually met – see for example the section on wage rates and methods of payment, below.

Security of employment/contracts: The vast majority of workers (94%) are employed on a contract/casual basis. However, in general this accurately reflects the nature of the work, i.e. piece work where employees only work for 2-3 days at a time. In contrast, on many commercial farms workers employed on casual terms and conditions are often actually long-term employees.

Few farmers have written contracts with their workers, the majority being employed on the basis of a verbal agreement. While formal contracts are rare, there are likely to be some checks and balances in place to help ensure that agreements are honoured. In a village community, everyone knows everyone else, and the person you employ today may be your employer (or your son's employer) tomorrow. Security of employment and the extent to which employment agreements are honoured are therefore not necessarily worse than on commercial farms.

Wage rates and method of payment: Few contract workers are paid a daily wage. Payments are generally for completion of a particular piece of work. Less than half (47%) of workers are paid in cash only

– the majority are paid in kind, or a mixture of cash and kind. There are many different forms of payments in kind, ranging from labour exchange, working in return for draught power or land rental, or for vegetables or staple foods. It is therefore a complicated task to work out whether or not workers are being paid above or below a stipulated minimum wage.

Although smallholders are generally not aware of the legal minimum wage, many contract workers are in fact being paid the equivalent of or above the minimum wage for general casual workers. This may in part be due to the fact that workers appear to have some negotiating power in determining payments. In general it appears that while farmers determine the nature and size of the task, the workers determine the payment, the amount and whether it will be in cash, kind or both.

Employment of children: Zimbabwean labour legislation allows for children of 12 years and over to do light work that does not interfere with their schooling or physical or mental health. While many smallholders do employ children, the great majority do so in accordance with labour laws, only employing children of 12 years and above, and mainly only during weekends and holidays.

Trades unions and labour representation: Hardly any of the workers on the 3 schemes are members of the agricultural workers' union, and there are no union representatives on any of the farms or schemes. There seems to be some pressure from scheme managers and farmers against worker membership of unions. However, a significant number of workers had never heard of the agricultural union. Many other workers said they were free to join the union, and were aware of its existence, but found it too expensive to join, and/or were not able to find time to meet together.

It is questionable whether the local agricultural workers union has the interest or capacity to support workers on smallholder farms. Moreover, local workers have recourse to local leaders (village headmen or chiefs) in the case of a dispute about working conditions.

Health facilities, emergencies and accidents: Facilities for dealing with worker health emergencies and accidents are poor. While there are village health workers in some villages, they tend to have very limited if any medical supplies. Workers therefore have to rely on visiting the nearest clinic – between 3 and 8 kilometres away from the village, or the nearest hospital – between 20 and 40 kms away. These are large distances for people without access to any transport. Scheme management teams – where they exist – had very little awareness of what to do in the case of accidents, and did not have any relevant medical supplies e.g. antidotes for pesticides poisonings.

The state of health facilities and services is not acceptable. However, the farmers themselves share the same poor health facilities as their workers, and are not in a position to improve these facilities.

Water, sanitation & accommodation facilities: Water and sanitation facilities for workers are generally poor, but again these are in general no worse than those available to their smallholder employers. Accommodation tends to be provided to permanent workers only, often within the home of the smallholder. One difficulty for permanent workers is that only single accommodation is provided, so they cannot live with their families.

Opportunities and constraints

There are opportunities to increase awareness of labour regulations both amongst farmers and workers. Raising awareness of labour regulations and rights amongst workers can help them negotiate better deals with employers. There is also likely to be some mileage in creating more awareness about the trades union and benefits of membership, and to ensure that employers or scheme managers do not prevent workers from joining. Health and safety standards could also be improved to some extent through appropriate training on safe use and handling of chemicals.

At the same time, it is difficult to see how smallholders can reach and demonstrate the same level of compliance as commercial farmers when it comes to certain other labour standards. Difficult areas include the payment of a minimum or living wage, provision of written contracts for contract workers, and provision of “adequate” health, water, sanitation, accommodation and other facilities. Many smallholders pay the equivalent of or above the minimum wage, but it will be very time-consuming and possibly inaccurate to have to calculate whether 2 baskets of tomatoes, or the ploughing of a certain field, is worth more or less than the minimum wage. It is also difficult to envisage smallholders issuing written contracts to all contract workers – when many only work for 2-3 days at a time, and many smallholders may themselves be illiterate or semi-literate. Improvement of health and other facilities is not in general within the power or means of smallholders to do themselves.

Relationships between exporters & growers

FINDINGS FROM ZIMBABWE STUDY

Contracts/clear specification of responsibilities and obligations: A lack of written contracts appears to be a universal problem amongst smallholders supplying to exporters. Combined with this is a lack of clarity on both sides (exporter and smallholder) on who takes responsibility for what. From the viewpoint of smallholders, there is a poor understanding of the terms and conditions under which they grow and sell produce to the exporter, and what they can expect in terms of support from the exporter. Smallholders are suspicious of exporters – for example, they think that exporters “cheat” them when it comes to grading of produce. While this must happen in certain cases, it appears that exporters often do actually follow clear procedures for grading etc., but they haven’t effectively communicated these procedures to the smallholders. At a more basic level, smallholders often misunderstand the nature of the relationship between themselves and the exporter. Many see it as a relationship of benefactor (exporter) and beneficiary (smallholder), rather than as a business relationship.

While smallholders complain that exporters do not deliver what they have promised, there seems to be blame on both sides – smallholder often don’t stick to their side of the bargain either.

Provision of training and advice: Some exporters provide training and advice to farmers on issues such as chemical use and record-keeping. Other exporters maintain a high degree of control over smallholder production, and the exporter’s staff, rather than smallholders themselves, make all key cropping decisions. In such cases, exporters train their own staff, but little knowledge or skills are passed on to smallholders. Moreover, even where training and advice is provided to farmers, it is inadequate in terms of numbers of farmers reached.

Assistance with inputs, transport, loans etc: Material assistance in the form of inputs, transport for produce, loans etc. varies from exporter to exporter. Where inputs such as seeds, fertiliser and pesticides are provided by the exporter, the cost of the inputs is deducted from crop sales. Some smallholders were dissatisfied with input costs, although it is not clear whether exporters were charging above or below market prices.

Terms and conditions of trade: Terms and conditions of trade also vary from exporter to exporter. Nevertheless, there seem to be widespread problems with lack of access to rejects for resale (an important additional source of income for smallholders); lack of transparency about grading systems and practice; unreliable transport for harvested produce, leading to crop wastage; and delays in payment for produce.

Opportunities and constraints

Problems currently exist in all aspects of the relationship between exporters and smallholders. Nevertheless, some exporters clearly manage to do better than others, showing that it is possible to get it right. Moreover, many of the problems can be tackled relatively quickly and at low cost through improved communication by the exporter about the nature of the relationship between exporter and smallholder, and clear specification of terms, conditions and mutual obligations. Secondly, significant improvements can also be made by tightening up logistics for facilities such as transport and payments, to ensure that they are on time. Thirdly, further improvements could be achieved through improved provision of training in agronomic practices, post-harvest handling and grading systems.

Recommendations for exporters

Clear division of responsibilities

As an exporter, you will need to take responsibility for certain aspects of code compliance (e.g. pesticide training). It is important that both you and your smallholders are clear about who takes responsibility for what. Responsibilities should be allocated through negotiation between the exporter and smallholder representatives, bearing in mind capacity constraints on each side. If possible, bring in an outside intermediary who can help set up and broker the discussions e.g. a staff member of an export association, local government extension staff. While this may seem time-consuming, this process will help to instil a sense of responsibility amongst your smallholders, and would help to avoid a whole host of misunderstandings and problems further down the line.

Training

Provision of appropriate training is absolutely critical for ensuring compliance against many areas of the code. Particular areas where training is necessary include: contractual agreements and responsibilities, labour legislation, record-keeping, health and safety issues, and practical training in all aspects of pesticide handling and use. It would appear that the only practical solution is for the exporter to take responsibility for ensuring that appropriate training takes place. However, this does not mean that you have to do all the training yourself. Training smallholders requires different types of skills from training commercial farmers. Consider enlisting the help of others who are used to training smallholders e.g. government extension staff, local NGO extension staff.

Provide clear incentives for compliance

If you want smallholders to comply with code requirements, it is important to give them incentives for doing so. Introduce a culture of mutual responsibility – if the smallholder fulfils his/her obligations to meet code requirements, then you will also honour your obligations to the smallholder.

Chemical usage

Consider ways of reducing smallholders' reliance on chemicals e.g. restrict smallholder production to crops and varieties which are less susceptible to pests and diseases in the first place; introduce integrated pest management (IPM) systems and approaches, making more use of non-chemical control methods; or explore conversion to certified organic smallholder production for certain crops.

Capital investments

Most smallholders cannot afford to make certain capital investments necessary for compliance with codes. These include chemical stores, bathing/shower facilities for after spraying, toilets and boreholes. Try to negotiate longer time frames with your customers for meeting these aspects of the code. You then need to set up progressive (e.g. annual) targets to ensure that improvements are being made on a regular basis. Some financing mechanisms will need to be provided for the smallholders. Shared facilities such as boreholes and chemical stores may be an option, but you need to make sure that someone takes responsibility for maintaining and managing the facility. Make sure you consult smallholders and workers on appropriate design and location of pesticide stores etc. If you don't consult, you may end up with stores or toilets that are never used, or unnecessarily elaborate structures when a simpler, cheaper one would have done just as well.

Monitoring and record-keeping

Effective record-keeping in the smallholder-sector is going to take some creativity, since you need to find ways of keeping records given the low literacy levels. Record-keeping should be kept to a minimum (given market requirements), record sheets should be as simple as possible, using symbols, colours or pictures where possible, and referring to local systems of measurement that smallholders will understand. Consider enlisting the help of extension staff and/or school children in the family.

Recommendations for supermarkets & codes bodies

Balancing smallholder and worker welfare

There is a trade-off between the welfare of workers on the one hand, and the welfare of the smallholders on the other hand. Many smallholders themselves don't have access to basic needs, such as clean water and primary health facilities. They have few spare resources at their disposal. We need to help ensure that workers on smallholder farms are treated fairly by their employers. At the same time, if the requirements are too stringent, many smallholders may not be able to meet them and will no longer be able to sell to the export market, therefore losing an important source of cash income. So a balance needs to be struck between the interests of smallholders and their workers. Other trends in supply chain management are already militating against smallholder involvement in export horticulture. "Ethical" codes should help reverse rather than exacerbate these trends.

The following recommendations consider ways in which this balance can be maintained.

Record-keeping requirements

Bear in mind that smallholders will have particular difficulty in keeping records. Record-keeping requirements should be kept to what is strictly necessary – see the recommendation for exporters above. NRET's experience shows that auditing of many areas of social and environmental performance can be done accurately where farmers do not keep many records. Rather than placing

the onus on smallholders or exporters to produce documentary evidence, auditors' (written) reports can be used for this purpose.

Need for different interpretation of labour standards for smallholder farms

The basic principles behind core labour standards will of course need to remain intact, and clear abuses of workers' rights such as forced labour, dangerous working conditions, and excessive working hours need to be prevented. However, interpretation of principles such as payment of a living wage, provision of formal contracts & provision of facilities need to take the following into account:

- **Limited resources** and poor infrastructure/facilities faced by smallholders themselves – you can't expect them to provide to workers what they can't provide for themselves. If you want such facilities to be improved, you need to provide appropriate assistance.
- **Informal labour arrangements**, based on kinship and other social ties, and on one-to-one negotiations between employer and employee. Even although they are "informal" and imperfect, they provide some checks and balances against exploitation of workers. Imposing inappropriate, rigid standards based on what is appropriate on commercial farms may make conditions worse by damaging existing mechanisms for determining payments etc.
- **Informal management structures**, with little record-keeping. In many cases existing management systems may be adequate when only employing a handful of workers.

Longer lead times

Reaching compliance will take longer on smallholder farms than on commercial farms, particularly when it comes to areas requiring capital investment. In setting code compliance targets for your suppliers, this needs to be taken into account. This should not be an excuse for "doing nothing". Exporters/growers should be asked to set annual targets and be able to demonstrate regular progress, even if full compliance will not be reached for several years.

Educating consumers and pressure groups on smallholder conditions

As a company or organisation responsible for developing codes, you can play an important role in educating consumers and pressure groups about the constraints faced by smallholders, and what that means for code implementation. In particular, the trade-off between helping workers and keeping smallholders in the export market should be emphasised.

Positive incentives for smallholder supply e.g. special "small producer" lines

In combination with consumer education, consideration should also be given to providing positive incentives to suppliers (importers and exporters) to source from smallholders. One possibility may be to consider developing a special product line which is marketed on the basis that they "help small producers" (akin to the fair trade concept). Consumers accepted lower cosmetic quality standards for organic fruit and vegetables. Would consumers also accept lower cosmetic quality standards for smallholder products, if they knew this meant that poor farmers could sell more of their crop and boost their meagre incomes?

For further information...

Please see **Theme Paper 8: Where to Find Further Information.**

The information contained in this paper is distilled from a 3-year study managed by the Natural Resources and Ethical Trade Programme (NRET), in collaboration with Agro Eco Consultancy of the Netherlands and the Centre for Applied Social Sciences (CASS) of the University of Zimbabwe. The study involved in-depth research in Ghana and Zimbabwe and the U.K, and was conducted in close collaboration with key players involved in the supply of fresh horticultural produce to European markets, from farm workers to supermarket buyers. For more detailed information about the findings from the study, please contact NRET (contact details are on the front page). The individual researchers involved in the study were Man-Kwun Chan (Project Leader), Geoffrey Bockett, Mick Blowfield, Stephanie Gallat, Seth Gogoe, Richard Tweneboah-Kodua (NRI); Rufaro Madakadze, Elias Madzudzo, Diana Auret, Edward Mbizo (CASS); and Bo van Elzakker (Agro Eco Consultancy).

This publication is an output from a research project (R7468, *Crop Post-Harvest Programme*) funded by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) for the benefit of developing countries. The views expressed are not necessarily those of DFID.