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Max Havelaar France, backer of this study, is the NGO representing Fairtrade international’s movement in France.

**Manage**
- The Fairtrade certification in France
- The development, within the Fairtrade international movement, of a reliable and impactful international guarantee system for producers

**Support**
- Economic actors in their commitment to change their buying practices
- The development of the Fairtrade certification in France by increasing market opportunities for certified products

**Sensitize**
- Consumers to responsible and sustainable consumption
- Public authorities through advocacy actions in order to regulate international agricultural markets and foster the empowerment of small producers.
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2. NATURE BIO-FOODS LTD

Overview of the company

Mission

“Delivering pure and healthy quality products to the global consumers by following environmentally safe production techniques and using agri-ingredients that secures the socio-economic development”

What they do

- Sell high quality organic products all around the world
- Foster organic practices and fair dealings in agri-products supply chains
- Develop contract farming and Fairtrade projects

Products

- Rice, soybean, pulses, gluten-free flour, nuts, oil, cane sugar, noodles, corn, spices...
- All are free of any chemicals

Key figures

1997: year of creation.
1 organic brand: Ecolife, 80,000 Indian farmers involved
2005: creation of the first organic contract production
2009: development of the CSR programs
2009: creation of the NGO Fair Farming Foundation

Vision

“To be a leading company in agri-products with social, economical and environmental soundness”
3 Fairtrade projects located in Haridwar, Bahraich and Ramnagar

Expected benefits for farmers:
• Assured markets
• Assured MSP*
• Less transportation and costs
• FT premium invested in
• Community welfare
• Increased sense of ownership, leadership and confidence

Fairtrade project under study: Ramnagar project
FT certified since 2012

NBF’s roles in the study
Communication of information regarding the projects
Organization of the interviews, qualitative interviews and focus group discussions
Translations from English to Hindi (and vice versa)
Organization of the logistics for the research team: accommodation, transportation..
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A three-year project

I FEED GOOD is a NGO created in September 2016. Since then, I FEED GOOD voluntarily proposes its expertise to NGOs and social enterprises. The team is conducting field missions from October 2017 to August 2018. Afterwards, the team will share its experiences through various events (conferences, debates, etc.).

Social Impact Assessment (SIA)

The team is specialized in SIA. Before going on the field, all its members were trained by (IM)PROVE, an association which has developed its own methodology of SIA since 2009 and worked on more than 100 projects.

Our theme: Sustainable food

Throughout the year, I FEED GOOD team will be working on social projects that are involved in sustainable food and agriculture.
For one year, the I FEED GOOD team was trained and mentored by (IM)PROVE.

- One of the very few structures that are only specialized in Social Impact Assessment
- An association created in 2009 by 3 graduates from HEC Paris

- Immerse – Impact – Improve
- A methodology that was developed by (IM)PROVE, HEC Paris and Ashoka and used during I FEED GOOD’s SIA missions

- Social Impact Assessment missions carried out by (IM)PROVE teams since 2009
- For both major companies and smaller structures, in France and on all continents
Presentation of the team

- **Julie**
  Head of Enterprises & Foundations
  Sciences Po Lille
  Julie is from Paris. She studied at Sciences Po. She has experiences in social entrepreneurship and CSR projects as business developer and head of communication.

- **Anaïs**
  Head of Social Entrepreneurs & NGO
  ESSEC Business School
  Anaïs is from Picardie, France. She studied at ESSEC business school. She worked for organic shops and farms and she is now developing her own social enterprise.

- **Lara**
  Head of Communication & Transmission
  University of Perpignan
  Lara is from Perpignan, France. She studied photojournalism. She worked for sustainable food projects as a video editor or head of communication.

- **Morgane**
  Head of Administration & Finance
  Sciences Po Grenoble
  Morgane is from Chambery, France. She studied at Sciences Po Grenoble. She cumulates experiences in statistics and field studies for social projects.
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1. SCOPE

WHAT?

- Impact assessment of the Fairtrade Certification on basmati rice producers
- 10 impacts selected (social, economic and environmental)

WHEN?

- During 6 weeks: from December 4th 2017 to January 13th 2018
- Data collection: from 11th to 22th December 2017

WHERE?

- Ramnagar (Uttarakhand) and Bahraich areas (Uttar Pradesh), India

WHO?

- Beneficiaries of the Fairtrade certification: rice producers and their families (especially their children)
• To identify and highlight the economic, social and environmental impacts of Fairtrade certification on rice producers with concrete, quantitative and qualitative data.

• To get information about the Contract Production (CP) model to better understand it and its differences with the Small Producer Organization Model (SPO)

• To enable Max Havelaar France to justify to its economic partners why the Fairtrade prices are higher.
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2. DELIVERABLES

FINAL RESULTS

Exhaustive report (PPT)
Infographic of the main results
Videos

SIA MISSION TOOLS

Impact Map (PPT)
Theory of Change (PPT)
Calendar of the data collection (Excel)
Questionnaires (Excel)
Qualitative interviews and focus groups guides (Excel)
Databases of the data collection (Excel)
Transcriptions of the qualitative interviews and focus groups (Word and Excel)
Plan of analysis (Excel)
Analysis documents (Excel)

Impact assessment – December 2017
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# Methodology

The different steps of IMPROVE’s methodology

## Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Decision on the <strong>objectives</strong>, road map and sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | **Key tools** to set scope  
- Tables |
| 3 | **Quantitative** and **qualitative**  
- Tailored with MHF* |
| 4 | Around 2 weeks long  
- Physical interviews |
| 5 | **Data analysis** on Excel  
- Analyses reported in PPT |
| 6 | **Final report** in PPT  
- **Tools** handed to MHF |

## Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Give a <strong>clear direction</strong> and target to the study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | Identify all potential impacts  
- Determine relevant indicators |
| 3 | Collect data according to selected indicators |
| 4 | Build database for social impact analysis |
| 5 | Convert collected data into trends through statistics |
| 6 | Highlight and communicate on key results of the study |

*MHF : Max Havelaar France*
### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 – 8 December</td>
<td>Preliminary work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15 December</td>
<td>Questionnaire drafting &amp; test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 22 December</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 29 December</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 5 January</td>
<td>Final report drafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – 13 January</td>
<td>Tools / deliverables preparation and finalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The principle of the methodology relies on the comparison between a target group and a control one, in order to highlight the impacts generated by the Fairtrade certification.

**TARGET GROUP**
- Fairtrade and organic rice producers
  - Ramnagar region

**CONTROL GROUP**
- Organic rice producers
  - Bahraich region
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4. THEORY OF CHANGE

---

### INTERVENTIONS

- Fairtrade standards and certification for the contract production organization
- Support to small producers

---

### OUTPUTS

- Enhanced access to fair trading conditions for small producers
- Increased investment in small producers, their organizations and communities
- Stronger organizations for small producers
- Enhanced knowledge and capacity among small producers

---

### OUTCOMES

- Improved farming performance
- Protection of the environment and adaptation to climate change
- Enhanced benefits for small producers and their communities
- Increased influence of small producers
- Growing proportion of trade on Fairtrade terms

---

### IMPACTS

- Improved household income and standard of living
- Less risk and vulnerability
- Improved access to basic services
- Increased environmental sustainability
- Inter-generational sustainability
- Increased gender equality
- Increased dignity, confidence, control and choice
- Enhanced status of small producers
- Improved production

---

**Note:** This Theory of Change has been inspired by the Fairtrade Theory of Change designed for Small Producers Organizations

---

**Impact assessment – December 2017**
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SELECTED IMPACT

Improved household income and standards of living

SELECTED INDICATORS

- Current level of income
- Evolution of the income (last 3 years)
- Comparison of the rice price per kilo: Organic VS Organic and Fairtrade + evolution (last 3 years)
- % of producers who perceive that their economic situation has improved (last 3 years)
- % of producers who have access to certain facilities

Improved access to basic services

- % of producers’ children between 7 to 14 who currently attend primary school
- % of producers’ children who currently attend secondary education institutions
- % of producers who have access to healthcare
- % of producers who can afford to use certain health care facilities (comparison between public and private facilities)
SELECTED IMPACT

Less risk and vulnerability

SELECTED INDICATORS

• % of producers who have credit(s)
• % of producers who struggle to repay their debts
• % of producers who have savings
• % of producers who have received their payments on time
• Conditions of payment
• % of producers who are confident about their economic situation

Enhanced status of small producers

• % of producers who perceive having a good relationship with their buyers
• % of producers who perceive that they have knowledge concerning the business conditions with their buyers
• % of producers who perceive that they have the capacity to negotiate the prices
• Producers’ satisfaction concerning their relationship with their buyers
• Willingness to become a SPO
**SELECTED IMPACT**

- Increased dignity, confidence, control and choice
- Increased gender equality

**SELECTED INDICATORS**

- % of producers who are proud to be farmers
- % producers who think that gender equality is important
- % producers who think that it is important to have women in the PEB / as lead farmers
- % FT premium used for gender equality related projects
- Willingness to implement projects to foster gender equality
- % of women in the PEB
- % of women who are lead farmers
- Ability for women to dare to take stance during meetings
SELECTED IMPACT

- Inter-generational sustainability of rural communities
- Increased environmental sustainability and resilience to climate change
- Improved production

SELECTED INDICATORS

- Degree to which farmer’s children consider farming as a viable livelihood
- Degree to which farmers consider farming as a viable livelihood
- % of producers that implement sustainable practices to manage natural resources
- % of producers that re-use the organic waste of their production
- % of producers that implement practices to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- % of producers that have access to tools (focus on machines)
A meeting was also organized with the Nature Bio Food team at the beginning of the study.
Target and control group are completely different in terms of age distribution. This might have an impact on the results.

Reading: People aged between 40 and 50 years old represent 21% of Fairtrade farmers interviewed.

A majority of farmers in target and control group have been certified for 5 years or more. The impact of the certification should be visible.

Reading: 46% of Fairtrade farmers interviewed registered in 2012.
Target and control groups are completely similar regarding gender and marital status.

9/10
Farmers interviewed during this study are male.
Most of the certified lands are under men names.

1/10
Farmers interviewed during this study are female:
9% for the control group
10% for the target group

94.5%
of farmers interviewed in target or control group are married.

4%
of farmers interviewed in target or control group are single.

1.5%
of farmers interviewed in target or control group are widows-widowers.
### Family composition

**Number of children in farmers' families**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Target #</th>
<th>Control #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target**

- Min: 1
- Average: 3.5
- Max: 9

**Control**

- Min: 0
- Average: 2.5
- Max: 6

Farmers in the target group tend to have more children than in control group. It might have an impact on the results of the study (e.g. figures related to education).

Reading: 27 non-Fairtrade farmers interviewed declared that they had 2 kids.
III
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The target and the control group were very different (see part III “projects under study”)

• The Fairtrade certification was far to be the only difference between the two groups

→ Thus, the results have to be treated with caution

Comparability of the groups

Translations

• Each interview was conducted with the help of one translator.
• Each interview was done in simultaneous translation.
• The questionnaires were filled out in English by ourselves.

→ However, we cannot always assure the veracity nor the accuracy of the translated answers

Social desirability bias

• We stressed our independence and used neutral questions as much as possible but the translators all were from Nature Bio Foods. This may had an impact on the producers’ answers.

→ Thus, we cannot be sure that no social desirability bias was introduced
Quality of information

- Some farmers misunderstood or had difficulties to answer some questions, especially the questions concerning their income. Even though we tried to mitigate this problem by asking different questions to get one information, we sometimes received answers that did not seem correct.

Teenager’s influence on each other

- Teenagers could be influenced by each other during the focus group due to the group effect.
  
  ➔ It may limit the reliability of the teenagers’ answers
PROJECTS UNDER STUDY
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PROJECTS UNDER STUDY

2. CONTEXT OVERVIEW
2 projects have been under study to analyse the impact of Fairtrade.

**Ramnagar project**
Fairtrade and Organic Basmati Rice
Nainital district

**Bahraich project**
Organic Basmati Rice
Bahraich district

**1 buyer – Nature Bio-Foods**
- Nature Bio Foods is the main, most of the time unique, buyer of the studied farmers.
- It is through it that they obtain organic and Fairtrade certifications.
- They both have a 5 year contract with Nature Bio Foods.
**Organic certification:** Control Union  
**Fairtrade certification:** Max Havelaar (2011)  
**Farmers:** 988 since 2014  
**Women farmers:** 5%  

**Status of the organization:** Contract Production  
**Organization of producers:** Fair Farming Foundation (NGO), created in 2009  

**Fairtrade Premium in 2016:** 1,171,871 INR  

**Determination of the price:**  
- **Step 1** – PEB members consult farmers’ opinions through lead farmers (2 representatives in each village)  
- **Step 2** – PEB members decide of a price based on the international market and farmers’ opinions. They propose the price to Nature Bio-Foods.  
- **Step 3** – Nature Bio-Foods proposes a counteroffer.  
- **Step 4** – PEB members meet with Nature Bio-Foods and negotiate the price. The price will be the same for all the farmers.

*Note: the price determination process was explained to the research team during the study through qualitative interviews and the focus group with leaders.*
Organic certification: Food Cert

Farmers: 1000 (divided in ICS – groups of 500 organic farmers)
Women farmers: 3%

Determination of the price:
Step 1 – Farmers bring their production to the closest buying center.
Step 2 – Nature Bio Foods local team analyzes the quality.
Step 3 – Depending on the current world market and quality of the product, Nature Bio Foods local team determines the price and proposes it to farmers.
There is no guarantee of price for Bahraich farmers.

Note: the price determination process was explained to the research team during the study by Nature Bio Food local team
III
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### III – PROJECTS UNDER STUDY

#### 2. CONTEXT

**Ramnagar Project**  
*Target group*  
*State*: Uttarakhand

- **Total area**: 53,483 km²
- **Population**: 10,086,292 (2011). 0.83% of the Indian population

**Gender distribution in Uttarakhand:**
- Women: 49%
- Men: 51%

**Mountains**
- 86%

**Population rural area**
- 70%

**Population growth**
- 19%

**Hindu followers**
- 83%

**Bahraich Project**  
*Control group*  
*State*: Uttar Pradesh

- **Total area**: 240,928 km²
- **Population**: 199,812,341 (2011). 16.50% of the Indian population

**Gender distribution in Uttar Pradesh:**
- Women: 48%
- Men: 52%

**Mountains**
- Mostly plains

**Population rural area**
- 78%

**Population growth**
- 20%

**Hindu followers**
- 80%

---

**Geography**

- **New state** created in 2000, after the dissociation from Uttar Pradesh state.
- Uttarakhand faces frequent landslides damages on facilities and infrastructures and had to deal with remoted areas.
- 1st state in term of population
- 2nd state in terms of economy with a large part from agricultural sector
1st expenditure item of the Government of India.

9 education programmes (with the oldest from the 1980’s).

Right to Education Act (2009): schooling is free and compulsory for all children from 6 to 14.

Elementary education:
- Primary (6-10 year old)
- Upper primary (11-14 year old)

Secondary education:
- Secondary (14-16 year old)
- Higher/senior secondary (16-18 year old).

**National Context**

India

**Literacy rate**: 78.82% (2011)

**Literacy rate in rural areas**: 76.31% (2011)

**Gender distribution for literacy rate in Uttar Pradesh rural areas**:
- Women: 48%
- Men: 76%

**Gender distribution for literacy rate in Uttarakhand rural areas**:
- Women: 66%
- Men: 87%

**Ramnagar Project**

Target group

Uttarakhand

**Bahraich Project**

Control group

Uttar Pradesh

**Literacy rate**: 67.68% (2011)

**Literacy rate in rural areas**: 65.46% (2011)
India’s constitution guarantees free healthcare for all its citizens. State-owned health care facilities provide free health care for those below the poverty line. However, the public sector is often considered to have poor quality of care and can be also far away.

The private healthcare sector is responsible for the majority of health care in India:

- 70% of households in urban areas
- 63% of households in rural areas

Most of the health care expenses are paid out of pocket by people rather than through health insurance.

Declared chronic illness*

General: 88.4%
Rural areas: 86.2%

Average number of people for 1 Sub Centre** in Rural Areas:
3,110 - 4,045 people

Declared chronic illness*

General: 95.3%
Rural areas: 95.0%

Average number of people for 1 Sub Centre** in Rural Areas:
5,802 - 15,520 people

* Having any kind of symptoms of chronic illness and sought medical care
** Sub Centre: the most basic health center in India.
India invests almost $2.5 billion each year through 6 different programs to improve water supply in rural areas.

96% of the rural population has a tap or a well at a reasonable distance from their homes. Most of the water supply and sanitation systems in rural areas have been implemented by state-owned agencies.

But a lot of problems have arisen: maintenance, quality, dryness …

World Bank Project and numerous policies to increase water and toilet accessibility

1st state with decentralized approach on its entire territory. Gram Panchayats* are in charge of water facilities.

97% of sustainable toilet coverage

According to NBF staff the access to water in rural areas in Uttar Pradesh is worse than in rural areas in Uttarakhand.

However, we could not find official documents to support this statement.

* local governance infrastructure
8 electricity programs. The main one: “Power for All” program.

However, most of the time, Indian government cannot implement projects alone, it needs other shareholders:

- states governments,
- communities,
- companies,
- NGOs (…)

→ As a result, there is an unequal action on the territory.

"The power situation in Uttarakhand is not that bad with most villages connected to the grid and getting electric supply for more than 15 hours a day"

3rd state in the country selected for the "Power for All" program.

Household without electricity (2011)
General: 13%
Rural areas: 17%

According to NBF staff the access to electricity in rural areas in Uttar Pradesh is worse than in rural areas in Uttarakhand.

However, we could not find official documents to support this statement.
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**IV – RESULTS PER IMPACT**

**VISUAL CUES AND LEGEND**

**Visual cues throughout the presentation**

**Full length at the top of the slide:** Main conclusion of the slide

- **Positive impact or result**
- **Inconclusive impact or result**
- **Observation, data reporting**

**Inside the slide:** Explanation of the result

- **Results – impact – lecture of number or of a graph**
- **Lecture of number or a graph for control group only**
- **Useful information, explanation regarding the context**
- **Remarks or reminder of information that could impact the results.**

**Colors for comparison between target and control group**

- Dark green refers to target group
- Light green refers to control group

**Colors for comparison between gender**

- Orange refers to female group
- Light brown refers to male group

Impact assessment – December 2017
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### INCOME

**Organic basmati rice**

In average non-Fairtrade farmers have a bigger rice income.

---

**How much money did you get by selling your rice this year?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min</strong></td>
<td>3,165 INR</td>
<td>20,000 INR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td>40,135 INR</td>
<td>136,132 INR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN</strong></td>
<td>26,750 INR</td>
<td>66,000 INR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max</strong></td>
<td>273,000 INR</td>
<td>2,240,250 INR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since **both groups have very eclectic results** (huge gap between the minimum and the maximum income), it’s recommended to compare the **medians**.

---

Rice income depends on the production capacity, the size of the land, but also on climatic and geographic aspects. It is essential to keep that in mind. These first results don’t mean that Fairtrade has no economic impact.

**Geographical contexts** were very different and could have a great **impact on these results**.

**Fairtrade farmers are dealing with:**

- Smaller lands and production capacities,
- A different environment (mountains),
- The risk of destruction of their productions by wild animals…

---

Reading: 50% of the Fairtrade farmers have a rice income equal or lower than 26,750 INR in 2017 whereas 50% of non-Fairtrade have a rice income equal or lower than 66,000 INR in 2017.

---

Impact assessment – December 2017
Non-Fairtrade farmers are able to produce more organic basmati rice than Fairtrade farmers.

This result impacts the previous results regarding the income: Fairtrade farmers are producing less than non-Fairtrade farmers so they can sell less rice and their incomes are lower.

For complementary figures concerning selling and use of production, please consult the attached excel files.

95% of non-Fairtrade farmers produced 1 000 kg or more in 2017.

39% of Fairtrade farmers produced 1 000 kg or more in 2017.

Reading: 10% of Fairtrade farmers produced between 2000 and 5000 kg of Organic Basmati rice in 2017 while 56% of non-Fairtrade farmers did.
Reading: 50% of the Fairtrade farmers that produced between 2000kg and 5000kg have a rice income equal or higher to 96,000 INR in 2017 whereas 50% of non-Fairtrade with the same production capacity have a rice income equal or higher to 79,600 INR.

The median rice income of Fairtrade farmers that produce between 500 kg and 1000 kg is **16% higher** than the one of non-Fairtrade farmers with the same production capacity.

**Impact assessment – December 2017**
The price of Fairtrade and organic basmati rice is always higher than the one non-Fairtrade and organic. However, the gap is decreasing.

The gap between Fairtrade and non-Fairtrade price is reducing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gap Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fairtrade price is always **higher by 2 to 4 INR / kg.**

Variations of price in the target group are due to farmers’ mistakes since their price is fixed.

Variations of price in the control group happened more often.

In fact, the price is based on the quality of the rice and the international market. The price is always fluctuating.

**Reading:** In 2017, the price of Fairtrade and Organic Basmati rice was 35 INR / kg while it was 33 INR / kg for non-Fairtrade but Organic Basmati rice.
72% of Fairtrade farmers declared that they can sometimes have another source of income than rice.

85% of non-Fairtrade farmers declared that they can sometimes have another source of income than rice.

Nature Bio Foods team is encouraging Fairtrade farmers to diversify their activities in order to reduce their dependence on rice.

Non-Fairtrade farmers have more chances to have another source of income besides rice.

Reading: 72% of Fairtrade farmers declared to have other sources of income than rice while 85% of non-Fairtrade farmers did.
What are your other sources of income?

- **Target**
  - Agriculture: 62%
  - Livestock farming: 11%
  - Salary job: 20%
  - Shop: 3%
  - Family help: 3%
  - Pension: 0%
  - Other: 1%

- **Control**
  - Agriculture: 85%
  - Livestock farming: 8%
  - Salary job: 3%
  - Shop: 1%
  - Family help: 1%
  - Pension: 0%
  - Other: 0%

**Reading**: 62% of Fairtrade farmers declared to have an other source of income in the agricultural sector while 85% of non Fairtrade farmers did.

**Impact assessment – December 2017**

**38%** of Fairtrade farmers that have other sources of income find them in other sectors than agriculture.

**Nature Bio Foods team is encouraging Fairtrade farmers to diversify their activities in order to reduce their dependence on rice.**

**15%** of non-Fairtrade farmers that have other sources of income find them in other sectors than agriculture.
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1. HOUSEHOLD INCOME AND STANDARD OF LIVING

STANDARD OF LIVING

Living conditions

□ Fairtrade farmers are more to declare having good living conditions.

How do you feel about your living conditions ?
(0: very bad – 10 : very good)

Target

Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% of the Fairtrade farmers gave a mark equal or superior to 8

Whereas 50% of the non-Fairtrade farmers gave a mark equal or superior to 5

Fairtrade farmers cumulate 72% of positive answers* to this question
*marks superior to 5

Non-Fairtrade farmers cumulate 37% of positive answers* to this question
*marks superior to 5

Reading : On the total of the Fairtrade farmers who answered to this question, 32% gave a mark of 10

Impact assessment – December 2017

Target | Control
---|---
AVERAGE | 7.6 | 5.8
MEDIAN | 8 | 5
Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers who answered to this question, 31% said they have loans (at least one).

In the target group, Fairtrade farmers told us in some villages that they had toilets at home or drinking water facilities for only 1 or 2 years, thanks to governmental programs.

Hand pump is a system to bring underground water up to the surface. It is really different from running water which comes from the village network, is distributed by the government and is already filtered.

In the control group, non-Fairtrade farmers often owned a hand pump (they were considering this water as tap and drinking water). We had to change their answers into « hand pump » when we cleaned the database.

The economic situation of the two states is very different, as well as the action of the government
### Access to facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap water</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand pump</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartphone</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fridge</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fairtrade farmers have:**
- **2.5 times** more access to toilet
- **17.4 times** more access to tap water
- **5.4 times** more access to drinking water
- **1.5 times** more access to electricity
- **1.2 times** more access to a phone
- **4.4 times** more access to a fridge

...than non-Fairtrade farmers

---

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers, 99 said they had toilets at home. They are 39 within the non-Fairtrade farmers group.
There is no difference between the two groups.

How is your access to machines (0-10)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target: AVERAGE = 6.9, MEDIAN = 8
Control: AVERAGE = 7.4, MEDIAN = 8

Some farmers had a center in their villages, where they could rent machines.

There was one in Kotabagh for example, which was opened thanks to the Fairtrade Premium*

*See the presentation of NBF in appendix

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 8% gave a mark of 10. They are 18% within the non-Fairtrade farmers
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Children of Fairtrade farmers are all going to primary school.

How many of your children between 6 and 14 years old go to school?

- Target: 100% of children of Fairtrade farmers go to school.
- Control: 87% of children go to school.

Although primary education is declared free and compulsory by the Indian government, the education system is managed by local governments. Geographical differences between the target and control groups involve a bias to Max Havelaar’s advantage, as Uttarakhand state seems to have a better education system and schooling rate than Uttar Pradesh.

Reading: 100% of Fairtrade farmers declared that all of their children between 6 and 14 years old are going to school whereas 87% of Non-Fairtrade farmers did.
Children of Fairtrade farmers are more attending secondary education schools.

How many of your children above 15 years old go to school?

- **Target**: 84% declared that almost all or all of their children above 15 years old are going to school.
- **Control**: 72% declared that almost all or all of their children above 15 years old are going to school.

Education above 15 years-old is not obligatory. We will design it as “secondary education”.

69 Fairtrade farmers and only 39 non-Fairtrade farmers have children between 15 and 28 years old.

Reading: 68% of Fairtrade farmers declared that all of their children above 15 years old are going to high school or above.
Fairtrade farmers declare more being healthy.

Would you say that you and your family are healthy?
(0: completely disagree – 10: completely agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fairtrade farmers cumulate 86% of positive answers to this question
Non-Fairtrade farmers cumulate 65% of positive answers to this question

Reading: 33% of Fairtrade farmers gave a 10 mark out of 10 for their health while 26% of non-Fairtrade farmers did.

Impact assessment – December 2017
Fairtrade farmers declare being more able to have access to health facilities.

Would you say that you have access to any kind of health facilities? (0: completely disagree – 10: completely agree)

Fairtrade farmers cumulate 69% of positive answers to this question

Non-Fairtrade farmers cumulate 48% of positive answers to this question

Geographical differences have a great influence on this question:
1. A significant part of Fairtrade farmers are living in the mountains, far always from any health facilities.
2. Uttarakhand seems to have a better health system.
Fairtrade farmers declare being more able to afford better health facilities.

What kind of health facilities can you afford?

**Fairtrade farmers**
- For minor problem, we go to government hospital. But for bigger issues, we go to private one.
- For normal problems, we are ok. For big problems, we would have to sell buffalos. I would sell everything for my family.

61% of Fairtrade farmers declare that they can afford private health facilities

**Non-Fairtrade farmers**
- I would prefer to get medicine in the village first and then go see a doctor.
- I can only go to government hospital. I don’t have enough money for private ones!
- It is for this reason only that we took a loan.

31% of non-Fairtrade farmers declare that they can afford private health facilities

Reading: 39% of Fairtrade farmers declared using public health facilities while 64% of non-Fairtrade farmers declared the same.
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RISK AND VULNERABILITY

IV – RESULTS PER IMPACT

3. RISK AND VULNERABILITY

Financial independence

Fairtrade farmers have less loans.

Do you have any loans?

- Target
- Control

Yes

No

31% 37%

69% 63%

6-pt difference

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers who answered to this question, 31% said they have loans (at least one)
There is a significant difference for farmers between 30 and 50, and 70+ years old.

- **Target - Yes** vs **Target - No**
  - [20-30] 17% vs 83%
  - [30-40] 10% vs 90%
  - [40-50] 38% vs 62%
  - [50-60] 37% vs 63%
  - [60-70] 33% vs 67%
  - >70 20% vs 80%

- **Control - Yes** vs **Control - No**
  - [20-30] 20% vs 80%
  - [30-40] 34% vs 66%
  - [40-50] 60% vs 40%
  - [50-60] 40% vs 60%
  - [60-70] 27% vs 73%
  - >70 56% vs 44%

Reading: On the total of Fairtrade farmers between 40-50 years old who answered to this question, 38% said they have loans. They are 60% within the non Fairtrade farmers group.
There is a significant difference within the female farmers group. Fairtrade female farmers have less loans. There is almost no difference for the male farmers.

**Do you have loans?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target - Female</th>
<th>Control - Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 pt difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Female Fairtrade farmers have 2 times less loans**

The number of women interviewed is small: 10 for the Fairtrade farmers and 9 for the non-Fairtrade farmers

Reading: On the total of Fairtrade farmers female who answered to this question, 30% said they have loans. They are 67% within the non Fairtrade farmers group.
**RISK AND VULNERABILITY**

Capacity of repayment

---

**Fairtrade farmers are more able to repay their loans on time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very frequently</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rarely</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you repay your loans on time?**

- **Target**
  - Always: 86%
  - Very frequently: 10%
  - Often: 3%
  - Occasionally: 6%
  - Rarely: 0%
  - Very rarely: 12%
  - Never: 44%

- **Control**
  - Always: 29%
  - Very frequently: 0%
  - Often: 0%
  - Occasionally: 6%
  - Rarely: 9%
  - Very rarely: 12%
  - Never: 0%

**Target**
- Average: 9.7
- Median: 10

**Control**
- Average: 3.7
- Median: 2

---

**Reading:** On the total of the Fairtrade farmers who answered this question, 77% said they are able to save money. They are 62% within the non-Fairtrade farmers.
Fairtrade farmers have more able to save money.

Are you able to save money?

- Yes: Target 77%, Control 62% (15-pt difference)
- No: Target 17%, Control 32%
- Depends: Target 6%, Control 6%

Fairtrade farmers are 1.25 times more able to save money.

**AVERAGE (amount of savings per year)**
- Target: 44,110 INR
- Control: 42,895 INR

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers who answered to this question, 77% said they are able to save money. They are 62% within the non-Fairtrade farmers.

Impact assessment – December 2017
There is a significant difference for farmers between 40 and 60 years old.

**Savings : age**

**Target** - Yes | Target - No | Target - Depends
---|---|---
[20-30] 83% | 17% | 0%
[30-40] 80% | 20% | 0%
[40-50] 76% | 24% | 0%
[50-60] 87% | 7% | 7%
[60-70] 63% | 22% | 15%
>70 80% | 20% | 0%

**Control** - Yes | Control - No | Control - Depends
---|---|---
[20-30] 75% | 20% | 5%
[30-40] 79% | 21% | 0%
[40-50] 60% | 27% | 13%
[50-60] 47% | 47% | 7%
[60-70] 55% | 36% | 9%
>70 67% | 22% | 11%

**Impact assessment – December 2017**

*Reading:* On the total of Fairtrade farmers between 40-50 years old, who answered to this question, 76% said they are able to save money. They are 27% within the non Fairtrade farmers.
There is a significant difference within the female farmers. Fairtrade female farmers are more able to save.

**Are you able to save money?**

- **Target - Female**: 80% Yes, 33% No
- **Control - Female**: 67% Yes, 20% No

**47 pt difference**

- **Target - Male**: 76% Yes, 17% No
- **Control - Male**: 64% Yes, 29% No

Female Fairtrade farmers are **2.7 times more** able to save money

---

The number of women interviewed is small: 10 for the Fairtrade farmers and 9 for the non-Fairtrade farmers.

Reading: On the total of Fairtrade farmers female who answered to this question, 80% said they are able to save money. They are 33% within the non Fairtrade farmers.
When do you get paid by your buyers (in days) ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conditions of payments were diversified (by cash or by cheque).
By cash, the payment is immediate.
By cheque, it can take some days.

Some farmers answered by giving the numbers of days it takes to get the money on their bank accounts, not to have the payment from the buyer.

Fairtrade farmers:
- I receive the payment by cash, in a day.
- I get a cheque and then it can take 3 or 4 days for the payment to come.

Reading: In average, Fairtrade farmers receive their payment within 5,6 days
Since 2015, how many payments were on time? (maximum of 3 payments)

- **Target:**
  - 1. On time: 90%
  - 2. One time late: 2%
  - 3. Three time late: 3%
  - 4. No answer: 5%

- **Control:**
  - 1. On time: 95%
  - 2. One time late: 5%

There is no difference between the two groups. The two groups had the same buyer.

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers who answered to this question, 90% said they had their last 3 payments on time.
How do you see your economic situation in the future?

**Target**
- 14%: Very much improved
- 31%: Much improved
- 50%: Minimally improved
- 2%: Same
- 2%: Minimally worse
- 1%: No answer

**Control**
- 8%: Very much improved
- 34%: Much improved
- 53%: Minimally improved
- 2%: Same
- 2%: Minimally worse
- 1%: No answer

Fairtrade farmers are more optimistic about their future economic situation.

Fairtrade farmers cumulate 95% of positive answers to this question.

Non-Fairtrade farmers cumulate 62% of positive answers.

Fairtrade farmers answered 1.5 times more positively to this question.

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 2% said their economic situation will be the same in the future. They are 34% within the non-Fairtrade farmers group.
There is a significant difference in the distribution of the answers. The Fairtrade farmers answers are more positive than the non-Fairtrade farmes ones.

How do you see your economic situation in the future?

- **1. Very much improved**: 1% Target, 8% Control
- **2. Much improved**: 14% Target, 49% Control
- **3. Minimally improved**: 53% Target, 31% Control
- **4. Same**: 34% Target, 2% Control
- **5. Minimally worse**: 0% Target, 1% Control
- **6. Much worse**: 2% Target, 2% Control
- **No answer**: 0% Target, 2% Control

**93% of the answers for « Very much improved » are from Fairtrade farmers’ answers.**

**86% of the answers for « Much improved » are from Fairtrade farmers’ answers.**

**64% of the answers for « Minimally improved » are from non-Fairtrade farmers’ answers.**

**94% of the answers for « Same » are from non-Fairtrade farmers’ answers.**

Reading: On the total of Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 31% said their economic situation will be minimally improved in the future, which represents 38% of the total of the answers for « Minimally improved ».
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**Knowledge about the buyers**

Fairtrade farmers have more knowledge about their buyers.

Who are your buyers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knows</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not able to say</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Good answer**

Nature Bio Foods

**Bad answer**

- Wrong name of the company
- « Company »
- Name of the local staff
- Fair farming
- Fairtrade buyer

Fairtrade farmers are **1.3 times more able** to tell the name of their buyer.

Impact assessment – December 2017

**Reading**: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 63% gave an exact answer to the question.
Do you think that you have knowledge concerning the business conditions with your buyers?

Target
- 8% Excellent
- 25% Very good
- 18% Moderately
- 1% Few
- 1% Not at all
- 2% No answer

Control
- 5% Excellent
- 11% Very good
- 24% Moderately
- 1% Few
- 2% Not at all
- 57% No answer

Fairtrade farmers answered the most « very good » to this question.

Non-Fairtrade farmers answered the most « few » to this question.

54% of the Fairtrade farmers answered positively to this question, while they are only 13% within the Non-Fairtrade farmers group.

Fairtrade farmers have answered 4.1 times more positively to this question.

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 46% said they have very good knowledge about the business conditions with their buyers.
**IV – RESULTS PER IMPACT**

**4. INFLUENCE AND STATUS**

**ENHANCED INFLUENCE AND STATUS OF SMALL PRODUCERS**

**Capacity to negotiate**

**Fairtrade farmers are more to declare having the capacity to negotiate**

Would you say that you are able to negotiate the price offered by your buyers?

- **Target**
  - 1% completely disagree
  - 5% disagree
  - 16% neither agree nor disagree
  - 23% agree
  - 55% completely agree

- **Control**
  - 2% completely disagree
  - 8% disagree
  - 27% neither agree nor disagree
  - 7% agree
  - 56% completely agree

**71%** of the Fairtrade farmers answered positively to this question, while they are **56%** within the Non-Fairtrade farmers group.

Fairtrade farmers have answered **1.3 times more** positively to this question.

Fairtrade farmers cumulate **78%** of positive answers.

Non-Fairtrade farmers cumulate **56%** of positive answers.

*Reading*: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 16% said they completely agree with the statement.

Impact assessment – December 2017
Fairtrade farmers are a majority to know what a Small Producer Organization (SPO) is:

Do you know what is a SPO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. A little
- 3. No

- 40% Yes
- 32% A little
- 28% No

Fairtrade farmers cumulate 72% of positive answers

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 37% said they know what is a SPO and gave a good definition.

Impact assessment – December 2017
Willingness to become a SPO

If they know what a SPO is, Fairtrade farmers are a majority to want to be part of one:

Do you want to be part of a SPO?
(0: not at all – 10: of course)

- Fairtrade farmers are 45% to answer positively to this question
- 50% of Fairtrade farmers gave a mark superior or equal to 8
- 62 farmers answered to this question (only within the farmers who knew what was a SPO)

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 18% gave a mark of 10 out of 10 at the question.
The more farmers know what a SPO is, the more they want to be part of one:

Do you want to be part of a SPO? (0 : not at all – 10 : of course)

- **35 farmers knew what is a SPO**
  - AVERAGE: 7.3
  - MEDIAN: 8

- **25 farmers knew a little what is a SPO**
  - AVERAGE: 6.4
  - MEDIAN: 7

Reading: On the total of farmers who knew what a SPO is, 28% gave a mark of 8 out of 10 to this question.
### Willingness to become a SPO

#### Reasons to become or not a SPO:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the decision-taking process</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give benefits for the community</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with empowerment of farmers</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide facilities</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with community-making</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve economic situation</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual situation is good</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already have difficulties to solve</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too difficult to take decisions together</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much work</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ready</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasons for a positive answer**

- We would have more ability to negotiate the price
- Benefits will go to all farmers in the village
- It will help to get additional income and support
- We could collectively bargain
- It would enable to share knowledge between farmers

**Neutral**

- Actual situation is good

**Reasons for a negative answer**

- We are small groups of farmers with already a lot of conflicts
- The job of a farmer is to produce, not to sell
- We are not ready, we need the help of NBF

---

Reading: On the total of farmers who answered to this question, « Provide facilities » was mentioned in 9% of the cases and « Too much work » in 4% of the cases.
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IV – RESULTS PER IMPACT

DIGNITY, CONFIDENCE, CONTROL AND CHOICE

Pride to be a farmer

Fairtrade farmers declare being more proud of their profession

How proud are you to be a farmer? (0: completely disagree – 10: completely agree)

Target % | Control %
---|---
No answer | 2% | 3%
10 | 33% | 60%
9 | 4% | 11%
8 | 10% | 14%
7 | 2% | 5%
6 | 3% | 3%
5 | 5% | 24%
4 | 1% | 6%
3 | 1% | 5%
2 | 0% | 4%
1 | 1% | 2%
0 | 0% | 0%

90% of Fairtrade farmers answered positively this question.
56% of non-Fairtrade farmers answered positively to this question.

Fairtrade farmer
Farmer is the one that can feed. It is a fortune to have a land and grow what you want. As much as we work, we have great health and we eat whatever we want.

Non-Fairtrade farmer
I’m proud to be organic because I’m able to pay the education of my children. I don’t depend on others. And no begging.

Impact assessment – December 2017

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers who answered to this question, almost 60% gave a mark of 10 while only 33% of non-Fairtrade farmers did.
### DIGNITY, CONFIDENCE, CONTROL AND CHOICE

#### Pride to be a farmer

However opinions are very diverse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive opinion</th>
<th>Negative opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairtrade Farmers</td>
<td>Agriculture is not a profitable profession. Better amount of money and easier life with government job. We are struggling to survive with agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmers work hard and are not getting a good respect in society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I'm independent. In jobs, there is no freedom so I'm happy to be farmer.”</td>
<td>“I should be proud but there are so many problems of being a farmer. If I was prime minister I would feel very proud. Here I'm middle proud. There is no other alternative for me.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Agriculture is the base of the economy and food is needed for everybody.”</td>
<td>“We are the one who produce the food for all. It's a good profession.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“All the world depends on the farmers. Nothing is possible without them.”</td>
<td>“Farming enables you to be in good physical condition and to do hard work.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Agriculture is the base of the economy and food is needed for everybody.”</td>
<td>“Whatever I am, it is only because of farming.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact assessment – December 2017
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Generalities on the qualitative interviews and the gender distribution in the Producer Executive Body (PEB).

Even if women represent 25% of the PEB today, it was not easy to include them. In fact, NBF team explained that normally only people who have land registered under their name could become a member of the Board. But since it was complicated for women, NBF broadened the possibility to become a PEB member to all women farmers members of the Ramnagar project.

Information on the 2 qualitative interviews:

- Both are representatives since the beginning of the project (2011).
- Both studied more than compulsory education.
- Both were already active in organic farming before the beginning of the Fairtrade Contract Production project in Ramnagar.
- Both are very proud of their activities.

The “women perception” part is only based on 2 qualitative interviews (1 woman PEB member and 1 woman lead farmer), observations during data collection and 1 focus group. It is only indicative information.
Fairtrade women farmers declare feeling confident during meeting or in their role as representatives

**Women PEB member**

I organize a lot of meetings to get connected with the company and to offer to farmers to take on producing basmati rice.

Then, we meet and discuss about the proposals. But, I’m confident to say yes or no when it is needed in meeting.

Now, I can sit with the company to negotiate the price. From the beginning, I’m capable to compare the price in time. But we have to be careful and well informed because basmati rice cannot be compared with rice on the local market.

[I] have to address and present the problem in the meeting. But there are so many issues taken to the PEB that it is difficult. So [I] need to see what are the things that are possible and what are the priorities. And then, [I] have to convert the answers to farmers.

**Women lead farmer**

I think that I have more convincing skills and farming skills [since I became a lead farmer].

It’s very difficult to fight the stereotypes and to teach farmers new methods.

At the beginning, farmers were reluctant about me but now they trust me.

I’m trying to teach these techniques to the farmers. At the beginning, it was very challenging to teach to the farmers.

I had to convince farmers that these new techniques can work. Once they are convinced, farmers are willing to implement these new techniques. To convince them, I proposed to farmers to try composting on a small place by collecting their home waste.

During the focus group, women rarely spoke up their mind. Never took the lead, only gave comments.
**INCREASED GENDER EQUALITY**

**Perception of gender equity**

Fairtrade farmers declare more than non-Fairtrade farmers that women should work outside home.

**How important is it for a woman to work outside home?**

(0: not important – 10: very important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Fairtrade (Target %)</th>
<th>Fairtrade (Control %)</th>
<th>Non-Fairtrade (Target %)</th>
<th>Non-Fairtrade (Control %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fairtrade</th>
<th>Non-Fairtrade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEDIAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fairtrade</th>
<th>Non-Fairtrade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fairtrade farmers cumulate 80% of positive answers to this question. Non-Fairtrade farmers cumulate 15% of positive answers to this question.

**Reading:** 51% of Fairtrade farmers gave a 10 mark out of 10 for this question while 6% of non-Fairtrade farmers did.

**Reading Median:** 50% of the Fairtrade farmers gave a 10 mark. Whereas 50% of non-Fairtrade gave a mark equal or superior to 2.

**Considering how multi-factorial gender equality is, these results can not be attributed to Fairtrade activity only. Cultural differences between the two groups should also be considered.**
Fairtrade farmers believe less that it is more important for men to earn money than for women.

Is it more important for men to earn money than for women?

![Bar chart showing the perception of gender equity among Fairtrade farmers and non-Fairtrade farmers.](chart.png)

Fairtrade farmers answered « No » 2.2 times more than non-Fairtrade farmers.

Considering how multi-factorial gender equality is, these results can not be attributed to Fairtrade activity only. Cultural differences between the two groups should also be considered.

Reading : On the total of Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 52% said that it is not more important for men to earn money than for women. They are 23% within the non Fairtrade farmers group.
**6. GENDER EQUALITY**

**INCREASED GENDER EQUALITY**

Perception of gender equity

---

Fairtrade farmers believe more that both women and men are capable to lead.

---

Who is the most capable to lead?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target %</th>
<th>Control %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fairtrade farmers answered « Both » 1.5 times more than non-Fairtrade farmers.

Considering how multi-factorial gender equality is, these results can not be attributed to Fairtrade activity only. Cultural differences between the two groups should also be considered.

---

94% of Fairtrade farmers consider women as potential leaders.

49% of non-Fairtrade farmers consider women as potential leaders.

Reading: 66% of Fairtrade farmers answered “both” to this question while 44% of non-Fairtrade farmers did.

Impact assessment – December 2017
Most of the Fairtrade farmers believe that it is important to have women as representatives.

How important is it to have women in the PEB?

How important is it to have women as lead farmers?

These 2 questions were only asked to the target group.

Farmers’ answers to the 2 different questions are almost all the time the same. There might be a confusion in the definition of lead farmer or PEB member.

Fairtrade farmers cumulate 84% of positive answers to these questions.

Impact assessment – December 2017
Among all projects on which the Fairtrade premium has been used, 55% were to improve the production.

9% of projects on which the Fairtrade Premium has been used are related to gender equality. This information comes from data given by NBF local team in Ramnagar.

Projects to foster gender equality are not a priority for the Fairtrade farmers.

Geographical reality has to be considered regarding this issue. Most of Fairtrade farmers in Ramnagar project are living in isolated areas or inside a national park. Protection of the land against wild animals is THE priority since one incident can destroy the whole production and considerably reduce farmers’ income.

Impact assessment – December 2017

Reading: Among all projects on which the Fairtrade premium has been used, 55% were to improve the production.
Projects to foster gender equality are not a priority for the Fairtrade farmers.

In the future, how should the Fairtrade premium be used?

- Children oriented projects
- Health oriented projects
- Village improvement projects
- Production oriented projects (protection of land)
- Production oriented projects (water)
- Production oriented projects (other)
- Woman oriented projects
- Renewable energy projects

This question was only asked to the target group.

Only 3% of uses evoked by Fairtrade farmers are related to gender equality.

Geographical reality has to be considered regarding this issue. Most of Fairtrade farmers in Ramnagar project are living in isolated areas or inside a national park. Protection of the land against wild animals is THE priority since one incident can destroy the whole production and considerably reduce farmers’ income.

Reading: 67% of possibilities to use Fairtrade premium suggested by farmers were oriented towards projects to improve the production.
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Reading: On the total of Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 22% would not recommend to their children to become farmers. They are 35% within the non Fairtrade farmers.
IV – RESULTS PER IMPACT

7. INTER-GENERATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY

INTER-GENERATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY OF RURAL COMMUNITIES

Farming as a viable livelihood

There are some slight differences between the two groups.

Why would you recommend or not to your children to become farmers?

- Children's choice: 67% of answers regarding "Children's choice" are from Fairtrade farmers.
- Non-sufficient money: 63% of answers regarding “Non sufficient money” are from non-Fairtrade farmers.
- Lack of opportunity: 69% of answers regarding “Lack of opportunity” (no choice) are from non-Fairtrade farmers.
- Children's choice: 84% of answers regarding “Children's choice” are from Fairtrade farmers.
- Feeding responsibility: 84% of answers regarding “Feeding responsibility” are from Fairtrade farmers.

Reading: 26% of Fairtrade farmers said that it is their children’s choice to become or not farmer while 13% of non-Fairtrade farmers did.
Opinions and reasons are very diverse:

**Fairtrade Farmers**

It is up to them. They should learn and then decide.

They should associated themselves to farming. They can do any job but they should keep farming on the ancestor land.

Farming is an opportunity to work with healthy weather and way of life. Always good to be associated to farming along with a job.

Obviously if they have time along with their studies they will learn about the field. Job is still better if they have no time. If they do, they should do farming along.

Climate is changing. Children are educated so they should work in the private sector.

**Non-Fairtrade Farmers**

I want my children to be more educated and earn more than me.

First I'll give preferences to job and monthly paid. Pay is too uncertain in agriculture.

I have to invest to give the possibility for my child. But if they become farmers it would be nice.

First they should focus on education then do jobs along with farming. They should study hard and then do systematic farming.

I'll tell my children: “First go to school, get education and then learn agriculture. But this is our ancestors property, you cannot leave it. Plus, agriculture is essential for society.”
There is a significant difference for farmers between 20 and 40, and 50-60 years old.

Would you recommend to your children to become farmers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Depends %</th>
<th>No Answer %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;70</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;70</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact assessment – December 2017

Reading: On the total of Fairtrade farmers between 50-60 years old who answered to this question, 33% said they would recommend becoming farmer. They are 60% within the non-Fairtrade farmers group.
Farming as a viable livelihood: gender

Fairtrade female farmers tend to hesitate to recommend farming to their children compared to non-Fairtrade female farmers. Male farmers have more similar answers but Fairtrade ones are less to dissuade their children to become farmers.

Would you recommend to your children to become farmers?

- **Female Target %**
  - Yes: 78%
  - No: 11%
  - Depends: 11%
  - No Answer: 0%

- **Female Control %**
  - Yes: 50%
  - No: 10%
  - Depends: 0%
  - No Answer: 0%

**39 pt difference**

- **Male Target %**
  - Yes: 39%
  - No: 24%
  - Depends: 38%
  - No Answer: 2%

- **Male Control %**
  - Yes: 36%
  - No: 24%
  - Depends: 24%
  - No Answer: 2%

**14 pt difference**

The number of women interviewed is small: 10 for Fairtrade farmers and 9 for non-Fairtrade farmers.

Men Fairtrade farmers declare 1.6 times less that they would not recommend farming to their children.

Reading: On the total of women Fairtrade farmers who answered to this question, 50% said they might or might not (depends) recommend farming to their children.
Children of Fairtrade farmers do not see farming as a viable profession.

**Children perception**

**Teens tend to like farming and have a good view of it**
- A few teens evoked the possibility to work in agriculture field (scientist or farmers).
- A majority of teens helps their parents in the farm and likes it.
- A majority of teens believes that their parents love farming.

**But Farming is not considered as an attractive profession**
- A majority of teens doesn’t have dreamed jobs related to farming.
- Teens don’t consider farming as an attractive profession because:
  - Income is low
  - Being a farmer is not well-seen in society

**Teens are able to describe the advantages of farming**
- You are healthy
- You can get fresh food
- You can understand nature
- You are always outside

**A majority of teens doesn’t have dreamed jobs related to farming**

**Impact assessment – December 2017**

A huge majority of teens didn't know what Fairtrade is. These results are only based on 1 focus group in 1 village with 23 teens. They cannot be consider as a generality.
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There is a problem with water and it will go worse because the activities of humans are increasing; water and river will get dry – Fairtrade farmer

With the carbon emissions of factories: temperature increases and there is an impact on farming – Fairtrade farmer

Seasons are changing – Fairtrade farmer

There is no rain or too much rain
The extreme weather is impacting the growth of the plants – Non-Fairtrade farmer

There are new and more insects – Non-Fairtrade farmer

The two groups were not in the same state. The climate and its perception by farmers can be different.

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 93% said that climate change has an impact. They are 83% within the non-Fairtrade group.
Fairtrade farmers between 20 and 40 years old, and 60+ years old are more aware of climate change.

Do you think that global warming has an impact on your activity?

- Target - Yes
- Target - No
- Target - Do not know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Target - Yes</th>
<th>Target - No</th>
<th>Target - Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[20-30]</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[30-40]</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[40-50]</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[50-60]</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[60-70]</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;70</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Control - Yes</th>
<th>Control - No answer</th>
<th>Control - No</th>
<th>Control - Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[20-30]</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[30-40]</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[40-50]</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[50-60]</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[60-70]</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;70</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers between 30 and 40 years old interviewed, 100% said that climate change has an impact. They are 76% within the non-Fairtrade group.
Fairtrade farmers are more to declare having water-efficient practices.

Do you have practices that are water-efficient?

**Target**

- **Yes**: 83%
- **No**: 16%
- **Do not know**: 1%

**Control**

- **Yes**: 57%
- **No**: 43%
- **Do not know**: 0%

**26-pt difference**

Fairtrade farmers declare 1.5 times more to have water-efficient practices.

*Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 83% said they have water-efficient practices. They are 57% within the non-Fairtrade group.*

Impact assessment – December 2017
Fairtrade farmers between 30 and 50 years old and 60 to 70 years old claim having more water-efficient practices.

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers between 30 and 40 years old interviewed, 90% said they are having water-efficient practices. They are 55% within the non-Fairtrade group.

Impact assessment – December 2017
System of rice intensification (SRI)

SRI involves a set of farming practices (organic fertilisers, 20 cm of space between plants, young transplantation of the seedlings…) which helps to increase productivity and at the same time reduce inputs of seeds, water and labour.

Alternative wetting and drying method (AWD)

The AWD practice involves periodic drying and reflooding of the rice field. It saves water and reduces greenhouse gas emissions while maintaining fields.

Bunds

By building bunds along the contour lines, water runoff is slowed down, which leads to increased water infiltration and enhanced soil moisture.

Water tank

An installation to collect the rain

Fairtrade Farmers were using SRI and AWD methods, which are more complex.

Source: NBF guide – Organic basmati rice
Reese of organic waste

There is no difference between the two groups.

Do you reuse the organic waste of your production?

- **Target**
  - Yes: 99%
  - No: 1%

- **Control**
  - Yes: 100%
  - No: 0%

Farmers reuse the organic waste to:
- Feed their cattle
- Do manure
- Do compost

More than an environmental aspect, there is an *economical advantage* to reuse the waste of the production, which might explain why so many farmers are doing it.

**Reading**: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 99% said they reuse their organic waste. They are 100% within the non-Fairtrade group.
IV – RESULTS PER IMPACT

8. ENVIRONMENT

Environment-related impacts on producers

Energy-efficiency: consumption

Do you have practices that use less energy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51-pt difference

Fairtrade farmers declare 2.25 times more to use less energy.

Farmers use:
- LED bulbs
- Energy-efficient cookstoves

They also declare limiting their consumption of energy at home.

NBF started a program in Ramnagar project and distributed LED bulbs and energy-efficient cookstoves to the farmers.

Reading: On the total of the Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 91% said they use practices that use less energy. They are 40% within the non-Fairtrade group.

Impact assessment – December 2017
There is also a difference on the diversity of practices.

Detail of the practices

- **Target % of the total answers**
  - LED: 99%
  - Energy efficient cookstove: 21%
  - Limited consumption: 0%

- **Control % of the total answers**
  - LED: 100%
  - Energy efficient cookstove: 0%
  - Limited consumption: 10%

Reading: On the total of Fairtrade farmers who answered to this question, «LED» was mentioned in 99% of the cases and «Energy efficient cookstove» in 21% of the cases. On the total of non-Fairtrade farmers who answered to this question, «LED» was mentioned 100% and «Energy efficient cookstove» 0%.

92 Fairtrade farmers and 36 non-Fairtrade farmers answered to this question.

This data was not collected in the same way.

Some interviewers asked details about the practices, some others did not ask details to the interviewee.

It could be that some farmers were having energy-efficient practices but did not consider them so.
**IV – RESULTS PER IMPACT**

**8. ENVIRONMENT**

**ENVIRONMENT-RELATED IMPACTS ON PRODUCERS**

Energy-efficiency: renewable energy sources

---

**Fairtrade farmers are more to declare using renewable energy sources.**

---

**Do you use renewable energy sources (for your production and at home) ?**

- **Yes**
  - Target: 81%
  - Control: 32%
  - 49-pt difference

- **No answer**
  - Target: 1%
  - Control: 2%

- **No**
  - Target: 16%
  - Control: 2%

- **Do not know**
  - Target: 2%
  - Control: 0%

---

**Farmers use:**
- Biogas
- Solar energy (including solar torchs, solar lights …)

---

**NBF started a program in Ramnagar project and distributed biogas plants and solar torches to the farmers.**

---

**Fairtrade farmers are 2.5 times more to declare using less energy**

**Reading:** On the total of the Fairtrade farmers interviewed, 81% said they use renewable energy sources. They are 32% within the non-Fairtrade group.

---

**Impact assessment – December 2017**
There is also a difference on the diversity of practices.

Details of the renewable energy sources used:

- **Target % of the total answers**
  - Biogas: 66%
  - Solar energy: 0%

- **Control % of the total answers**
  - Biogas: 80%
  - Solar energy: 100%

Reading: On the total of Fairtrade farmers who answered to this question, « Biogas » was mentioned in 60% of the cases and « Solar energy » in 80% of the cases. On the total of non-Fairtrade farmers who answered to this question, « Biogas » was mentioned 0% and « Solar energy » 100%.

79 Fairtrade farmers and 30 non-Fairtrade farmers answered to this question.

This data was not collected in the same way.

Some interviewers asked details about the practices, some others did not ask details to the interviewee.

It could be that some farmers were using renewable energy sources but did not consider them so.
IV – RESULTS PER IMPACT
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Impacts

### Positive Impacts

- **Living Conditions**
  - Brighter diversity in sources of income
  - Higher impression to have good living conditions
  - Better access to facilities at home

- **Health**
  - Higher impression to be in better shape
  - Higher accessibility to health facilities
  - Higher capacity to afford health facilities

- **Education**
  - Higher schooling rate for compulsory school (6-14)
  - Higher schooling rate for facultative school (above 15)

- **Financial Situation**
  - Less loans
  - Better capacity to repay debts
  - Better capacity to save money
  - Better confidence in future economic situations

Impact assessment – December 2017
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POSITIVE IMPACTS

- BUSINESS SITUATION
  - Paid more quickly
  - Better / More knowledge about buyers
  - Better / More knowledge about business conditions
  - Better / More capacity to negotiate the price

- PROFESSION
  - Higher proudness of being farmers

- GENDER EQUITY
  - Higher consciousness towards gender equity
  - High willingness to have women as representative

- SUSTAINABILITY
  - More aware of climate change
  - More use of water-efficient practices
  - Less use of energy
  - More use of renewable energy sources
### Impact assessment – December 2017

#### IV – RESULTS PER IMPACT

#### 9. CONCLUSION

**Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Living Conditions       | - Slightly better income.  
                          | - Better price but the gap is reducing.  
                          | - Less likely to have other sources of income. |
| Business Situation      | - No difference in delay of payment.                                    |
| Gender Equity           | - No priority for projects to foster gender equality (use of Fairtrade Premium) |
| Sustainability          | - No difference in use of practice to reduce organic waste              |
| Machines                | - No difference in the access to machines                               |
| Profession              | - No difference in recommendation to children to become farmers.        |
1. SIA TOOLS

SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT TOOLS

- List of producers
- Samples for the two groups
- Calendars of the data collection for the two groups
- Data collections tools (questionnaire and focus group discussion)
- Database (raw and cleaned)
- Reports of the focus group discussions
- Reports of the qualitative interviews
Websites of the Stakeholders
- maxhavelaarfrance.org
- ifeedgood.org
- naturebiofoods.com

Websites for general information
- uponline.in/About/Profile/Geography/index.html
- census2011.co.in/census/state/uttar-pradesh.html
- census2011.co.in/census/state/uttarakhand.html
- en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Healthcare_in_India
- en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Uttarakhand
- en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UttarPradesh
- mnre.gov.in
- powermin.nic.in
- ibef.org
- wrmin.nic.in
- uerc.gov.in
- moef.nic.in
- ureda.uk.gov.in

Documents available on-line
- britishcouncil.in/sites/default/files/indian_school_education_system_-_an_overview_1.pdf
- censusindia.gov.in/vital_statistics/AHSBulletins/AHS_Baseline_Factsheets/Uttarakhand.pdf
- censusindia.gov.in/vital_statistics/AHSBulletins/AHS_Factsheets_2012-13/FACTSHEET-UTTAR_PRADESH.pdf
- wcd.nic.in/sites/default/files/RHS_1.pdf
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