Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition "Flagship": Legumes

Alan de Brauw Markets, Trade and Institutions Division International Food Policy Research Institute May 2014

Challenge: Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition

- Diets in developing countries are not just (intermittently) short on calories, also on macro and micronutrients
- Income increases are not sufficient to improve diet
- Policies sometimes promote production of grains at the expense of healthier products
 - US Farm Bill, but many examples in LDCs too
- Notion: Can use a value chain approach targeting more nutritious crops
 - Relatively new notion at IFPRI and somewhat within the CGIAR (exception of biofortification which is related)

Evidence: Diet Diversification; Food Group Shares (kcal/cap/day)



Evidence: Shares of daily calorie consumption by food groups

	Ideal	US	China	Bangladesh
Starchy Staples	48	31	49	80
Legumes & Nuts	22	5	3	4
Animal & Fish Products	10	14	20	4
Fruits & Vegetables	9	7	9	2
Fats & Sugars	11	43	19	10
Total Calories	2200	Too many	Too many	Too few

Source for "Ideal" shares: Thompson and Meerman, FAO, 2013

Income Increases and Diet

- Ruel and Alderman show that:
 - 10% increase in GDP per capita associated with 6% reduction in stunting (income elasticity of stunting=-0.6)
 - 10% increase in GDP per capita associated with a 7% **increase** in overweight and obesity among women (income elasticity of overweight=0.7)
- Why? Previous food security goals could be a reason...

Non-Staple Food Prices in India Have Risen by 50% Over 30 Years





Three aspects of value chains for enhanced nutrition

- Demand (Consumption) Side
 - Affected by Prices, Income
 - Demand "shifters" (Preferences; Information)
- Supply (Production) Side
 - Producing more nutritious foods (macronutrients/micronutrients)
 - Making sure those are safe (food safety- more of a challenge with animal source foods, but also aflatoxins etc.)
- Policies / Markets

Four Broad Classes of Nutritious Foods

- Pulses/Legumes
 - Could categorize specific oilseeds here (e.g. soy)
- Fruits/Vegetables
- Animal Products
- Biofortified Crops (HarvestPlus)
- Different Classes of Foods may have different constraints to increased use
 - Pulses/Legumes- cooking times

Applied to Pulses and Legumes...

- Demand Side
 - Consumers may simply lack information
 pulses and legumes are particularly healthy crops
 - Often only lightly processed (e.g. washed and bagged)
 - May be innovations possible on the demand side to stimulate consumption of pulses or legumes
- Supply Side
 - Relative prices quite high (in many cases) so clear advantage to growing more pulses and legumes
 - Value chain interventions could lead to increased supply and smallholder incomes
- Policy
 - Public focus on staple crops means underinvestment in nutrient rich foods

Pulses and Legumes: What is A4NH doing?

- Our goal is to develop a research program that examines ways to overcome constraints against:
 - Consumption of pulses/legumes among the poor
 - Production of pulses/legumes (in collaboration with PIM)
 - Potentially stimulate the use of pulses and/or legumes in more processed foods
- One constraint- legumes in particular may not do much for stunting
 - Cooking times are likely prohibitive for the poor

Work so far: Pulse Innovation Partnership (PIP) in India (through McGill)

- What are the technological capabilities of the partners in the PIP (inventory)?
- What is the route to market (business model) for the PIP?
- What are the funding avenues for the PIP projects?

Capabilities in the PVC



Gaps and Challenges

- Absence of consumer facing food companies in the partnership. This creates a void in
 - Intelligence on Consumer preference
 - Distribution and retailing of products
- Heterogeneity of interests among partners
 Locational interests (Canada, Australia, India).
 - Short-term versus long-term interests (what pulse products can we take to market in the next year; how can we increase pulse consumption so there is an increased demand for pulse production).
- Route to market unclear
 - Should the PIP engage in product innovation? If so, which and how many food companies should PIP partner with?
 - Should the PIP provide a knowledge package service offering? How can such an offering add value beyond existing market mechanisms?
- Funding model
 - What are the sources of funding for PIP activities?
 - What is the suitable positioning to seek funding from these sources?

Infra + Knowledge Package – A three pronged strategy

Innovation pillar

- Upstream value chain support for food companies to develop pulse products. This spans pulse sourcing, technologies for all stages of physical processing and technologies for sensory experience.
- The subset of partners for this pillar will be Firmenich, Buhler, DSM, Hakan foods, Glencore, Leo Burnett.

• Marketing pillar

- · Consumer and market insights; Market intelligence
- Broad marketing support for creating awareness about pulse-based products and their nutritional benefits
- Endorsement by nutrition experts (example: American Nutrition Association).
- Recognition as an official partner of IYOP, perhaps with mention at IYOP events and in IYOP marketing material.
- This may be headed by Leo Burnett, Pulse Canada, Pulse Australia along with CGIAR.

Policy pillar

- Work with governments to negotiate favorable policies for pulse based products.
 - More responsive to evidence of health and nutrition benefits
 - Enable investments that don't suffer from market and institutional failures and are not skewed through inefficient subsidies or regulations.
- Policies that interface between marketing and the behavioral and social improvements required for healthier consumption.
- Pulse Canada, Pulse Australia will drive this in respective countries with support from CGIAR

Private Sector- "Gives" and "Gets"

- Gives
 - Make a commitment to roll out at least 2 pulse-based food products in 2016. Could be formalized via an MoU.
 - How many products? How many countries?
- Gets
 - Innovation support
 - Marketing support (Depending on the pledge, they could be awarded partnership levels) partnerships)
 - Policy support
 - Opportunity to create a new, healthy food category (contribution to the triple bottom line)
- The actual gives and gets will depend on the type of company i.e., SMBs or large companies.

PIP – High Level Action Plan

- Form task force for each pillar Innovation, Marketing and Policy.
- Task forces to fine tune the club, public and private goods they will offer; Create detailed plan to make that happen.
- Reach out and sign up food companies based on the PIP value proposition articulated (to be finalized by the task forces).
 - Target: 20 pulse products by 2016 (10 food companies)
 - Companies may be large MNCs or SMBs
 - Location not to be a constraint (Canada, Australia, India)
 - Each partner to open doors with 2 food companies?

Funding

- The partners who stand to expand their business and monetize their in-kind support to the PIP should put down a seed fund (Firmenich, Buhler, DSM, Hakan, Glencore). This should cover for travel and other activities to enlist food companies.
- Others (Pulse Canada, Pulse Australia) will contribute in-kind.
- IDRC may be willing to support a proposal that uses the policy pillar as the main plank and linking it to private sector participation.
- IYOP might be willing to provide in-kind support to the marketing pillar.
- This component could use potentially some more thought

Conclusion

- Through Value Chains for Enhanced Nutrition, looking for ways to integrate project ideas with rigorous evaluation
 - Likely to implement something in next year with IFPRI India office
- Interested in testing ways that we can either stimulate demand for or develop supply of interesting products related to legumes
 - Focus remains on stimulating demand among the poor to diversify diets among those most likely affected by malnutrition