A certificate starts with a working service market

Agriculture, food quality & nutrition

Retrospective · September 2021–July 2022 learning | Published 17 November 2026

Retrospective learning edition: the period above is the experience discussed, not an earlier publication date.

A miller can understand a standard and still struggle to comply. This edition examines the relationships between practical advice, enforcement, investment and demand for safer food.

IAM and processed-food certification

FtF IAM facilitated regional sector-wide training with Food Safety Associates, Partners in Food Solutions and UNBS, followed by tailored technical assistance, mentoring of local consultants and processor learning events. Its July 2022 tracer study gathered feedback from 33 cereal processors.

The brief describes increased interest in certification and changes to facilities and operating practices. It also identifies an unresolved service-market question: who will pay for advice once project support ends? Certification incentives included compliance and operating improvements; a price premium could not simply be assumed.

What the Activity did

1. Explained cereal standards and practical hygienic and manufacturing requirements.

2. Connected processors with tailored technical assistance and locally based advisers.

3. Convened learning events to discuss practice and demand for certification services.

Evidence boundary

The tracer evidence is programme-generated and involves training, technical assistance and enforcement together. It does not prove that training alone caused the observed changes.

What this means for future design

UMSDN editorial interpretation

UMSDN's design interpretation begins with a distinction between knowing a requirement and being able to meet it. A processor might lack cash for an upgrade, trusted advice, a reliable testing service or a buyer willing to recognise quality. Repeating awareness sessions will address only some of those constraints.

A future intervention should map a processor's compliance journey. Identify where a decision stalls and what would make the next step worthwhile. Compare the cost of an adviser with plausible savings, lower rejection, access to a buyer or reduced disruption. Record those as hypotheses until verified with the business.

There is also a public-interest question. Safer food can benefit people beyond the individual firm. That does not remove the need for a credible financing arrangement, but it means full commercial cost recovery is not the only possible design. Spell out any public role, responsible institution and budget route.

For learning, follow processors who take no action as well as those who upgrade. Check whether advice remains available, whether fees are affordable, and whether practices continue. A completed training register or an application for a certificate is a useful milestone; neither is the same as sustained quality or safer consumption.

The question for discussion

If consumers do not pay a premium, what would make a small processor keep investing in food quality?

Try this with your team

Map five steps from a processor recognising a requirement to maintaining compliant operations. At each step, name the service provider, cost, incentive and evidence needed. Circle the step a new programme should investigate first.

Read the source. Share your view.

Catalyzing demand for quality in Uganda through processed foods certification

FtF IAM learning brief, including July 2022 tracer feedback. UMSDN's interpretation and exercise are original editorial material.

https://beamexchange.org/resources/resource-library/2103/

Read and contribute directly: https://umsdn-learning-hub.vocalapron1.chatgpt.site/resources/newsletters/?issue=02