

Value chain development for rural poverty reduction: A reality check and a warning

DIETMAR STOIAN, JASON DONOVAN, JOHN FISK and
MICHELLE F. MULDOON

Over the past decade, the value chain development approach has increasingly been adopted by governments, donors, and NGOs to reduce rural poverty. The design of related interventions often assumes that poor households: 1) have sufficient resources to effectively participate in value chain development; 2) do not face substantial trade-offs when using these resources; and 3) are able to assume higher risks when reinvesting capital and labour. However, insights from our own experiences and the literature show that these assumptions often do not reflect the realities and the needs of the poor. We argue that value chain development with poor and vulnerable populations, particularly in rural areas, requires additional conceptual frameworks, analyses, and interventions. In particular, we encourage donor agencies and development practitioners to adopt an asset-based approach to the design, implementation, and assessment of target value chains and to identify the non-market interventions needed for enabling particularly disenfranchised groups to meet the minimum asset thresholds for their successful participation in value chain initiatives.

Keywords: value chain development, very poor, poverty reduction, asset-based approach, vulnerable populations

In search of viable
alternatives to
reducing poverty,
value chain
development
emerged in the
early 2000s

IN THE LATE 1990s, a sense of urgency over the need to reinvigorate development processes led to the formulation of the Millennium Development Goals which incorporated the view that increased income is a prerequisite to livelihood security and a decent standard of living. To date, however, notable progress in poverty reduction – measured in terms of income and passing the \$1 a day absolute poverty threshold – has mainly been made in Southeast and East Asia, especially China, while significant poverty pockets continue to persist in the rural areas of sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and Central and South America (UN, 2011). In search of viable alternatives to reducing poverty, value chain development emerged in the

Dietmar Stoian (stoian@catie.ac.cr) is Leader, Program of Competitiveness and Value Chains, Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center (CATIE), Turrialba, Costa Rica; Jason Donovan is Marketing Specialist with the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), Lima, Peru; John Fisk is Director and Michelle F. Muldoon is Program Officer of the Wallace Center at Winrock International, Arlington, VA, USA.

© Practical Action Publishing, 2012, www.practicalactionpublishing.org
doi: 10.3362/1755-1986.2012.006, ISSN: 1755-1978 (print) 1755-1986 (online)

early 2000s as: 1) a market-based approach to meet poverty-related Millennium Development Goals; and 2) a response to new opportunities in international markets signalling stronger demand for agricultural and forest products and services produced with environmental and social responsibility.

Value chain development has generally been defined as an 'effort to strengthen mutually beneficial linkages among firms so that they work together to take advantage of market opportunities, that is, to create and build trust among value chain participants' (Webber and Labaste, 2010). Key concepts related to value chain development are: win-win relationships, upgrading, innovation, and added value. 'Pro-poor' value chain development has been defined as a 'positive or desirable change in a value chain to extend or improve productive operations and generate social benefits: poverty reduction, income and employment generation, economic growth, environmental performance, gender equity and other development goals' (UNIDO, 2011). It is principally from the latter perspective that many development agencies, donors, and governments have adopted value chain development as a key element of their rural poverty reduction strategies (see DFID and SDC, 2008; Humphrey and Navas-Alemán, 2010). In addition to targeting poor and vulnerable populations in the rural sector as primary beneficiaries, some value chain initiatives seek to link to the macroeconomic environment by broadening their approach towards resource-constrained enterprises in the upstream segments of a value chain, and the promotion of changes in the political-legal, institutional, and regulatory frameworks (see Kula et al., 2006).

Despite the prominent role of the value chain development approach in current development agendas, surprisingly little is known about its impacts on rural poverty. The urgency of making tangible progress towards the poverty-related Millennium Development Goals and the uncertainty about the actual and potential contributions from value chain development call for taking stock in terms of what we already know about its design, implementation, and impact, and what we have yet to learn to better direct growing investments in such initiatives and ensure substantial effects on poverty. In this article, we call for an asset-based approach to design, implementation, and assessment of value chain development and the need for non-market interventions to help particularly disenfranchised groups to meet the minimum asset thresholds for their successful participation in value chain development.

Key concepts
related to value
chain development
are: win-win
relationships,
upgrading,
innovation, and
added value

What we know

1. Actors promoting value chain development vary widely, as do their motives. NGOs often pursue explicit poverty reduction goals, while the private sector may see them as a by-product.

The stronger the win–win nature of such relations, the more likely they are to endure over time

The strengthening of mutually beneficial business relationships between two or more chain actors, including producers, distributors, processors, wholesalers, and/or retailers, requires improved interactions between them, often facilitated by the provision of technical, business, and financial services from outside of the chain. Related interventions aim at strengthening capacities and enhancing mechanisms for sharing information, benefits, and risks. The stronger the win–win nature of such relations, the more likely they are to endure over time. While pro-poor value chain initiatives have an explicit focus on poverty reduction, other value chain initiatives may not. This, however, does not mean that they could not have an important, though unintended, poverty impact. Further, in many cases, a diverse set of stakeholders from within and outside of the value chain invest in the chain, at times with little or no coordination between them. Private companies, for example, may invest in their relationships with poor producers in an effort to improve their environmental and social credentials, while an NGO may provide technical and financial assistance to the producers and other chain actors. From the company's perspective, value chain development is one among several types of business strategy pursued to ensure a positive image, market positioning, and the sourcing of scarce raw materials (Box 1).

Box 1. Private sector initiatives that link to the poor

An alternative approach is the base-of-the-pyramid (BoP), where large companies aim to involve the poor in markets as providers of raw materials and/or as customers of affordable products. Such approaches often aim at producing more with less and ensuring long-term business viability. Concerns have been raised that BoP approaches underappreciate heterogeneity among the poor, as well as the intricacies of participatory partnerships between transnational companies and poor communities (Arora and Romijn, 2009). Other approaches go beyond economic goals by incorporating environmental and social goals. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) strategies call for exceeding legal mandates by involving ethical standards, stakeholder claims, and international norms in the business model. Pioneers of CSR have made notable investments in determining and improving their carbon, poverty, and other environmental or social footprints in pursuit of company or industry-wide goals. Lately, though, CSR has been criticized by Porter and Kramer (2011) for not being a solution, as social issues remain at the periphery, not at the core. Instead, they advocate creating shared value (CSV) as a strategy to generate value for both companies and society by reconceiving products and markets, redefining productivity in the value chain, and enabling local cluster development.

From the NGO's perspective, their work with upstream chain actors is in explicit pursuit of poverty reduction goals.

2. Value chain development involving the poor needs to account for their diversified livelihood strategies and related risks and trade-offs.

The poverty reduction potential of value chain development is often based on assumptions about poor households

A review of value chain methodologies and case studies (see, for example, Kula et al., 2006; Tanburn and Sen, 2011) shows that the poverty reduction potential of value chain development is often based on the assumption that poor households: 1) have sufficient resources to effectively participate in value chain development; 2) do not face substantial trade-offs when using these resources; and 3) are able to assume higher risks when reinvesting capital and labour. In reality, however, many poor households pursue diversified livelihood strategies by combining subsistence and market-oriented agriculture with off-farm labour and other non-agricultural income-generating activities. In contrast, participation in value chain development often requires them to pursue a specialization strategy, with higher investments of capital, labour, and other resources in a given chain. Involving the rural poor in value chain development therefore calls for a sound approach to address the complex trade-offs between income generation, food security, gender equity, sustainable natural resource management, and overall livelihood resilience.

Threats for the poor are greater and opportunities more limited where the domestic business sector lags

According to empirical evidence, threats for the rural poor are much greater and opportunities more limited where the competitiveness of the domestic business sector lags far behind international standards (Altenburg, 2007). Under these conditions a 'multi-chain approach' to value chain development as suggested by Stoian and Donovan (2007) for agricultural and forest sectors helps to minimize risks and to maximize poverty reduction potential by strengthening not only the most promising, often export-oriented value chain, but also a variety of domestic or regional chains to which smallholders have access. Charette (2011) argues on a similar line when advocating a 'portfolio approach' to value chain development programmes that stretches across sectors, in particular where the agricultural sector is highly subject to price and weather shocks, and where the manufacturing and/or services sectors show strong potential for growth and development. Despite these recent conceptual advances in value chain development, it is still common practice to focus on a single value chain without due attention to the impact of value chain participation of the rural poor on overall livelihood resilience and related trade-offs. In any case, value chain development is only part of the solution to rural poverty reduction. A complementary focus on rural infrastructure and services, food security, and local markets for traditional products, such as basic grains, is necessary as part of a comprehensive strategy for rural development.

3. Pro-poor value chain development has both advocates and sceptics. Both sides lack sound evidence to substantiate their claims.

It does not come as a surprise that this approach has both advocates and sceptics. The former argue that the most promising option for lifting rural people out of poverty, other than rural–urban migration, is linking poor farming households to lucrative markets through skills development and new institutional arrangements along the chain. Sceptics, on the other hand, regard value chain development as unsuitable for working with the very poor, given its perceived emphasis on risk-taking and entrepreneurship, and the additional challenges faced by the very poor when responding to economic incentives (Fowler and Brand, 2011). The history of stimulating export-oriented production of non-traditional agricultural products illustrates some of the challenges faced when seeking to integrate the poor into more demanding markets (although not all value chain development programmes target export markets). From the sceptics’ perspective, such an approach may be seen as an example of failed pro-poor value chain development, while advocates would hold that precisely the absence of good value chain development practice has limited the impact of non-traditional agricultural export programmes on poverty (Box 2).

Not all value chain
development
programmes target
export markets

Box 2. Struggles of smallholders to participate in non-traditional agricultural exports

Beginning in the 1970s and through the 1990s, governments and donor agencies promoted non-traditional agricultural exports (NTAE) in Latin America and Africa through trade liberalization, cooperative development, export promotion, fiscal incentives, subsidized credit, technical assistance, and infrastructure development. These initiatives were often geared towards medium and large-scale agribusinesses, while smallholders participated with varying levels of intensity without being the primary beneficiaries of NTAE interventions. In some cases, the private sector has taken the lead in organizing the production of non-traditional export goods. Food processors and supermarkets in Europe and the United States have redirected part of their sourcing of raw materials to traders, processors, and producers in developing countries. There is ample evidence that the conditions for smallholder participation in NTAE were often inadequate to allow for poverty reduction, and many of them dropped out of programmes because of low productivity, high input costs, falling export prices, and limited access to farming inputs and credit. In other cases, smallholders were pushed out as a result of their limited ability to meet the quality or volume requirements of traders and processors. Over the years, consensus has emerged that NTAE development programmes generally lacked economic sustainability, and did not adequately address poverty or the environmental and social costs of export-oriented production by large agribusinesses. Value chain development today, with its focus on both supply and demand factors for the design of sustainable market linkages, responds to the lessons learned from earlier NTAE experiences. However, there is urgent need for those that fund and implement value chain initiatives to address the poverty implications of their interventions in a more integrated way.

Neither advocates
nor sceptics can
base their claims
on sound impact
assessment

When looking for evidence of the impact of poverty-focused programmes it becomes evident that 'despite the pressure for measuring and reporting on results, most development agencies have in effect failed to measure and report on significant results in eradicating poverty' (Tanburn and Sen, 2011). As a result, neither advocates nor sceptics can base their claims regarding the efficacy of value chain development on sound impact assessment. In fact, most methodologies used for assessing the impact of value chain development on poverty are fairly simplistic and yield partial information on its strengths and limitations as a pathway out of poverty. Assessments typically focus on the generation of employment and income, rather than broader changes in terms of critical livelihood and business assets (see Humphrey and Navas-Alemán, 2010). Resulting reports thus provide an incomplete and potentially biased picture of value chain development impact on the livelihoods of the poor and the viability of smallholder enterprises of which they may be a part. For example, a given initiative may have increased the income derived from commercializing crop production, while at the same time it has compromised household food security and induced gender inequalities in terms of labour division and decision making; or a smallholder enterprise may have increased permanent staff, though increased payroll costs undercut the prices paid to producer members.

4. Current assessments of value chain development tend to provide an incomplete picture of their impact.

Reported impact
is made more
questionable
if household-
level impacts are
deduced from
enterprise-level
outcomes

The limited utility of one-dimensional assessments follows a general trend of ineffective design and implementation of monitoring and evaluation for development interventions, including those in agriculture (Haddad et al., 2010). Discussions in the grey literature on private sector development have advocated traditional logframe-based project assessment for understanding value chain development poverty implications, with emphasis on enterprise rather than household-level impacts (see Tanburn and Sen, 2011). While logframes and similar tools for 'rigorous' planning, monitoring, and evaluation may serve the reporting needs of project managers and donors, they are inappropriate for understanding complex development processes (Jones, 2011), as they assume that the implementing organization has the capacity to achieve the targeted outcomes and impacts on its own. The failure to adequately account for external factors, such as changes in the political-legal or market context, or the effects of value chain interventions by others, provides an incomplete and potentially distorted picture of value chain development impact. The reported impact is made more questionable if household-level impacts are deduced from enterprise-level outcomes rather than by measuring them.

What we think we know

This section addresses our own insights or those of others that are yet to become part of the mainstream discussion on value chain development.

1. Conceptual models underlying pro-poor value chain development tend to lack a holistic perspective.

The simplified design of a value chain initiative reduces monitoring and evaluation costs

Many value chain initiatives involving the poor are based on fairly simple conceptual models focusing on a few variables (output, employment, income, production practices, infrastructure), while minimizing or omitting other critical, albeit complex, factors (e.g. social and human capital building, vulnerability). Such initiatives often aim to achieve greater productivity and better prices for poor households, and the resulting increase in income is seen as a proxy for poverty reduction, if not overall development. On the upside, the simplified design of a value chain initiative reduces both monitoring and evaluation, and implementation costs and makes the results easy to communicate across the chain and to other stakeholders. On the downside, such an approach does not recognize the full set of assets needed by poor households to effectively participate in value chain development, nor does it address how these assets can be built over time to permanently escape from poverty and ensure livelihood resilience, or deal with the trade-offs the rural poor face when making decisions about their allocation of time and resources between a specific value chain and other livelihood activities.

2. Poor households and smallholder enterprises require minimum assets to successfully participate in value chain development.

‘Value chain readiness’ of SMEs requires adequate policies to improve overall investment conditions

Despite the warning that poor households vary in their asset levels, income flows, social networks, and abilities to cope with shocks (Fowler and Brand, 2011), many value chain initiatives treat poor rural households as a uniform stakeholder group with the same response capacity. In reality, however, both external factors such as access to basic infrastructure and services, common pool resources, and social stability, and internal factors, such as asset endowments, interests, and power, ultimately determine the extent to which poor households are ‘ready’ to participate in specific value chains. Similarly, the ‘value chain readiness’ of SMEs requires adequate policies to improve overall investment conditions, attract foreign investment, and provide better business services to increase their competitiveness (Altenburg, 2007). Minimum asset thresholds for successful participation in value chain development thus apply at both household and enterprise levels, as illustrated by an example of a coffee cooperative in Nicaragua (Box 3). Below these thresholds,

Box 3. Evidence of asset thresholds for successful participation in certified coffee markets

The Nicaragua-based coffee cooperative, Soppexcca, links roughly 500 smallholder producers to international buyers of certified fair-trade and organic coffee. Following the coffee crisis – a period between 1999 and 2004 when prices fell below the cost of production for many producers in Central America – donors and NGOs invested US\$2.1 m in building the capacity of Soppexcca and its members to expand their output and better meet the quality demands of international buyers. Donovan and Poole (2011) assessed the changes in tangible and non-tangible assets for both Soppexcca and a representative sample of its members between 2006 and 2009. For the cooperative, interventions enabled major expansion of infrastructure and processing machinery, increased coverage of its technical assistance, and higher ability to engage with new fair-trade coffee buyers in the United States. Related investments provided an option for generating income through expanded service provision to members, and thus were considered critical for the co-op's long-term survival. Most co-op members benefited in terms of increased income flows and greater resilience through their membership in the cooperative. Nearly a quarter of the households were able to take advantage of credit provided by Soppexcca and others to expand their landholdings, diversify their agricultural production, and/or rejuvenate their coffee plantations. However, important weaknesses and gaps in assets remained unaddressed by the interventions and by Soppexcca itself. For example, financial assets remained seriously underdeveloped during the assessment period, while long-term debt increased significantly. Extension services expanded during the period but had difficulties in responding to members' needs. One-third of the sampled households faced major barriers to intensify coffee production, access crucial inputs and services, and increase or diversify their production of basic grains. These households tended to be strongly constrained in their endowment with or access to assets, as reflected in very small landholdings, insecure land tenure, and high dependence on off-farm income for their livelihoods. They were also more likely to have older household heads or to be headed by a female. The Soppexcca case shows that greater attention needs to be paid to the asset endowments of smallholders and the related dynamics, if value chain development is to reduce rural poverty in an integrated and significant way.

specific, non-market-based interventions are needed to create the necessary preconditions for poor households and resource-constrained enterprises to become value chain ready.

3. Value chain development stakeholders would benefit from an asset-based approach, clear impact models, and sound metrics for understanding poverty impacts and identifying options for improved pro-poor value chain development.

There is a growing consensus that conventional poverty definitions need to be broadened

There is a growing consensus that conventional poverty definitions need to be broadened to account for critical livelihood assets and vulnerability (see, for example, McKay, 2009). These definitions allow for the endowments of and changes in human, social, natural, physical, and financial capital, and their effects on livelihood resilience. When applied in value chain development, such an asset-based approach is critical to determine whether value chain readiness is reached by meeting minimum asset thresholds. It also permits us to prove the existence of positive feedback loops; that is, processes in which the building of one asset (e.g. financial capital) leads to the building of others (e.g. human or physical capital). These would be understood as indicators of broad-based and lasting impact on rural livelihoods in pursuit of well-being and resilience.

Clear impact models with plausible cause–effect relationships are largely absent

Despite advances in thinking about the nature and causes of poverty, most sceptics and advocates of value chain development rely on a limited set of indicators and data to substantiate their poverty claims. The former tend to describe the limited poverty impact of value chain development by focusing on either the limited *relative* share of benefits captured by the poor in a given chain, or the exclusion of the poorest sections of the rural population. Advocates, on the other hand, argue that the contribution of value chain development to poverty reduction needs to be measured as an *absolute* increase in income through interventions in a value chain, and that employment effects among the poor are relevant irrespective of the overall distribution of benefits. In both cases, clear impact models with plausible cause–effect relationships, or refined metrics that allow for both positive and negative effects of value chain development are largely absent.

There is an urgent need and an opportunity for public and private investors in value chain development to promote the adoption of an asset-based approach to the design and implementation of value chain initiatives, based on well-defined impact models, and to develop sound metrics that help demonstrate under which conditions value chain development generates high poverty impact. Recent work by an international coalition of development practitioners and researchers highlights the opportunities and the challenges for the application of an asset-based approach to value chain development (Box 4).

Box 4. International collaboration to design an asset-based approach to value chain development assessment

Between 2008 and 2011, an international group of development practitioners and researchers, representing Bioversity International, CATIE, CRS, ICRAF, Intercooperation, LWR, MEDA, Swisscontact, TechnoServe, and Winrock's Wallace Center, among others, collaborated on the design and testing of the *5CapitalsToolkit* – an asset-based approach to assess the poverty impacts of value chain development (see Donovan and Stoian, 2010). In collaboration with local NGOs and consultants, and with financial support from the Ford Foundation, the toolkit was designed and validated through 23 case studies in Latin and North America, Africa, and Asia. The aim was to design a tool that would: 1) assess the impact of a whole set of value chain development interventions, rather than that of a particular intervention; 2) consider changes in assets among both households and the enterprises that maintained links with them; and 3) differentiate between the impacts of the combined value chain development interventions vis-à-vis those induced by external factors. Experiences gained in tool testing demonstrated the potential of an asset-based approach to value chain development assessment, along with related challenges. Case study collaborators agreed that: 1) such an approach is very useful to gain in-depth insight into value chain development-related poverty impacts; 2) the focus on both household and enterprise assets sheds additional light on poverty impacts; 3) the context analysis as the first step of the methodology is critical to isolate value chain development-related impact from context-induced change; and 4) the results of impact assessment have highest value when used for redesigning value chain development interventions. At the same time they found that this approach: 1) implies investments of human and financial resources that are reasonable but not low-cost; 2) requires a flexible handling of the enterprise assessment due to the varied nature of 'linked enterprises'; and 3) depends on systems thinking to make the most out of it. The final version of the toolkit (in English and Spanish) and an edited case study volume will be made available on the CATIE and ICRAF websites in 2012 (www.catie.ac.cr and www.icraf.org)

4. Value chain development requires adequate linking of technical, business, and financial services.

In addition to successful collaboration between public and private sectors and civil society, pro-poor value chain development requires a combination of technical, business, and financial services. Some of these services are available from within the chain, particularly those that help improve quality or efficiency. Such 'embedded services', typically provided by downstream actors to their upstream business partners, have the advantage of focusing on clearly identified needs and upgrading opportunities in the chain. On the other hand, certain services may not be readily available from within the chain, especially those that help improve environmental and social performance or that address long-term issues related to capacity building and skills development among the poor. These services may need to be sourced from external service providers, such as government agencies, NGOs, development projects, and consulting firms. The diverse nature of the services needed poses a challenge to their effective and efficient delivery. Technical services related to production and, to a lesser extent, processing technologies tend to be readily available for traditional products, either from downstream actors or from external service providers. Financial services may be provided in the form of advance payments or credits within the chain, or through government-funded programmes and microfinance projects from outside the chain. Usually, however, they are not available to highly resource-constrained smallholders. Business services often turn out to be the Achilles heel in value chain development as specialized business service providers for the rural sector are largely absent. A further challenge for value chain development-related services is their provision in an isolated fashion. Service providers are typically specialized in one of these three types of service and rarely make an effort to partner with those who provide complementary services. Effective and efficient services for value chain development require a sound demand analysis and a concerted approach to the delivery of technical, business, and financial services that are well-linked and complement each other in a logical fashion. Following the subsidiarity principle, only those services would be provided from outside the chain that cannot be sourced from within the chain.

Certain services
may not be readily
available from
within the chain

Financial services
may be provided in
the form of advance
payments or credits
within the chain

Service providers
rarely make an effort
to partner with
those who provide
complementary
services

What we still need to know and do differently

The number of rural people living in desperate conditions under various degrees of vulnerability remains high. Undoubtedly, we have advanced our understanding of poverty issues and there is a growing consensus on the importance of pro-poor interventions in

There are a number
of 'action gaps'
related to areas
that require forms
of engagement in
value chains

value chains. Yet there are a number of crucial issues on which our knowledge is still insufficient. In the absence of an asset-based approach to designing, implementing, and monitoring value chain initiatives, related impact models and theories of change are incomplete. Under these conditions, it is virtually impossible to identify the best options for helping poor people to *exit* from poverty, let alone to *stay* out of poverty. In addition to these knowledge gaps, there are a number of 'action gaps' related to areas that require forms of engagement in value chains in addition to, or other than, those applied to date.

Need for improved knowledge

1. *How to determine value chain readiness?* If the goal of the intervention is to reduce vulnerability and lift people out of poverty, how can we determine whether poor households and their business organizations are ready to participate in value chain development? Which minimum asset thresholds do they need to meet and, if not available, what are the best options to help them become value chain ready?
2. *Can asset building at the level of smallholder enterprises spur asset building at the household level?* Since business organization of smallholders is often considered a prerequisite for their successful participation in value chains, we need to understand under what conditions asset building at the level of the smallholder enterprises positively influences household assets and reduces vulnerability, and how value chain development can help to create more synergy in this respect.
3. *How to ensure that assessing value chain development impact is both effective and efficient?* Current impact assessment of value chain programmes tends to be low-cost and fairly one-dimensional, whereas an asset-based approach to assessment yields more robust results while requiring higher investments. There is a clear need for experimenting with differentiated approaches to impact assessment, for example the routine measuring of outputs, the assessing of outcomes to the extent possible, and full-fledged impact assessment through in-depth case studies. The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED), for example, recommends three 'universal' impact indicators (scale, income, and jobs) for ongoing results measurement; at the same time it acknowledges that this cannot replace rigorous impact assessments, nor evaluations, as these ask broader questions (Tanburn and Sen, 2011).
4. *How best to use an asset-based approach for planning, implementing, and assessing value chain development?* In particular, we need to better understand what indicators within each asset

Which proxies
can be used to
make assessment
manageable and
cost effective?

type – typically including human, social, natural, physical, and financial capital – tell us the most about reducing poverty and vulnerability. Which proxies can be used to make assessment manageable and cost effective? How do we adapt or tailor value chain development to different contexts and varying asset levels in given populations? How can we best deal with non-linear asset pathways (asset building followed by asset erosion or vice versa)?

5. *Which roles correspond to private, public, and civil society sectors in promoting value chain development?* What can the private sector do alone? Under what conditions will the private sector invest in the long term, or go the extra mile for pro-poor value chain development? What can realistically be expected from private sector initiatives, such as base of the pyramid, corporate social responsibility, or creating shared value? Where and how do public-private partnerships work best and where are their limits? What is the specific role of NGOs in helping build assets beyond the contributions from public and private sectors?

Need for improved action

Different measures
are needed in
each stage when
following a
pathway out of
poverty

1. *Account for the evolution of income and asset objectives.* Value chain development programmes need to account for the dynamics and variations of asset endowments and livelihood objectives among poor and vulnerable populations. Different measures are needed in each stage when following a pathway out of poverty from: '(i) stabilizing household consumption/stemming asset loss, to (ii) smoothing household consumption/protecting assets, to (iii) smoothing household income/acquiring assets, to (iv) expanding household income/leverage assets, and to (v) stabilized income-generation and asset accumulation' (Fowler and Brand, 2011).
2. *Differentiate between those who are value chain ready and those who are not.* Market-based interventions work for those who meet minimum asset thresholds and, hence, are value chain ready. Those who are not require specific, non-market-based interventions to create the necessary preconditions for their participation in value chain development. These include, but are not limited to, customized technical assistance and training to build human and social capital, rehabilitation of natural capital where eroded, investments in basic infrastructure and services, and resolution of land tenure conflicts where existing. These interventions fall outside the realm of value chain development but are critical for its success, if the poorest sections of the rural population are to benefit from it.

Human and social capital needs to be built before considering investments in physical capital

We need to ensure that the services are geared to the requirements identified by the chain actors

3. *Follow logical sequence of asset building.* There are plentiful examples of programmes where donors have given processing equipment to farmer organizations, but the initiatives have failed because of lacking business skills. In many cases, human and social capital needs to be built before considering investments in physical capital. In other cases, eroded natural capital needs to be rebuilt before meaningful business development is possible.
4. *Ensure synergies among public and private sectors and civil society, promoting value chain development.* Based on the subsidiarity principle, public sector and civil society should only engage in those interventions that cannot be performed by the private sector. This requires determining which services can be provided from within the chain ('embedded services') and which need to be sourced from external service providers (in many cases government agencies or NGOs). For example, rather than donating equipment, donors might link farmers to credit agencies to buy the equipment. If necessary, agencies could subsidize the cost of credit.
5. *Improve the quality of and the linking between technical, business, and financial services.* In the absence of integrated service providers, we need to make major efforts to link technical, business, and financial services in ways that allow for meaningful asset building at household and smallholder enterprise levels. At the same time, we need to ensure that these services are geared to the requirements identified by the chain actors rather than outside agents from public sector or civil society.
6. *Create awareness among donors and development practitioners about the advantages of adopting an asset-based approach to the design, implementation, and assessment of value chain development.* There is a need to provide evidence that the increased costs and complexity of an asset-based approach are outweighed by tangible benefits in terms of higher impact on poverty reduction, livelihood resilience, and viability of smallholder enterprises.
7. *Promote comprehensive strategies to rural development.* There is both a need for and an opportunity to combine value chain development with other approaches to rural development, such as sustainable rural livelihoods, territorial development, and investments in rural infrastructure and services.
8. *Innovate in partnerships for joint learning and continuous improvement.* The diverse nature of stakeholders in value chain development provides a great opportunity for joint learning. Each of them brings specific perspectives, skills, and experiences to the table, but we need to define appropriate forums and mechanisms for sharing and capitalizing on these. The outcome of such learning alliances and communities of practice will be

highest if nurtured by genuine interest in learning and authentic commitment to continuous improvement.

Conclusions

Market-oriented activities are important but not exclusive elements of rural livelihood strategies

Our current knowledge of the poverty impacts of value chain development is limited. Regardless of whether related initiatives are driven by private, public, or civil society sectors, the use of sound metrics to determine their impact at both the enterprise and the household level, and to isolate value chain development from context-induced change should be the rule rather than the exception. If value chain development is to be effective in addressing rural poverty, it must embrace the complex needs and realities of the rural poor. This includes the recognition that market-oriented activities are important but not exclusive elements of rural livelihood strategies. Particular attention needs to be paid to the specific challenges and needs of the very poor given their higher risk and vulnerability. Otherwise there is a substantial risk that pro-poor value chain development does not live up to expectations and causes undue trade-offs in the livelihood strategies of the rural poor.

An asset-based approach to value chain development comes at a price

An asset-based approach to the design, implementation, and assessment of value chain development is a powerful vehicle to address these challenges and risks. Not only does it provide an appropriate measure of the multiple dimensions of poverty and vulnerability, but it also helps to determine which households and smallholder enterprises are ready for value chain development, and which require specific preparatory interventions to become value chain ready. An asset-based approach to value chain development comes at a price, though. Related planning, data collection, and analysis are relatively time-consuming, complex, and costly. At the same time, such an approach helps forgo higher expenses to mitigate unintended effects of interventions in value chains. It provides public sector and civil society organizations with the necessary information to justify the investment of taxpayers' money, and holds the potential to improve the environmental and social credentials of private sector companies pursuing base of the pyramid, corporate social responsibility, creating shared value, or similar strategies.

Value chain development is not a panacea to rural development. When seeking impact beyond poverty reduction on resilience of livelihoods and ecosystems, it needs to be paired with complementary approaches. Comprehensive strategies for rural development would include improvements in local infrastructure and services, political-legal frameworks, food security, local markets for agricultural and forest products, and income generation through services and off-farm employment. Appropriate design, implementation, and monitoring

and evaluation of such strategies, again, will best be achieved by pursuing an asset-based approach.

Much remains to be learned about the best possible design and implementation of value chain programmes and pertinent combinations with other approaches. Undoubtedly, however, an asset-based approach to pro-poor value chain development is a critical piece of such strategies. Governments, donors, development agencies, NGOs, and private sector agents committed to poverty reduction will need to invest in pilot projects, tool development, and capacity building; engage in multi-stakeholder platforms for joint learning; and commit to continuous improvement. Without the adoption of an asset-based approach to value chain development, poor households and smallholder enterprises in the upstream segments of the chain will continue to be exposed to high uncertainty and risk and, in particular, to potentially harmful trade-offs between value chain optimization and resilience at the household and business level.

Poor households
and smallholder
enterprises may
continue to be
exposed to high
uncertainty and risk

References

Altenburg, T. (2007) *Donor Approaches to Supporting Pro-poor Value Chains* [website], report prepared for the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development – Working Group on Linkages and Value Chains, German Development Institute (DIE), Bonn, Germany <www.value-chains.org/dyn/bds/docs/568/DonorApproachestoPro-PoorValueChains.pdf> [last accessed 24 January 2012].

Arora, S. and Romijn, H. (2009) *Innovation for the Base of the Pyramid: Critical Perspectives from Development Studies on Heterogeneity and Participation* [website], United Nations University/Maastricht Economic and Social Research and Training Centre on Innovation and Technology, Maastricht, the Netherlands <www.merit.unu.edu/publications/wp/pdf/2009/wp2009-036.pdf> [last accessed 24 January 2012].

Charette, D. (2011) *A Portfolio Approach to Value Chain Development Programs*, MicroREPORT #169, USAID, Washington, DC.

DFID (Department for International Development) and SDC (Swiss Development Corporation) (2008) *A Synthesis of the Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) Approach*, SDC, Berne, Switzerland.

Donovan, J. and Poole, N. (2011) 'Asset building in response to value chain development: Evidence from specialty smallholder coffee producers in Nicaragua', *ICRAF Working Paper 138*, World Agroforestry Centre, Nairobi, Kenya.

Donovan, J. and Stoian, D. (with contributions from Antezana, I., Belt, J., Clark, S., Harper, M., Poole, N., Ruddick, S. and Waagbo, J.) (2010) *Assessing the Impact of Value Chain Approaches on Rural Poverty*, Methodological Guidelines for Development Practitioners and Private Sector Representatives, CATIE, Turrialba, Costa Rica.

- Fowler, B. and Brand, M. (2011) *Pathways Out of Poverty: Applying Key Principles of the Value Chain Approach to Reach the Very Poor*, Discussion Paper/Microreport #173, USAID, Washington, DC.
- Haddad, L., Lindstrom, J. and Pinto, Y. (2010) 'The sorry state of M&E in agriculture: Can people-centred approaches help?' *IDS Bulletin* 41: 6-25.
- Humphrey, J. and Navas-Alemán, L. (2010) 'Value chains, donor interventions and poverty reduction: A review of donor practice', *IDS Research Report* 63, IDS, Brighton, UK.
- Jones, H. (2011) 'Taking responsibility for complexity: When is a policy problem complex, why does it matter, and how can it be tackled?' *ODI Briefing Paper* 68, ODI, London.
- Kula, O., Downing, J. and Field, M. (2006) 'Value chain programmes to integrate competitiveness, economic growth and poverty reduction', *Small Enterprise Development* 17: 23-35.
- McKay, A. (2009) 'Assets and chronic poverty: Background paper', *Chronic Poverty Research Centre Working Paper* 100, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK <www.chronicpoverty.org/uploads/publication_files/WP100%20McKay_1.pdf> [last accessed 24 January 2012].
- Porter, M.E. and Kramer, M.R. (2011) 'Creating shared value: How to reinvent capitalism – and unleash a wave of innovation and growth', *Harvard Business Review* (Jan-Feb 2011): 2–17.
- Stoian, D. and Donovan, J. (2007) 'Value chain development from a livelihoods perspective: A multi-chain approach for coffee and cacao producing households in Central America', in E. Tielkes (ed.), *Utilisation of Diversity in Land Use Systems: Sustainable and Organic Approaches to Meet Human Needs. Tropentag 2007 – International Research on Food Security, Natural Resource Management and Rural Development*, Kassel-Witzenhausen, Germany, 9–11 October 2007.
- Tanburn, J. and Sen, N. (2011) *Why Have a Standard for Measuring Results? Progress and Plans of the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development*, DCED, London.
- UN (United Nations) (2011) *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2011*, UN, New York.
- UNIDO (United Nations Industrial Development Organization) (2011) *Pro-poor Value Chain Development: 25 Guiding Questions for Designing and Implementing Agroindustry Projects*, UNIDO, Vienna, Austria.
- Webber, C.M. and Labaste, P. (2010) *Building Competitiveness in Africa's Agriculture: A Guide to Value Chain Concepts and Applications*, World Bank, Washington, DC.