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Definition of MSME under GRASP

Any enterprise engaged in an economic activity irrespective of its legal form or registration status. This includes self-employed, family firms, partnerships and associations that may or may not be registered.

Enterprises that are either Farms/Farmer Groups or Agribusinesses in and around the selected value chains. Agribusinesses include input suppliers, collectors, traders, processors or retailers.

Agribusinesses or farms/farmer groups with less than 250 employees (State Bank of Pakistan).

With annual sales turnover of less than or equal to PKR 650 million ($4.2 million) (SME Policy 2019).

Micro: 1 – 9
Small: 10 – 49
Medium: 49 – 249
Horticulture:
Small: Up to 32 acres
Medium: Above 32 acres to 64 acres
Large: Above 64 acres

Source: State Bank of Pakistan

Livestock: (Goats and Sheep)
Small: Less than 50 animals
Medium: 50 – 200 animals
Large: Above 200 animals

Source: No official definition exists. This definition comes from the farm surveys conducted by ITC
Surveyed Districts of Balochistan

GRASP surveyed districts
Based on ITC’s SME Competitiveness Survey (SMECS), and captures a wide range of factors, which determine firm competitiveness and relationships among value chain actors. It serves as an instrument for SME-level data collection and baseline setting.

Objectives

To gain understanding of private sector activities (production of good and services), as well as horizontal and vertical business linkages in selected value chains.

To identify, deepen into and validate main challenges faced by agri-businesses involved in inputs and services provision, trading and/or primary and secondary agro-processing in and around select value chains.
Agribusiness Survey in a snapshot – Balochistan

SAMPLE SIZE: 81 Agribusinesses

Respondents by Main Sector of Operation

- **Livestock**: 18 respondents
  - Processor: 6
  - Trade/Collector: 11
  - Input Supplier: 1

- **Vegetables**: 7 respondents
  - Processor: 3
  - Trade/Collector: 2
  - Input Supplier: 1

- **Fruits**: 16 respondents
  - Processor: 8
  - Trade/Collector: 7
  - Input Supplier: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Processor</th>
<th>Trade/Collector</th>
<th>Input Supplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 Collectors/Traders
20 Input Supplier
20 Processors

Respondents by types of products

- **Fruits**: 12%
  - Olives, 14%
  - Grapes, 12%

- **Vegetables**: 14%
  - Dates, 11%
  - Vegetables
  - Fresh or Frozen Chicken, 4%

- **Livestock**
  - Live Goats, 19%
  - Live Poultry, 14%
  - Live Sheep, 11%

- **Onions**: 14%
  - Fresh Sheep/Goat Meat, 2%
Agribusiness Survey in a snapshot – Balochistan

Agribusinesses by Size (# of employees)

- Micro (1-9 employees), 78%
- Small (10-49 employees), 22%

Agribusinesses by District

- Lasbela: 44% Input Supplier, 56% Processor
- Panjgur: 53% Input Supplier, 33% Processor, 13% Trade/Collector
- Khuzdar: 31% Input Supplier, 54% Processor, 15% Trade/Collector
- Nushki: 20% Input Supplier, 50% Processor, 30% Trade/Collector
- Quetta: 8% Input Supplier, 62% Processor, 31% Trade/Collector
- Pishin: 25% Input Supplier, 63% Processor, 13% Trade/Collector
- Musakhel: 30% Input Supplier, 60% Processor, 10% Trade/Collector
The survey contributes to gathering information at farm level on production, access to markets and inputs, identifying main challenges, and assessing knowledge and practices in areas relevant to the GRASP programme, such as climate change and gender issues.

Objectives

To gain an understanding of the characteristics and performance of primary production in select value chains from a farm-level perspective.

To identify, deepen into and validate main challenges faced by farmers and farmer groups when engaging in the production, value addition and commercialization of select products.
Farm Survey in a snapshot – Balochistan

**SAMPLE SIZE: 57 Farmers**

### Size of the farm – Land Holdings

- **Small**: 61%
- **Medium**: 28%
- **Large**: 11%

### Main sector of activity (%)

- **Livestock**: 47%
- **Fruits**: 37%
- **Vegetables**: 16%

---

**District and share of respondents: farm survey**

- **Musakhel**: 18%
- **Pishin**: 16%
- **Quetta**: 12%
- **Nushki**: 16%
- **Khuzdar**: 14%
- **Panjgur**: 12%
- **Labela**: 12%
Annual Revenue*

**FARMS – Annual Revenue**

- PKR 20,000-200,000, 16%
- PKR 200,000-2,000,000, 28%
- PKR 2,000,000-20,000,000, 5%
- PKR 20,000,000 or greater, 2%
- Refuse to answer, 4%

**Agribusinesses - Annual Revenue**

- PKR 200,000-2,000,000, 35%
- PKR 2,000,000-20,000,000, 21%
- PKR 20,000,000 or greater, 1%
- Refuse to answer, 3%
- PKR 200-20,000, 6%

*Annual Revenue from Sales*
FTE* = 40 hours/week is referred to as one FTE (2,080 hours/annum)

FARMS by Number of Full-Time Employees
- Micro (1-9 employees), 72%
- Small (10-49 employees), 28%

AGRIBUSINESSES by Number of Full-Time Employees
- Micro (1-9 employees), 78%
- Small (10-49 employees), 22%
Climate Smart Agriculture
Environmentally Sustainable

AGRIBUSINESS SURVEY:
• Only 4 agribusinesses out of 81 reported that they have an environment certificate

FARM SURVEY:
• Just 5 of the 57 (9%) interviewed farmers implemented new technique/technology of water management practices in the past year
Use of mobile phones by FARMERS by activity

- **Access to market pricing information**: 49%
- **Gaining knowledge on good agriculture practices**: 14%
- **Access to weather forecasting services**: 21%
- **Monitoring farm activities**: 7%
- **Do not use mobile digital technology**: 8%
Agribusinesses needing help with environmental issues

62% of the respondents mentioned that access to finance is one of the top three key indicators they would be interested in receiving assistance in to deal with environmental issues.

Number of agribusiness firms saying they need help to deal with specified environmental issues

- Accessing finance: 50
- Accessing information and communication technology: 27
- Risk management methods: 26
- Improving your logistics and shipping: 23
- Adopting sustainability standards: 22
- Insuring your business: 16
- Increasing information sharing regarding environmental issues: 11
- Training in climate smart agriculture: 10
- Training in energy efficiency and security: 5
- Lowering costs of compliance with environmental regulations: 5
- Training in climate proofing infrastructural developments: 4
Value Addition
FOR AGRIBUSINESS: Only 6 firms out of 81 reported inadequate post-harvest handling was a top constraint for them.

FOR FARMERS:

- 82% of the surveyed farmers lost 10% or less of their output to spoilage and/or pest.
- 14% of the farmers lost between 11-20% of their total produce to spoilage and/or pest.
- While, a 4% of the 57 farmers surveyed lost nearly a substantial amount (21-30%) of their produce to spoilage and/or pest.
More than half of the firms reported that they were involved in value addition. Adopting special variety seed or breed was the most popular value addition activity taking place, followed by firms producing organic or contaminant-free products.
Firms involved in Value Addition - Agribusiness

With respect to processors:
- For fruits and vegetable processors, cutting/peeling in primary processing and canning and sauce-making in secondary processing are the most popular.
- For livestock processors, deboning, cutting and packing is the most popular form of processing.

With respect to farmers:
- None of the surveyed farmers do any kind of chilling/freezing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Processors Undertaking Primary/Secondary Processing Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Fat and Oils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Meat, Smoke Meat and Sausages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deboned/Cut/Packed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables and Fruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other processed food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauces/Chutneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juice/Pulp/Purree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut/Peel/Sort/Dry/Package</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nearly half of the surveyed farmers undertake cleaning, grading and sorting activities in their farm for selling products.
Quality and Regulatory Management
Out of those answering the questions, 19% of the respondents reported that they have at least one type of certification. Between those who hold any type of certification, the most popular certification held was Food Safety, followed by Quality.
A miniscule percentage of the surveyed farmers have any type of certification. Around 2% have the Food Safety Certificate, Labour Safety Certificate, Quality or Performance Certificate respectively, and roughly 3.5% have the Sustainability Certificate.

77% of the farmers are planning to obtain certification.
Agribusiness Management and Marketing
### Marketing and Branding – Agribusiness Survey

49% of the AGRIBUSINESSES have a brand recognised in Pakistan; while merely 6% have brand recognised overseas.

68% of the AGRIBUSINESSES said that the training on MARKETING MANAGEMENT would useful for their business operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Type</th>
<th>Number of Respondent Agribusinesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage management</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety and handling</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality management</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic education (reading, writing, counting etc.)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than half of the total respondents directly market their products either through retail or export. Out of those directly marketing, most of them (40%) choose direct retail as their market channel.

*Firms that directly market more than or equal to 5% of their produce*
In the past year, on an average, among the surveyed farms responses:

- 6% of the average sales was to processors
- 8% was sold directly to wholesalers
- 9% was sold directly to Farmers organizations
- 4% directly to Retailers and
- 28% directly to consumers
- However, nearly half (43%) sell indirectly through middlemen (Mainly Arthis, and Beopari’s)

Note: "Others" category was excluded from this assessment
• 29% of the respondents were registered firms.
• The highest rate of registration was found in fruits firms, followed by livestock firms.

• 70% of the farms interviewed had a registered their property.
• Less than a third of the 57 farms interviewed had not registered.
More than half of the firms source from farmer or farmers groups
Firms-Farm Linkages

If the firm has formal agreement with the farmer, what is the most important aspect of the agreement?

- A fair price, 17
- Produce is ready to be collected or delivered on time, 22
- Quality protocols are respected, 8
Access to Market Information

5 out of 81 AGRIBUSINESSES responding said that Dissemination of Market Information is amongst the top 3 constraints faced by them.
Access to Finance
Out of those answering (59 out of 81), most firms face some kind of obstacle due to lack of access to finance, with more than half of the firms reporting that they faced very severe obstacles due to the lack of access to finance.

Firms usually source from their own savings or friends or family. None turn to commercial banks.
Farmers having a bank account – Farm Survey

FARMERS having a bank account

Yes, 51%

No, 49%
Gender
Only 27% of the total respondents (22 out of 81) reported that they employ full time female employees. However, firms employing women reported a balanced men-women ratio.

- A large percentage, 72% of the surveyed farms have full time women employees.
- In addition, amongst nearly the quarter farms that employ full time women employees, the proportion is quite substantial; on an average more than half (59%) of the farms employees are women farmers.
Institutions and Support Services
Firm-Public Institution Linkages – Agribusiness Survey

Agribusinesses’ Linkages with Public Institutions

- Yes: Government institution or agencies in charge of agriculture and livestock, 6%
- Yes: Government institution or agencies in charge of standards or certification, 6%
- Yes: Other govt. institutions, 5%

No, 84%
Yes, 16%
Access to and Quality of Advisory Services Provided to Agribusinesses by Public Institutions

- No access to advisory services, 81%
- Yes: Low Quality, 11%
- Yes: Medium Quality, 4%
- Yes: High Quality, 4%
- Yes, 19%
Of the total AGRIBUSINESSES, the following received support from public institutions:

- 7 for product development,
- 7 for business planning, and
- 1 for supply chain management.

A majority of 45 answered that no such services were provided by the public institutions.
39% of the FARMERS said that they have never accessed any public institution service

Quality of services provided by public institutions to FARMERS

- Low: 56%
- Medium: 15%
- High: 29%

Quality of services by public institutions
Do not belong to any associations, 18%

No service provided, 32%

Any service provided, 50%

Poor, 14%

Average, 20%

Good, 16%
Agriculture Extension Services – Agribusiness Survey

Type of advice provided to farmers or farmer groups (%)

- Other: 42%
- Nutrition management: 38%
- Crop focused/breed focused training: 25%
- Land preparation, soil testing, planting: 17%
- Integrated pest management: 17%
- Water management: 15%

AGRIBUSINESS: Services provided to farmers or farmers group (in %)

- Yes: Financial (loans, advancement payments, grants), 24%
- Yes: Market information, 27%
- Yes: Packaging material, 14%
- Yes: Storage facilities, 6%
- Yes: Extension/Training, 2%

Yes, 73%
Agriculture Extension Services – Farm Survey

Share of farmers accessing agricultural extension service

- No agriculture extension providers, 37%
- Any agriculture extension providers, 63%

- Government extension services, 2%
- Private sector extension services, 1%
- Farmer association, 12%
- Collectors/Traders, 11%
- NGOs, 11%
- Donor projects, 10%
- Input suppliers, 2%
- Other farmers, 14%

63% of farmers have accessed any agriculture extension services.
Agriculture Extension Services – Farm Survey

FARMERS: Support services by inputs suppliers

- No training/advice received, 67%
- Use of inputs, 11%
- Improve production techniques, 16%
- Improve storage techniques, 4%
- Sustainable practices of production, 2%
- Any training/advice received, 33%
Agriculture Extension Services – Farm Survey

FARMERS: Support services by buyers

- No training/advice received, 65%
- Any training/advice received, 35%

Services by Buyers:
- Identify quality inputs, 3%
- Improve production techniques, 4%
- Improve quality of production, 9%
- Sustainable practices of production, 6%
- Add value to products eg. cleaning/sorting, 4%
- Improve storage facilities, 2%
- Understand market specifications, 6%
# Agriculture Extension Services – Farm Survey

## Number of farmers requesting each type of training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Area</th>
<th>First Priority</th>
<th>Second Priority</th>
<th>Third Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal health management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal nutrition management and feed formulation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal breeding</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of planting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest and disease control</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop rotation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Livestock keepers
Horticulture farmers
COVID-19 Business Impact
Assessing COVID-19 impact on agricultural MSMEs

ASSESS the impact on business operations, production capacities, and market access of MSMEs in horticulture and livestock in Sindh and Balochistan, and analyse government response...

...BY generating empirical evidence

...TO feed into GRASP’s Rural MSME strategies, and policy briefs, and adapt GRASP’s planned support activities

98 agribusinesses and 72 farmers were interviewed
Effect of Covid-19 pandemic on MSMEs

Proportion of MSMEs affected by COVID-19 pandemic

- Moderately affected: 30% (Farm), 40% (Agribusiness)
- Strongly affected: 18% (Farm), 33% (Agribusiness)
- Slightly affected: 8% (Farm), 18% (Agribusiness)
- Not affected: 6% (Farm), 8% (Agribusiness)

Number of MSMEs reporting top effects of COVID-19 pandemic

1. Difficulty accessing inputs domestically: 63% (Farm), 54% (Agribusiness)
2. Lower domestic sales to businesses: 46% (Farm), 46% (Agribusiness)
3. Lower domestic sales to consumers: 31% (Farm), 37% (Agribusiness)
4. Temporary Shutdown: 20% (Farm), 27% (Agribusiness)
5. Clients not paying their bills: 19% (Farm), 28% (Agribusiness)
6. Reduced investment: 47% (Farm), 46% (Agribusiness)
7. Employee absences due to sickness or childcare: 44% (Farm), 38% (Agribusiness)
8. Reduced logistics services: 38% (Farm), 30% (Agribusiness)
9. Increased administrative bottlenecks: 24% (Farm), 20% (Agribusiness)
10. New problems with infrastructure e.g. internet or roads: 20% (Farm), 12% (Agribusiness)

Proportion of agribusinesses and farms envisaging business closure due to COVID-19

- Business closure not envisaged: 63% (Agribusiness), 54% (Farm)
- 1 month or less: 1% (Agribusiness), 1% (Farm)
- 3 months: 18% (Agribusiness), 18% (Farm)
- 6 months or more: 26% (Agribusiness), 18% (Farm)
Coping Strategies Employed by MSMEs to combat COVID-19 challenges

### Number of MSMEs employing coping strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Agribusiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Started sourcing from new suppliers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased marketing efforts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed online sales</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid off full time employees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid off/stopped paying daily wagers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily reduced employment</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed from friend/family</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold off assets</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used own-savings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed online sales</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased marketing efforts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started sourcing from new suppliers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact of coping strategies on MSMEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Agribusiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Positive Impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Negative Impact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Agribusiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief to daily wage workers</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accelerated tax refunds for exporters</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash transfers</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support to MSMEs</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief in fuel prices</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity bill payments</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid laying off workers</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently increase regulatory limit on extension of credit to SMEs</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing deferred interest payments</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessional Loans</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing reduction on interest rates</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ehsaas Emergency Cash Programme</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government of Pakistan’s policy response to the COVID-19 pandemic (select graphs)

The Ehsaas Emergency Cash Programme

- **Agribusiness**: 22% Not helpful at all, 34% Some what helpful, 39% Helpful, 5% Not aware of this measure
- **Farm**: 38% Not helpful at all, 22% Some what helpful, 19% Helpful, 21% Not aware of this measure

Electricity bill payment

- **Agribusiness**: 42% Helpful, 17% Some what helpful, 32% Not helpful at all, 7% Not aware of this measure
- **Farm**: 35% Helpful, 37% Some what helpful, 9% Not helpful at all, 21% Not aware of this measure

Permanently increase regulatory limit on extension of credit to SMEs

- **Agribusiness**: 69% Not aware of this measure, 21% Not helpful at all, 4% Somewhat helpful, 6% Helpful
- **Farm**: 57% Not aware of this measure, 22% Not helpful at all, 14% Somewhat helpful, 7% Helpful
MSME satisfaction and ease of access to information and benefits

Satisfaction with the policy response of the Government of Pakistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agribusiness</th>
<th>Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ease of access to information and benefits on policy measures

- Agribusiness: 70% Difficult, 12% Somewhat easy, 6% Easy
- Farm: 71% Difficult, 23% Easy
MSMEs needing specific Government policies to cope with COVID-19 challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Policy/Action</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Agribusiness</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary wage subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit guarantees</td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build emergency food reserves or food banks</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee waivers on loans</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax waivers or temporary tax breaks</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt-write-offs</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRODUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygienic and safe transport for workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of tariffs on imported inputs</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred payments for inputs</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge the gap between price received by farmer and market price</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax waivers or temporary tax breaks</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTPUT AND DISTRIBUTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection against falling commodity prices</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygienic transport and distribution channels</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of unsold stocks of finished goods</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build collection centres near production site</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully subsidize storage costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification for handling, and storage of food</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This graph depicts the share of respondents over the total number of respondents per category – finance, production, and output and distribution – for both, agribusinesses and farmers respectively. The highlighted rows illustrate the most needed policy response per category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Assistance</th>
<th>Priority 1: Immediate Need</th>
<th>Priority 2: Medium-Term Need</th>
<th>Priority 3: Long-Term Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Finance</td>
<td>Develop new business models to continue sales</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Train businesses in relevant financial literacy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop new financial models</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support in accessing existing loans and grants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Access</td>
<td>Market Information Dissemination</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Train value chain actors on new ways of business management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop new tools for selling/buying/market information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to existing online platforms for selling/buying/market information</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better Internet Connection</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity, Quality, and Sustainability</td>
<td>Train value chain actors on new ways of production</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase and ease input availability and procurement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support in obtaining certifications/compliance to be able to operate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of workplace safety standards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations and Policies</td>
<td>Incubation for start-ups</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure Food Security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support firms' survival during and post COVID</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Each respondent was asked to choose the urgency for each type of assistance they required from GRASP in the following categories: Regulations and Policies, Productivity, Quality, and Sustainability, Market Access, and Access to Finance. Each bar in the graphs shows the total number of respondents split into their chosen level of priority for each type of assistance in each of the categories.
Agribusinesses needing help from GRASP with COVID-19 challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Finance</th>
<th>Number of agribusinesses saying they need help to deal with specified COVID-19 challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop new business models to continue sales</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train businesses in relevant financial literacy</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new financial models</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support in accessing existing loans and grants</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Information Dissemination</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train value chain actors on new ways of business management</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new tools for selling/buying/market information</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to existing online platforms for selling/buying/market information</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Internet Connection</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Access</th>
<th>Number of agribusinesses saying they need help to deal with specified COVID-19 challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train value chain actors on new ways of production</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase and ease input availability and procurement</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support in obtaining certifications/compliance to be able to operate</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of workplace safety standards</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity, Quality, and Sustainability</th>
<th>Number of agribusinesses saying they need help to deal with specified COVID-19 challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incubation for start-ups</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Food Security</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support firms' survival during and post COVID</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Each respondent was asked to choose the urgency for each type of assistance they required from GRASP in the following categories: Regulations and Policies, Productivity, Quality, and Sustainability, Market Access, and Access to Finance. Each bar in the graphs shows the total number of respondents split into their chosen level of priority for each type of assistance in each of the categories.