

# Multi-stakeholder platforms for innovation and coordination in market chains

G. Thiele, A. Devaux, I. Reinoso, H. Pico, F. Montesdeoca, M. Pumisacho, C. Velasco, P. Flores, R. Esprella, A. Thomann and K. Manrique  
Corresponding author: g.thiele@cgiar.org

---

## Introduction

In the Andes, interactions among market chain actors and service providers are frequently characterized by a lack of trust, and successful private–public partnerships and alliances are rare. Papa Andina and its partners have supported different types of multi-stakeholder platforms to promote interaction, social learning, social capital formation, and collective action involving these diverse actors in innovation and market coordination processes. This paper analyses experiences with platforms of different types, presents a general framework for characterizing platforms and identifies key lessons learned for facilitation and securing significant outcomes. It complements a more general paper prepared about Papa Andina’s innovation approach also prepared for this symposium (Devaux et al 2009)

## Literature review and theoretical framework

The term “platform” is in vogue. Sometimes it is used to characterize a methodology such as Farmer Field Schools. When used to refer groups it has sometimes been applied to any group which comes together for joint action. Building on previous work of Roling et al (2002) and Papa Andina (Thiele et al 2005), we define a multistakeholder platform as a space of interaction between different stakeholders who share a resource or common interest and interact to improve their mutual understanding, create trust, learn, reach consensus over priorities, define roles and engage in joint action. Henceforth we refer to this as a “platform”.

It is an intrinsic characteristic of a platform defined in this way that it involves stakeholders of diverse types, who have different visions, ways of making a living and sets of resources. A producer cooperative would not be a platform in this sense because it includes only one type of actor. The platform is relevant and has value for these stakeholders because there is interdependence between them either actually or potentially. This interdependence can create tension, conflict, maneuvering to seek advantage and even group displacement. But it also opens opportunities for mutual understanding, building confidence, social learning and joint action (Röling et al 2002). Hence the platform makes it possible to achieve changes which none of its members could have achieved on their own. A platform is a particular type of partnership with an especially diverse and complex membership (Horton et al 2009). Because of its complex membership, potential for conflict and differences of opinion a platform is likely to require facilitation and may have a lengthy initial phase of mutual learning and role definition before it can get down to business (Thiele et al 2005).

Stakeholders can have different roles in a platform. In this paper we distinguish platform “members” who are the core partners who make up the platform, from “partners” who interact with the platform and share information and other resources and “clients” and “providers” who may receive or supply goods or services to the platform on a strictly commercial basis. In practice these categories may be somewhat blurred and some “members” may be more passive than “partners” who are not considered full platform members.

Multistakeholder platforms were first proposed in the context of natural resource management where a group of stakeholders share a common resource such as water access in a river basin (Roling et al 2002). The use of the concept in the context of market or value chains is less common and has hardly been discussed in the literature. A recent overview of collective action for small farmer market access gave particular consideration to small farmer organizations but did not mention platforms (Markelova et al 2009). In a market chain context, platforms may perform two somewhat different but interlinked functions. First, they create a space for learning and joint innovation. Second, they provide a coordination function within the market chain to reduce cost. Each of these functions can be linked to separate bodies of literature.

Devaux et al (2009) presents a framework for analyzing innovation in market chains, where the innovation arena is shaped by external environment, biophysical/material characteristics of the market chain, characteristics of market actors and institutional arrangements. The Participatory Market Chain Approach (PMCA) as a facilitated process contributes to social learning, social capital formation and joint activities which underpin commercial, technical and institutional innovations. Consistent with this framework, platforms have been used by Papa Andina and its partners as a structured space where innovation can occur and be sustained, and in this sense are complementary to the PMCA as a process. Together they have contributed to the creation of new potato products from which farmers and other market chain actors can capture higher value. By stimulating learning and improving access to information, platforms have played a role in empowerment of small-scale farmers and women in the market chain. In a similar vein, Critchly et al (2006) have emphasized the role of platforms as a space or theater where innovation involving different stakeholders can occur.

Two other bodies of literature - one academic and the other applied - have concerned themselves with market chain governance. Dorward et al (2009) writing from a New Institutional Economics perspective note that coordination between market actors provided through different non-market mechanisms can help actors in developing countries reduce transaction costs and escape what they call the low level equilibrium trap associated with underdevelopment. Developed countries have seen the emergence of supply chain management, defined as the "integration of key business processes from end-user through original suppliers that provide products, services and information that add value for customers and other stakeholders (Lambert 2008). Given the increasingly "disintegrated" nature of supply chains made up of different enterprises in automotive, textile and electronic industries, Bitran et al (2006) postulate the need for a neutral third player or maestro to coordinate the network of suppliers. The need for increased integration in developing countries and the disintegration of more hierarchically organized supply chains in developed countries has created a curious convergence with the need for new types of institutions which provide a coordination function in the market chain. As we shall see below, platforms have provided one such institutional mechanism for this market coordination function.

## **Three platforms compared**

### ***Origins***

All three platforms grew out of a lengthy prior process of interaction between the partners involved. This interaction was supported through project activities linked with Papa Andina and funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) including the regional Papa Andina project, Fortipapa in Ecuador and Incopa in Peru. For most of those involved in the three countries, working with markets by engaging market chain actors and a broader set of stakeholders was initially new, unfamiliar and challenging. Each case involved a research organization: PROINPA in Bolivia, INIAP in Ecuador and CIP in Peru, which had experience with participatory approaches for on-farm research but had not engaged multiple stakeholders to work with markets. It was clear in this new context that technological innovation was only one part of the process so that the research organization had to assume a new role. The research organization took the lead in overall facilitation of the process of platform creation and also played a subsidiary role in research to address specific market constraints. Papa Andina's coordination unit played an important backstopping role and promoted sharing of ideas about platforms as they were being developed. Because it was new, there were few guidelines or group knowledge to draw on. Partners in each country were aware of and learned from what occurred in the other locations but the origins, membership, structure and functions of the three platforms were all different.

In Peru and Bolivia, the CAPAC and Andibol platforms were established after cycles of PMCA which had already led to other commercial innovations and there was a perceived need for a more permanent forum to support the innovation process. These platforms engaged private sector market actors as either members or partners for innovation.

In Ecuador, the INIAP team which facilitated the creation of market oriented platforms was critical of the PMCA applications they had seen in Peru because they felt that it paid insufficient attention to farmer empowerment and that there was a risk of capture of the benefits of innovation by the private sector actors involved. Here the INIAP team guided a broad process of consultation with NGOs, Universities and others as part of the search for a "New Institutionalality" which meant explicitly adopting a multi-stakeholder approach recognizing that agricultural research and technological innovation was only one element. This sought to build on the existing mandates and interests of R&D actors in the potato sector recognizing that each had a particular competence

but with a new set of institutional rules about how they engaged – this was the “New Institutionalism”. Initially this was linked to the creation of a national level platform REDCAPAPA to improve equity and competitiveness in the whole potato chain (Reinoso and Thiele 2002). Whilst REDCAPAPA was not successful in engaging a wide range of actors and never became fully operational, it stimulated interest in local level platforms linked to specific market opportunities. The INIAP team was influenced by an earlier experience with a platform in the Colomi municipality of Bolivia which had been led by PROINPA and supported by Papa Andina (Reinoso et al 2006). In Ecuador, an experience led by CESA, an NGO, in Quisapincha of setting up a platform to link farmers to markets where INIAP had participated influenced thinking (Montes de Oca et al 2002). The INIAP team drawing on these experiences, developed a method for constructing platforms with the following steps: identification of local market opportunities, analysis of stakeholders, formulation of “shared projects” (*proyectos compartidos*) by farmers organizations and group of R&D organizations, training, input provision, marketing, farmer organization and consolidation, (Monteros et al 2005). In Ecuador, in contrast to Bolivia and Peru platforms were conceived of as alliances between R&D organizations and farmers, other market chain actors such as restaurants, supermarkets and Frito-Lay which purchases potatoes for chips were perceived as clients to be consulted and informed, but not as full platform members who joined in regular meetings. Through the Fortipapa project, INIAP helped establish four platforms, this paper concentrates on the Chimborazo platform, which began in 2003 to articulate small farmers with markets for processed potato.

### ***Mandate, objectives, stakeholder roles and facilitation***

CAPAC and Andibol have general mandates to promote market chains for potato and other Andean tubers and Andean products respectively. CAPAC has a specific objective concerned with promoting the inclusion of small producers and Andibol has adopted social responsibility as part of its name. Plataforma Chimborazo focuses on strengthening small scale potato producers and positioning them in the market for processed potato and is the only one to have a specific objective of organizing small potato farmers.

These differences in mandate and objectives are consistent with different stakeholder roles. Andibol engages private sector market actors as platform members. CAPAC interacts with some private sector actors as members (formal membership) and others (Frito-Lay and Wong) as partners. The Plataforma Chimborazo has treated private sector actors mostly as clients, and has placed greater emphasis on the organization and empowerment of small farmers within the platform.

All of the platforms have had external support and backstopping provided by a research organization or project. CAPAC and Plataforma Chimborazo have full time managers or coordinators, who spend a considerable amount of their time in supply chain management. In the case of Andibol, platform meetings are facilitated by PROINPA. Each of the platforms also has an elected board (*directiva*) drawn from its partners.

All of the platforms engage a wide and diverse group of stakeholders. CAPAC and Andibol include private actors such as MiChacra and Gastrotur cooking school in Peru and Ricafrut, Ascex and Bolivia Natural in Bolivia. Plataforma Chimborazo includes many more farmer organizations with many farmers attending meetings. It also has more commercial relationships with private sector actors. Initially, the primary client was seen as Frito-Lay, but in practice it was difficult to meet the more demanding quality (levels of reducing sugars) and quantity requirements imposed by this large agroindustrial client and the most important group of clients were restaurants serving french fries in Ambato and Riobamba.

### ***Activities***

Whilst CAPAC emerged out of the application of PMCA and the promotion of innovation, its current activities are principally concerned with providing technical orientation, capacity building and information to members (farmer organizations) and partners (public local authorities), and commercial services on a not-for-profit basis for linking farmers to the supply chain of processors like Frito-Lay (e.g. contract management, quality control). CAPAC only has one annual general assembly and other stakeholder interaction is project specific. In practice, involvement of some private sector partners is more active than that of some formal members. CAPAC also plays a role in advocacy and promotional activities, and takes part in technical normative commissions.

Andibol has regular monthly meetings with a principal focus on stimulating new product development, with its Chef Andino trademark and coordinating supporting technological innovation.

Plataforma Chimborazo had monthly meetings which focused on planning production, meeting quotas for delivery and overcoming technical constraints to improve the quantity and quality of potatoes produced. A business roundtable was held in 2004 with potential clients, primarily restaurants, for Fri papa (suitable for frying) and other varieties. This had stands with information about research and training activities of the platform, production plans to assure regular supply and bags of Fri papa with the CONPAPA label. The Cooking School from ESPOCH prepared French fries and other processed potato products and at the end representatives of restaurants were asked to estimate purchasing requirements by variety (Reinoso et al 2007).

### ***Outcomes and impacts***

Each of the platforms has outcomes linked to both innovation in a market context and to market coordination.

All three platforms have led to market linked innovation. CAPAC contributed to developing the “Mi Papa” collective trademark and a certification label for potato trade with CSR (Thomann et al., 2009). They also provide expertise to private partners for the creation of new products (e.g. Ayllin Papa). It has also linked with researchers at CIP to disseminate postharvest practices (e.g. handling, packing, technology to inhibit sprouting).

Andibol has also developed a trademark “Chef Andino”. Responding to a request from Ricafрут to improve, cleanliness, grading and peeling, PROINPA and Kurmi carried out participatory research to develop a potato peeler and grader (Velasco in press).

The Plataforma Chimborazo identified and developed a new market for the Fri papa variety amongst restaurants in Ambato and Riobamba who were looking for a potato which made good French fries. In the area of technological innovation the Plataforma supported training in integrated crop management with Farmer Field Schools, it also supported specific research on planting densities and fertilization to increase tuber size and on planting periods to lower the levels of reducing sugars in potatoes for chipping with local universities.

Turning to outcomes linked to market coordination, the Plataforma Chimborazo provided technical assistance, developed and monitored production plans with farmer quotas by area and managed supply of potatoes to clients, primarily to restaurants. This supply chain management function was very time consuming and involved most of the time of the coordinator of the Plataforma Chimborazo. In addition, the Plataforma Chimborazo empowered farmer organizations and associations to assume a greater leadership role, this began with Farmer Field Schools which helped build social capital by creating trained and organized groups and included specific training in leadership with a particular emphasis on women. This led to the creation of CONPAPA (Consortium of Small Potato Producers), which from 2007 took over the technical assistance functions, production planning, bulking up and marketing functions which the Platform had previously performed, leaving it with a more limited role of coordinating service provision.

In the case of Peru, CAPAC has neither the vocation nor resources to coordinate the whole supply chain. However, in the regions where no local partner (NGO) is available (Andahuaylas, Ayacucho), CAPAC carries out marketing tasks (contract management, quality control and delivery at the plant) that cannot yet be handled by farmer organizations, and provides them with orientation and capacity building for planning, production and postharvest management. At the beginning of every planting season, planning meetings among CAPAC and farmer representatives are held to establish quotas by area and planting times in order to organize production supply. Alliances with local partners are sought to develop technical assistance and greater organization at farmers’ level is encouraged.

An impact study of the Plataforma Chimborazo and other platforms in Ecuador, based on questionnaires and a control group found that it was effective in improving farmer incomes and welfare (Cavatassi et al 2009).

### **Contribution of Papa Andina to platform development**

Papa Andina as a regional project contributed to developing ideas about platforms, provided backstopping as platforms were implemented and contributed to systematization of experiences and the formulation of an explicit methodology for platforms in Ecuador (Reinoso et al 2007). Papa Andina coordinators participated frequently in meetings of the R&D organization which facilitated the development of each of the platforms. Papa Andina stimulated discussions among those involved in the three countries during workshops such as the workshop on PMCA and platforms in 2005 (Bobadilla 2005). It also supported horizontal evaluations of the

Plataforma Chimborazo in 2005 and of Andibol in 2009 as well as systematization of work with the different platforms (Thiele et al 2007 and Velasco et al 2009).

## Conclusion

Papa Andina has promoted a general concept of working with platforms as a space for bringing different kinds of actors together. Partners within the Papa Andina initiative have shared ideas and advances of working with platforms and there has been considerable cross-fertilization. Earlier work on platforms in Bolivia, influenced the development of platform concept in Ecuador in 2003-4 and visits by partners to the Ecuador platforms, including the horizontal evaluation in 2005, led to new thinking about platforms in Bolivia.

Despite the generation of a general platform concept and several exchanges of ideas amongst partners, there has been little explicit theory behind the creation of the platforms. In contrast, development of the PMCA was based on a prior theoretical construct - Rapid Appraisal of Agricultural Knowledge Systems (RAKS) - which structured the process of bringing stakeholders together to stimulate innovation from an early stage (Engel 1995). One attempt to provide a more general explicit theory was published but not widely read or applied amongst Papa Andina and its partners perhaps because it was too theoretical (Thiele et al 2005). Theory behind platforms has been mostly implicit and the platform facilitators involved followed their noses in pragmatically developing the platforms. Only one platform (Ecuador) appears to have had a specific procedure for implementing platforms but this lacked the theoretical basis of PMCA and was more fully described after the platforms had been implemented to promote wider use (Reinoso et al 2007).

Our principal conclusion is that Papa Andina has worked with two broadly different types of platform in a market context and that both have been effective:

1. Platforms structured along market chain bring farmers and their associations together with traders, processors, supermarkets, researchers, chefs and others to foster the creation of new products with greater possibility of added value for small farmers and pro-poor innovation. This type has been more widely described in previous publications (Devaux et al 2009).
2. Platforms structured around geographically delimited supply areas have also addressed market coordination problems in assuring volumes and meeting quality and timeliness constraints associated with a supply chain made up of many dispersed and small producers. They also address coordination problems in the subsidiary "markets" for support services and complementary inputs bringing NGOs and others in to provide technical support or access credit.

The platform in Bolivia is primarily about innovation, the platform in Ecuador primarily about market coordination. The case of Peru is more complex, whilst it began primarily to stimulate innovation, at present its activities appear to concentrate more on improving market coordination. Both types of platforms have also served as representative bodies for interaction with policy makers.

There is a growing body of evidence that platforms can achieve significant outcomes and impacts but more systematic impact evaluation is still needed (Cavatassi 2009). So whilst platforms as heterogeneous groups may be more difficult to facilitate than homogeneous ones (e.g. producer associations), it seems likely that they may result in new products, processes, norms, and behaviors. So far however platforms have lacked a coherent theoretical framework, compared for example, to the PMCA. Hopefully this paper should encourage more rigorous comparative analysis and stimulate wider use.

## References

- Bobadilla, P. (2005). Informe del taller de revision de los Enfoques Apoyados por Papa Andina: Enfoque Participativo de Cadenas (EPCP) y Plataformas de Concertación, Lima, CIP.
- Cavatassi, R., González-Flores, M., Winters, P., Andrade-Piedra, J., Espinosa, P. and Thiele, G. 2009 Linking Smallholders to the New Agricultural Economy: An Evaluation of the Plataformas Program in Ecuador, Working Paper No. 09-03 at the Agricultural Development Economics Division, FAO.

- Critchley, Will; Verburg, Miranda & Veldhuizen, Laurens van (eds). 2006, Facilitating multi-stakeholder partnerships: lessons from PROLINNOVA. Promoting Local Innovation. Silang, Cavite, Philippines: IIRR/Leusden: PROLINNOVA, ETC EcoCulture.
- Devaux, A., D. Horton, C. Velasco, G. Thiele, G. Lopez, T. Bernet, I. Reinoso and M. Ordinola (2009). "Collective Action for Market Chain Innovation in the Andes." *Food Policy* **34** 31-38
- Devaux, A., Velasco, C., López, G., Bernet, T., Ordinola, M., Pico, H., Thiele, G., Horton, D., (2007). Collective Action for Innovation and Small Farmer Market Access: The Papa Andina Experience. CAPRI Working Paper 68.
- Dorward, A., J. Kydd, C. Poulton and D. Bezemer (2009). "Coordination Risk and Cost Impacts on Economic Development in Poor Rural Areas." *Journal of Development Studies* 45(1): 1-20
- Engel, P. (1995). *The Social Organization of Innovation: a Focus on Stakeholder Interaction* Amsterdam, KIT
- Gabriel R. Bitran, Suri Gurumurthio, Shiou Lin Sam (2006). *Emerging Trends in Supply Chain Governance* MIT Sloan School of Management Working Report
- Devaux, A. Andrade, J. Antezana, I. D. Horton, G. Lopez, M. Ordinola, R. Oros, I. Reinoso, G. Thiele, A. Thomann and C. Velasco (2009) The 'Papa Andina Model' for linking research with pro-poor market innovation , ISTRC symposium.
- Horton, D., G. Prain and G. Thiele (2009) *Perspectives on Partnership: A Review of Literature Relevant to International Agricultural Research for Development*. CIP Social Science Working Document.
- Lambert, D. Ed 2008 *Supply Chain Management: Processes, Partnerships, Performance*, Third Edition, Supply Chain Management Institute. The Hartley Press, Jacksonville.
- Markelova, H., R. Meinzen-Dick, J. Hellin and S. Dohrn (2009). "Collective action for smallholder market access." *Food Policy* 34: 1-7.
- Montesdeoca, F., Pumisacho, M., Bermúdez, E. and Román, F. en Devaux, A. y Thiele, G. 2002. Compendio de Papa Andina. Logros y Experiencias de la Primera Fase (1998 – 2002), CIP, Lima Perú.
- Monteros, C. G. Pino and Iturralde, P. (2005) in Bobadilla (2005).
- Reinoso, I. y Thiele. G. (2002), *Construyendo una Nueva Institucionalidad para la Innovation Tecnologica de la Papa en Ecuador* en Devaux, A. y Thiele, G. Compendio de Papa Andina. Logros y Experiencias de la Primera Fase (1998 – 2002), CIP, Lima Perú.
- Reinoso, I., M. Pumisacho, F. Montesdeoca (2006) in Devaux and Thiele (2006).
- Reinoso, I., H. Pico, M. Pumisacho, F. Montesdeoca, C. Monteros, X. Cuesta and G. Thiele (2007). *Cadenas Agroalimentarias: Plataformas de concertación y proyectos compartidos*. Series Cadenas Agroalimentarias: Plataformas de concertación y proyectos compartidos. Quito, INIAP, COSUDE, Papa Andina: 62
- Röling, N., C. Leeuwis and R. Pyburn (2002). Beyond the aggregation of individual preferences: Moving from multiple cognition in resource dilemmas. *Wheelbarrows full of frogs: social learning in rural resource management*. C. Leeuwis and R. Pyburn. Assen, Koninklijke Van Gorcum: 25-47
- Thiele, G. Oros, Velasco, C. and Ambrose, K. (2005) ¿Porqué trabajar con plataformas? In *Conceptos, Pautas y Herramientas*. CIP
- Thiele, G., A. Devaux, C. Velasco and D. Horton (2007). "Horizontal evaluation. Fostering knowledge sharing and program Improvement within a network." *American Evaluation Association* **28**(4): 493-508
- Thomann A, Devaux A, Ordinola M, Cuentas M, Urday P, Sevilla M, Andrade-Piedra J. (2009) Native Potato Market Chain and Poverty Reduction: Innovation around Corporate Social Responsibility, ISTRC symposium.
- Velasco, C. et al 2009 ISTRC symposium.

**Table 1. The platforms compared, coverage, mandate, objectives and coordination**

	<b>CAPAC Peru</b>	<b>Plataforma Andina Boliviana (Andibol)</b> "business with social responsibility"	<b>Potato platform Chimborazo</b>
<b>Coverage</b>	<b>National, Peru</b> , concentration Huancavelica, Junín, Ayacucho, Apurímac	<b>Department La Paz, Bolivia</b>	<b>Provincia Chimborazo, Ecuador</b>
<b>When functioned</b>	2003 - ongoing	2007 - ongoing	2003-2007 (from 2007 most functions assumed by CONPAPA)
<b>Mandate or mission</b>	A second level organization for social economic and technological development with an orientation to provide highly specialized services for the development of market chains of potato and other tubers which are cultivated in the highlands of Peru	Promote and facilitate the development of businesses with Andean products	Achieve the positioning in the agro-processing market of the potato of the small farmers in the province of Chimborazo supporting production, improving marketing mechanisms and strengthening their empresarial structures
<b>Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote the development of the small farmer and market chains for tubers.</li> <li>• Support improving income and employment of the actors who take part in market chains for tubers, and small farmers in particular.</li> <li>• Promote the consumption of potato with concepts of quality and competitiveness.</li> <li>• Support a qualitative improvement in the policy environment for these crops.</li> <li>• Position CAPAC as a the most recognized institution for tubers at the national level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design methodological tools which guide the empresarial development of beneficiaries</li> <li>• Put in place quality standards for Andean products.</li> <li>• Develop mechanisms for responding to demands for technological innovation.</li> <li>• Jointly contribute to the organization of efficient mechanisms for product assembly operated by farmer associations.</li> <li>• Engage actors providing finance for business development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group and organize small potato farmers in the province of Chimborazo</li> <li>• Stimulate potato agri-business, linking small potato farmer organizations with market opportunities</li> <li>• Participate actively, with strategic alliances, in the organization, production and marketing in the market chain of potato and processed products.</li> <li>• Seek the improvement of the quality and productivity of potato through backstopping and technical support.</li> </ul>
<b>Facilitation/ coordination</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Backstopping INCOPA (CIP)</li> <li>• General manager</li> <li>• Technical manager</li> <li>• Board</li> <li>• General assembly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitation: PROINPA</li> <li>• Board: coordination, business development, technological innovation and commercial development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Backstopping and general facilitation: INIAP</li> <li>• Full time platform coordinator with NGO</li> <li>• Board selected from farmers</li> </ul>

**Table 2. Platforms compared: stakeholders and activities**

	<b>CAPAC Peru</b>	<b>Andibol</b>	<b>Chimborazo Platform</b>
<b>Stakeholders</b>	<p>Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 producer organizations (635 families)</li> <li>• NGOs: FOVIDA, SEGRA, DESCO, ADERS-Peru, PROAANPE</li> <li>• Small agro-industries: MiChacra, A&amp;L, Colcahuasi</li> <li>• Others: Union of Stevedores of Lima wholesaler market, cooking school Gastrotur, Mi Chacra (market information service provider), 4 wholesalers (handle "Mi Papa" Brand)</li> </ul> <p>Partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Govt. Bodies (MINAG, EMMSA) Regional govts, Junin and Ayacucho</li> <li>• Private companies: Corporation Wong, Frito-Lays, Villa Andina, Gloria Group etc.</li> <li>• Research centers (CIP, INIA)</li> </ul>	<p>Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Producer associations: APEPA, APROECA, ASOPRACH, UNAPA and FLOR DE HABA</li> <li>• Private companies: DEZE Ltda. (loading and unloading), RICAFRUT (processing, marketing and export), ASCEX (processing and export) y BOLIVIA NATURAL (processing and export andean grains)</li> <li>• Support organizations: KURMI (NGO), Program of Business Development, PROFIN Foundation (finance) and PROINPA Foundation (research)</li> </ul>	<p>Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Associations and producer organizations (28 organizations and 324 families from Licto, Pungalá, Lluclud, Cebadas, San Andrés in Chimborazo Province in 2006)</li> <li>• NGOs: CESA, CECI, Foundation Marco</li> <li>• Marketing company (SDC)</li> <li>• Research organizations: ESPOCH and UNACH (Universities) and INIAP</li> </ul> <p>Clients:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frito-Lays for chips</li> <li>• restaurants in Riobamba and Ambato for french fries</li> </ul>
<b>Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAPAC central office in Lima, 2 technical staff in Andahuaylas and Ayacucho based in offices loaned by municipal govts, give technical assistance to members and organize assembly with central office.</li> <li>• Trade mark and information committees</li> <li>• Leads the Papas Andinas (Andean Potatoes) Initiative and awards use of certification label</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly meetings of Platform.</li> <li>• Primarily project funded, but fund some joint activities with members own resources.</li> <li>• Implement strategic plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly platform and zonal meetings of producers.</li> <li>• Fund support activities and overall coordination with shared project</li> <li>• Training in integrated crop management in a market context with Farmer Field Schools</li> <li>• Commercial production, farmer seed multiplication and production</li> </ul>



**Table 3. Platforms compared: outcomes and added value by Papa Andina**

	<b>CAPAC Peru</b>	<b>Andibol</b>	<b>Chimborazo Plataforma</b>
<b>Outcomes related to innovation system</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owner of trademark “Mi Papa” (which resulted from PMCA)</li> <li>• Ayllin Papa” with supplier of Wong supermarket, supplied by CAPAC from Andahuaylas and Junín</li> <li>• Certification label with Lays Andinas. 3 companies in waiting list for label</li> <li>• Diffusion of new technologies: sprout inhibitors to extend period of availability and postharvest practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New trademark “Chef Andino” for all the products which are developed with the platform, currently with chuño processed products and quinoa flakes “Bolivia Natural</li> <li>• Technological innovation coordinated with members to respond to market demands: skinless chuño, mechanical peeler and a grading machine.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of a new market for Fripapa as a potato apt for frying in restaurants in Ambato and Riobamba</li> <li>• Planting densities and fertilization to produce tubers with a higher percentage larger than 5cm (ESPOCH)</li> <li>• Planting time to lower reducing sugars in potatoes for chips (UNACH)</li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes related to coordination in market system</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Links small farmers with Frito-Lays providing native potatoes for colored chips under “Lays Andinas” product name</li> <li>• In 2009, sales to Lays estimated at 52ts by 68 families</li> <li>• Supplies potato, from farmers in Andahuaylas and Junín to Wong supermarket for “Ayllin Papa”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot marketing of chuño flour for baking and soups with Chef Andino</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides farmers with quality seed</li> <li>• Coordination with credit agencies for production credit</li> <li>• Implementation of a production plan with quotas</li> <li>• Assembly and marketing of potatoes to restaurants and agroindustry (jointly with Marketing Company of SDC)</li> <li>• Empowerment of farmers with CONPAPA</li> </ul>
<b>Support and value added by Papa Andina</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of concept of corporate social responsibility with a label of certification (<a href="http://www.papasandinas.org">www.papasandinas.org</a>)</li> <li>• Support in developing public awareness with INCOPA (National Potato Day, participation in the thematic seed group which achieved the official registry of native potato varieties</li> <li>• Exchange of experiences with partners from Ecuador and Bolivia in horizontal evaluations and study tours.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support in start up of plataforma (backstopping)</li> <li>• Support in systematization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contributed ideas about platforms to INIAP technical group and start up of platform</li> <li>• Exchange of experiences in regional context and horizontal evaluation in 2005</li> <li>• Documentation and systematization of Platforms (e.g. Reinoso et al 2007)</li> </ul>