

A Service of

ZBW

Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Briones, Roehlano M.

Working Paper Market Structure and Distribution of Benefits from Agricultural Exports: the Case of the Philippine Mango Industry

PIDS Discussion Paper Series, No. 2013-16

Provided in Cooperation with: Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS), Philippines

Suggested Citation: Briones, Roehlano M. (2013) : Market Structure and Distribution of Benefits from Agricultural Exports: the Case of the Philippine Mango Industry, PIDS Discussion Paper Series, No. 2013-16, Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS), Makati City

This Version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/10419/126937

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



WWW.ECONSTOR.EU



Philippine Institute for Development Studies Surian sa mga Pag-aaral Pangkaunlaran ng Pilipinas

Market Structure and Distribution of Benefits from Agricultural Exports: The Case of the Philippine Mango Industry

Roehlano M. Briones

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES NO. 2013-16

The PIDS Discussion Paper Series constitutes studies that are preliminary and subject to further revisions. They are being circulated in a limited number of copies only for purposes of soliciting comments and suggestions for further refinements. The studies under the Series are unedited and unreviewed.

The views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute.

Not for quotation without permission from the author(s) and the Institute.



February 2013

For comments, suggestions or further inquiries please contact:

The Research Information Staff, Philippine Institute for Development Studies

5th Floor, NEDA sa Makati Building, 106 Amorsolo Street, Legaspi Village, Makati City, Philippines Tel Nos: (63-2) 8942584 and 8935705; Fax No: (63-2) 8939589; E-mail: publications@pids.gov.ph

Or visit our website at http://www.pids.gov.ph

MARKET STRUCTURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS FROM AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS : THE CASE OF THE PHILIPPINE MANGO INDUSTRY

Roehlano M. Brionesⁱ

Abstract: To illuminate the role of agro-export industry in inclusive growth, this case study on Philippine mango focuses on the role of market structure in the distribution of export benefits. It is based on review of industry trends and related studies, open-ended interviews of key informants, and structured interviews of respondents situated along the value chain.

The distribution of trade benefits is hypothesized to depend on both vertical and horizontal market structure. The former implies that a contracting relationship or vertical integration is a mechanism to elevate product quality to export grade. The latter implies that economies of scale are a factor in mango exporting, at the marketing and processing stages. It is noteworthy that are no discernible economies of scale at the primary level, which accounts for the prevalence of smallholder growing at the production stage.

Quantitative analysis confirms that vertical linkages are an important factor in raising mango quality to export grade. Moreover, enterprise size is an important factor in producing or procuring export grade mango. This in turn accounts for the prominence of horizontal market structure in the export sector.

However, the importance of scale economies in the industry should not be overstated. Investment requirements do rule out small-scale operations, but are perfectly within reach of medium-size firms. Considerably more entry is possible with adequate and stable supply of quality raw material at reasonable cost. In fact entry has been recorded in both fresh and processed exports, though exits are also frequent; the largest firms, especially among processors, tend to be the longest-lived.

To facilitate entry, encourage diversity, and widen distribution of benefits from exporting, concerned stakeholders must focus on relieving the key constraint, which is availability of stable and affordable supply of fresh mango of export grade for either fresh or processed sectors. This requires regulatory reforms, reliable database of mango growers, investments in R&D, and improvements in the extension system to offer technical assistance and technology transfer.

Keywords: Agricultural exports, distribution, market structure, vertical linkages

ⁱ Research Fellow, Philippine Institute for Development Studies. The author acknowledges financial support from the Food and Agriculture Organisation, research support of Peter Turingan and Erick Javier, and helpful comments of Manitra Ratakoarisoa. The paper expresses his personal views for which he alone is responsible.

1. INTRODUCTION

Overview

The Philippines is a large developing country that still derives considerable export revenues from agriculture; as of 2011, agricultural exports reached \$5.9 billion, equivalent to 10.7% of total exports. Among food exports, the single biggest source of earnings is edible fruits, valued at \$940 million.

The tropical fruit industry in the country has had long history of globalization, both in terms of trade and foreign direct investment. Globalization critics have long suspected that the benefits of the world trading system are confined to only a few large companies, i.e. transnationals and their local allies. On the other hand the benefits from the export market may turn out to be widely diffused over the supply chain, reaching numerous small and medium enterprises and growers. A study of the role of market structure in the distribution of export benefits would illuminate the contribution of the agro-export industry in inclusive growth.

This study examines the case of the Philippine mango industry, the third largest fruit export of the country after banana and pineapple. A diverse set of market players are active in the export trade. The mango industry is a case study of a dispersed industrial organization, in contrast to banana and pineapple, which tend to be dominated by large agribusiness interests.

Aims and scope

The case study approach will rely on quantitative and qualitative information, derived from desk review, focus group discussions, and key respondent interviews, using both structured questionnaires and informal question guide. The objectives are three-fold:

- 1. Characterize the mango export industry at the institution, industry, and firm levels;
- 2. Provide qualitative analyses of the main determinants of the level and distribution of trade benefits among firms;
- 3. Undertake quantitative analyses of the main determinants of the level and distribution of trade benefits among firms.

Subject to data availability, characterization and qualitative analysis would cover the following:

- Identify the size of the tropical fruits export industry (in comparison with other agricultural exports); sources of the export ability of the industry (regulations, comparative advantage, or abundance in factor endowment);
- Describe the industries and its firms and their link to the country's agricultural sector and economic activity;
- Identify exporting firms; their input and output markets; degree of integration; input sources; market destinations; market shares;
- Determine the level of industry concentration; level of competition among firms; market power; entry and exit rates;

- Identify the exporters' strategies to 'win' over the importers and the strategies when dealing with inputs and service providers; the size and distribution of the trade gain.
- Document past experiences, if any, when these exporters' strategies worked and effectively enhanced trade gains for exporting firms and influenced the distribution of trade benefits.
- Discuss all possible factors, including organization and conduct, that influence the level and distribution of trade benefits among the heterogeneous firm;
- Describe how trade benefits spill from the trading firms to their upstream or downstream domestic links;
- Provide implications of the findings for the distribution of potential trade gains on upstream and downstream links.

Accordingly, the following will be discussed in relation to the quantitative analysis:

- Determine what influences the level and distribution of trade benefits among firms and industries; particular focus will be on the role of organization and behavior of trading firms.
- Discuss the implications of the findings for enhancing the ability of trading firms and their upstream and downstream links to capture trade benefits and opportunities.

The remainder of the report is organized as follows: Section 2 characterizes the industry and based on review of industry trends and previous research. The case study method is described in Section 3, which discusses valid and tractable indicators of trade benefits that arise from the data. Key findings are presented Section 4. Section 5 summarizes and discusses implications for enhancing ability of firms to capture benefits from exporting.

2. PHILIPPINE MANGO INDUSTRY: REVIEW OF PAST TRENDS AND STUDIES

Trends

The Philippine mango industry has been consistently expanding, judging by trends in area harvested (Figure 1). From below 80,000 ha in 1990, area has been increasing, approaching 200,000 ha by 2009. Initially, yield was also increasing, from 6 t/ha in 1990 to 8 t/ha in 1997, before plummeting to current levels of only 4 t/ha. Aggregate production reached 1 million t in the late 1990s (Figure 2), and again in 2007, before dropping to below 800,000 in 2011. Climate and pests remain major drivers of production; in 2008 for instance the drop in production was traced to typhoons, wind damage, anthracnose, bacterial wilt, fruit flies, and leaf hoppers (BAS, 2008).

The climatic conditions for mango production are summarized as follows (Bally, 2006, p. 7):

Mango grows over a wide range of frost-free climates. The trees produce best in climates that have a well defined, relatively cool dry season with high heat accumulation during the flowering and fruit development period. Rain or free moisture (high humidity, heavy dew, and fog) during the flowering and fruiting period is conducive to the development of fungal diseases that cause flower and fruit drop.

Climate and geography of the Philippines is described in Box 1. Luzon possesses the climate ideal for mango growing; according to Figure 2, Luzon is by far the largest producer, with more than half of its output coming from Ilocos Region. The bulk of Luzon's output is harvested during the hot dry season of March to May. Year-round production is obtained

from Visayas and Mindanao. Mindanao has the unique advantage of being mostly free from the typhoons, which routinely strike about twenty times a year in the rest of the country.



Figure 1: Area (in '000 ha) and yield (t/ha) of mango, 1990 - 2010

Figure 2: Mango production in the Philippines by island group, 1990 - 2011 ('000 t)



Source: CountrySTAT.

Exports of mango by volume took off in the 1990s (Figure 3). Even at peak exports, the domestic market still absorbed 95 percent of domestic production. Note that mango exports followed overall trends in production in the 1990s; however in the 2000s, mango exports fell off quite steeply in terms of volume.

A different story emerges however from considering export value (Figure 4), which suggests a shift from exports of fresh mango towards the more rapidly growing processed sector (Digal and Concepcion, 2004). There is no clear declining trend in the 2000s, but rather one of fluctuation; the year of peak production (2007) does not coincide with the highest export earnings, which in fact peaked in 2011, approaching \$100 million. The country's mango industry has achieved such spectacular growth owing to a robust world market together with a shift in higher value products.

Box 1: The Philippines

The Philippines is divided into three major island groups: Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao, respectively: North, Central, and Southern Philippines. The north and central part is affected by monsoon rainfall beginning about May – June up to October – November, with a dry season from December to April. The northwestern part has a more pronounced dry and wet pattern compared to the rest of the country. The eastern part has no dry season but has a pronounced rainy season in December to February. Mindanao is characterized by uniform rainfall year-round. The rainy season is accompanied by typhoons (averaging twenty per year); which pass through a typhoon belt that basically bypass Mindanao.

Each island group is divided into administrative regions, the Ilocos Region highly suitable for mango growing. The list of regions of the Philippines is as follows:

Luzon			
NCR:	National Capital Region (Metro Manila)		Sulu
CAR:	Cordillera Administrative Region		Sea
Region I:	Ilocos		
Region II:	Cagayan Valley		
Region III:	Central Luzon	MALAYSIA	
Region IVA:	CALABARZON		
Region IVB:	MIMAROPA		
Region V:	Bicol		
Visayas			
Region VI:	Western Visayas		
Region VII:	Central Visayas		
Region VIII:	Eastern Visayas		
Mindanao			
Region X:	Northern Mindanao		
Region XI:	Davao		
Region XII:	Central Mindanao (SOCCSKSARGEN)		
Region XIII:	Caraga		
ARMM:	Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao		
	Source: http://kidlat.pagasa.dost.gov.ph/cab/	<u>climate.htm;</u> B	ally (2006)

Figure 3: Exports of mango in tons, 1962 – 2007 (includes guavas and mangosteens)



Note: Mangosteen and guava exports are negligible. Source: FAOStat.

ILOCOS REGION

South

China

Sea

Philippine

Sea

LUZON

MINDANAO

VISAYAS

By destination, the biggest markets have traditionally been Japan followed by Hong Kong. In the last few years though, export markets have diversified quite dramatically, with the US now being the biggest market destination, though Japan and Hong Kong continue to command significant export shares.



Figure 4: Value of exports by destination market, 2001 - 2011, in 1987 dollars

Farming practices

Mango production is input-intensive (Table 1). Farm inputs take up nearly a third of production cost; imputed costs of labor and capital accounts for another third. Profit per kg is P10.00.

Production is typically small-scale; in the last agricultural Census (2002), average farm size nationwide was only 1.64 ha (Figure 5). There are however large variations across regions: the largest farm sizes are found in Mindanao (in the 2 to 4 ha range, except for ARMM). Farm sizes in Ilocos Region (1.2 ha) are even lower than the national average.

	Cost per kg, in pesos	Share in total (percent)
Total cost	14.7	100.0
Cash cost	8.8	59.8
Farm inputs	4.8	32.9
Workers	2.5	16.7
Fuel, utilities	0.4	2.8
Other fees	1.1	7.4
Non-cash costs	1.0	6.7
Imputed costs	4.9	33.5
Family labor	1.1	7.5
Others	3.8	26.1

Table 1	1:	Production	cost of	'mango,	2010
---------	----	------------	---------	---------	------

Note: yield = 4,359 kg per ha; farmgate price is P24.76 per kg. In 2010 the exchange rate averaged 45.11 pesos per \$US.

Source: CountrySTAT.

Source: Trademap (<u>www.trademap.org</u>)



Figure 5: Average farm size of mango farms by region, 2002, in ha



A mango industry survey reported in BAS (2002) covers 200 farms, found in all the island groups (Table 2). Nearly three-quarters have farms of under 1 ha, while only 6 percent farm above 5 ha. The vast majority (over four-fifths) own their own mango farms, whereas tenants account for only 12 percent.

 Table 2: Distribution of mango farmers by size of farm and type of tenure, 2001 (percent)

Size of form	Below 1 ha	1 to 4.99 ha	Above 5 ha		
Size of farm	74	20	6		
Tupo of topuro	Owner	Tenant/Lessee	Other tenure		
Type of tenute	81	12	7		

Source: BAS (2002)

Farmers enter into three main types of contracts (De la Cruz, 2007):

Leasehold – the owner agrees to lease trees to a producer, who undertakes all commercial activities from spraying to harvesting and marketing. The renter/producer shoulders all input and marketing costs. Payment per tree is estimated based on age and size of tree. Payment may be done in installment, i.e. 50 percent before fruiting, and 50 percent after harvest. For larger farms (over twenty trees) the terms of lease may be governed by a written agreement.

Output-sharing – the farmer agrees to share output with a contractor; the latter shoulders production inputs starting from spraying up to harvest. The sharing is typically 50:50; 60:40 in favor of the contractor may also be agreed if the location or production environment of the farm is unfavorable (i.e. entails higher cost per kg for the contractor).

Contract buying - the contractor simply purchases fruit from the farmer at pre-determined rates; however the buyer is not involved in production. The agreement may be reached at the fruiting stage, or around harvest season.

The contracts differ in risk exposure and asset protection. Leasehold offers the least risk to

farmers, but also the least protection of their assets – the lessor may "abuse" the trees by over-spraying, while the lessee has difficulty monitoring such behavior. Contract buying offers maximum protection for the trees and land, but also shifts risk entirely on the farmer. Output sharing appears to be the middle ground to balance risk and asset protection, and has emerged as a "very popular" form of production contract.

Value chain

Summarizing previous studies, Digal (2005) describes the various marketing channels for the mango value chain (Figure 6). The farmer may sell directly to an exporter or even the consumer (especially for small local markets); however the most common route is through a contract buyer. From the buyer the product passes through either a wholesaler-retailer, or wholesalers, who then send the product to a retailer or to an exporter.





Source: adapted from Digal (2005)

One complication is the introduction of processing (dried mango, mango juice, mango pulp), which caters to the export or domestic market. Furthermore between the farmer and retailer there may be multiple layers of traders as described in BAS (2002). The categories are:

• Assembler: focuses on procurement from farmers or other traders; typically sells to one (primary) buyer. Can be distinguished by geographic level of sources: barangay, municipal, provincial, regional, interregional.

- Distributor: focuses on selling to multiple buyers. Can be distinguished by size, i.e. small, medium, and large distributor.
- Assembler-distributor: equal attention to procurement and sales. Can distinguish both by level of procurement operation, and size.

Digal (2005) provides a simple breakdown of the price margins for mango, with a comparison with the export price (Table 3). Note that the export price has only a slight edge over the retail price. The price differential accounts for 27 percent of the retail price and as much as 44 percent of the wholesale price.

	Price (\$US)	Margin (over previous level)		
Export (f.o.b.)	0.84	not available		
Retail	0.81	27		
Wholesale	0.59	44		
Farm	0.33	not applicable		
Source: Digal (2005)				

Table 3: Price margins for mango by market level, in percent, 2002

The differentials may be explained at least in part by marketing costs, described in detail in BAS (2002) based on a marketing cost survey. Marketing cost incurred by traders within a province (transportation, labor, materials, etc.) are shown in Table 4. The shares appear to be quite large relative to the farmgate price. Davao City has the highest cost owing to the airplane fare for transport to Metro Manila markets. Pangasinan cost is high owing to high cost of depreciation and labor; for Guimaras the largest cost components are miscellaneous expenses, materials, and labor.

	Cash cost	Non-cash cost	TOTAL	Farmgate price
Pangasinan, Ilocos	5.25	3.25	9.02	21.25
Guimaras, Eastern Visayas	5.77	3.25	9.02	24.51
Iloilo, Eastern Visayas	4.76	0.40	5.17	20.33
Cebu, Central Visayas	3.37	0.10	3.47	22.74
Davao City, Davao	10.02	0.01	10.03	14.41
Davao del Sur, Davao	4.16	0.04	4.2	21.35
General Santos, SOCCSKSARGEN	3.29	0.08	3.37	13.59

Table 4: Marketing cost and farmgate price of mango in selected provinces, in P/kg (2001)

Note: the exchange rate in 2001 was P51/\$1.

Source: BAS (2002)

A more recent survey on marketing cost is reported in Sarmiento et al (2012). Their study highlights the role of the export trader, as their pricing is higher compared to the local trader, inducing growers to improve the quality of their produce to export grade. The survey is limited to Davao City, Digos City (in Davao del Sur province), and Island Garden City of Samal (IGACOS, an island accessible by short boat trip from Davao City). The net margins by stage of the marketing chain are summarized in Table 5. In Davao City, retailers earned the highest margins; the city hosts large markets such as Bankerohan, which attracts consumers. In Digos City meanwhile, wholesalers earn the highest net margin owing to proximity to mango growers in Davao del Sur, reducing their transport costs. In IGACOS, it is the farmers which earn a higher net margin compared to retailers (no wholesalers operate

in the area). The markets stalls in the area are still small; most of the mangoes are shipped directly to Davao City and other neighboring provinces.

		D :		
		Price	Net Margins	
		(P/kg)	(P/kg)	
Davao City	Farmer	21.66	2.83	
	Wholesaler	40.00	14.96	
	Retailer	50.00	19.72	
Digos City	Farmer	22.83	6.35	
	Wholesaler	35.00	17.35	
	Retailer	52.50	16.15	
IGACOS	Farmer	20.60	8.93	
	Wholesaler	n/a	n/a	
	Retailer	45.00	4.41	

Tuble et i tet mai gins by stage of mai netnig enanny sereetea rocation	Table 5: Net	margins by s	tage of marketing	chain, selecte	d locations
---	--------------	--------------	-------------------	----------------	-------------

Source: Sarmiento et al (2012).

Export business

Aveno and Orden (2004) describe the business of four exporters operating in Luzon. Peak export months are from March to May; canvassing for supplies begins in December. Procurement is done through roving agents, though growers/cooperatives are also entertained.

A farmer may opt for classified pricing, in which mango pieces are sorted for export and local grade; the alternative is straight pricing, in which no sorting is done and payment is made according to total quantity. Export grade mangos should meet quality requirements, i.e. maturity, absence of scabs, molds, burns, marks, and scratches; fruits are further distinguished by size, i.e. small, medium, large, and extra large.

Fatajo et al (2006) discuss the Hong Kong export market. One motivation to export to Hong Kong is the absence of tariff or taxes in that city state; its regulatory imposition is modest, requiring only certification of fitness for human consumption from the Department of Health. Prices are predetermined by the exporter and consignee (the importing agent) before shipment. The landed cost of the fruit in Hong Kong was equivalent to P66 per kg in March 2002; at peak shipment (April and May) the price can drop to as low as P35 per kg, but can rise to 133 per kg from February to September.

A comprehensive value chain analysis is available for the processed mango industry as of mid-2000s (Pearl2 Project, 2004). The industry is composed of a variety of products including dried mango, puree, juice, nectar, slices, and halves. Processed mango exports are dominated by dried mangoes, accounting for 46 percent by value; this is followed by puree, accounting for 40 percent. Processors are actively introducing new products such as fruit blending (i.e. mango and tamarind), mango leather (dried puree), etc.

Most firms are small- and medium-sized. There are about 85 mango processing firms, majority of whom (66 percent) produce puree, and are clustered in Metro Manila. Thirteen firms, mostly processors of dried mango, are in Cebu. Numerous small processors specializing in other mango products such as sauces and preserves operate in and around Metro Manila and Metro Cebu. Fresh mango for processing is typically procured from the "open market". Only 23 percent of processors obtain mango from their own farm or by contract arrangements.

Philippine mango is well known worldwide for superior taste, which carries over into the

processed product. This corresponds to a price premium over its major competitors, namely Thailand, followed by India, China, Malaysia, Vietnam, and Indonesia. However competitiveness can be improved by reducing the cost of raw materials, especially mangoes and sugar. The report identifies the major issue of the industry being the "lack of good-quality mangoes at reasonable prices".

3. METHOD

Data collection

The case study collected qualitative and quantitative information based on informal interview of key respondents, and structured questionnaire. The question guide and questionnaire are presented in a separate documentation report.

The structured questionnaires were administered to respondents in the following categories: *growers, traders,* and *processors.* Growers are defined as mango producers (whether or not they own mango farm land) who do not engage in trading. Traders engage in trading, either for local and export markets (or both), whether or not they engage in growing, but are not engaged in processing. Processors produce dried mango for export (but may engage in other activities and markets). Distribution across geographic areas is as follows:

	Cebu	Davao Region	Pangasinan (Ilocos Region)	Manila	Total
Growers	1	6	7	0	14
Traders	4	9	13	1	27
Processors	5	0	0	0	5
TOTAL	10	15	20	1	46

Mango processors are mostly concentrated in Cebu; in Ilocos Region, the province with the highest production and densest concentration of mango farmers is in Pangasinan. In all 46 respondents were interviewed using the structured questionnaire. Informal interviews as well were conducted with the same respondents as appropriate; in addition, several members of the National Mango Action Team, a joint public-private sector consultative body convened by the Department of Agriculture (DA), were also interviewed.

Quantitative analysis

Quantitative analysis adopts a two-step approach. The first step is to quantify the benefit from exporting; second is to examine the distribution of benefits from exporting.

For the first step, data collected from the enterprise survey could in principle provide an indicator of trade benefit if there can be a clear distinction between mango sold for export, and mango sold for the domestic market. This is possible however only at the level of the direct exporter, or its direct suppliers, i.e. the last and penultimate links in the chain.

Further up the chain, from the grower to the earlier layers of marketing agents or traders, *it is usually impossible to make the distinction between mango for export and mango for the domestic market.* This implies two things that hold throughout the chain at the enterprise level (except the last and penultimate stages):

- Participants would usually be unable to identify the share of exports in total production;
- Participants would be unable to segment prices between exported mango, and mango for the domestic market.

To address this, for the first step the study focuses on the market-level effects of export prices using supply-demand modeling rather than analysis of enterprise-level data. The analytical tool is the Agricultural Multi-market model for Policy Evaluation (AMPLE), an eighteen-sector model of Philippine agriculture which includes Mango as a distinct sector, described in Briones (2010). The scenario involves dropping the world price of mango to levels at or near the domestic wholesale price, to simulate a situation of zero mango exports; the resulting prices, quantities, and so on, represent a counter-factual to the baseline or reference scenario.

For the second step, distribution of benefit from export trade is analyzed at the firm level using micro-data from the enterprise survey. Analysis focuses on the relationship between an *indicator of benefit from exporting* and *indicator of enterprise size* – conditional on a positive relationship, the greater the impact of enterprise size on benefit from exporting, the less equitable the distribution of trade benefit.

The ideal firm-level indicator is the impact of export trading on enterprise income or profitability. However, within the limited time frame of the study, measuring profit at the enterprise level would be time consuming as this would require information on cost. This does not seem necessary for two reasons:

- There seems to be no separate production technology targeting the export market; rather a set of good practices that produce high quality mango either for domestic or export market.
- There is relatively adequate information from previous studies reviewed in Section 2 for production cost and returns throughout the marketing chain.

Instead of differences in profitability, the study focuses on the difference in revenue due to exporting. However this confronts another difficulty: The widespread practice of "all-in" pricing mixes together both domestic grade and export grade mango, under a single price. *Hence high export prices can indirectly affect the average price along the chain*. This implies **market segmentation** between export and domestic outlets, with the former commanding a higher price, but imposing more stringent entry barriers in the form of quality standards and sales networks. Larger firms may have greater capability to overcome these entry barriers, allowing them to sell a larger share of output to the export market.

In short, a suitable indicator of trade benefit is average price or revenue per kilogram (RKG).

$$RKG = \frac{Export\ revenue}{Mango\ input, in\ kg}$$

Given the cross-section nature of the data, the most important factor distinguishing revenue per kilogram across firms, is access to the export market. Exporting allows the enterprise to gain access to a premium price, hence increasing RKG.

Hypotheses for quantitative analysis

The first key hypothesis of the study pertains to horizontal structure: *the bigger the firm, the greater the RKG*. The implication of this for equity is that the bigger firms are better able to gain access to a lucrative export market. The indicator of enterprise size is **value of fixed assets**.

The second pertains to vertical linkages: *relationship-based supply or purchase transactions promotes greater access to the export market and therefore higher RKG*. The indicator of vertical linkages pertains to a relationship-based supply or buying arrangement, or outright vertical integration (i.e. a grower-trader). This is represented as a binary variable (value of 1 for vertical linkages and zero for spot market transactions.) The presence of vertical linkages allows greater control over product quality, which facilitates exporting.

The relationship between RKG and enterprise size and vertical linkages is initially explored using simple summary charts. This is complemented by multiple regression analysis, incorporating other control variables such as: characteristics of enterprise head (years of schooling, and years of experience in mango business); and category of firm (represented by binary variables for Processor and Trader).

4. **RESULTS**

Benefits from exporting: national level analysis

As described in Section 4, the first step to analyzing benefits from exporting is a national level analysis using AMPLE. The AMPLE data set records exports of mango at 22,000 t (fresh weight equivalent), which is a 3-year average (2008-2010). This accounts for only 3 percent of total mango production of 827,000 t. Export price is about 48 percent higher than the estimated domestic wholesale price (P69 vs P43 per kg). As explained in Briones (2010), the supply for export and domestic markets are treated as differentiated goods, within a constant elasticity of transformation framework (fairly standard in computable general equilibrium models). Given the proportions involved, even a massive export price shock would likely have only small effect on market outcomes of the industry.

The AMPLE Reference scenario captures baseline trends for the agricultural sector and Philippine economy, similar to that projected in Briones (2012). Projection occurs over the horizon 2010 - 2020. World mango prices in real terms are unchanged over the horizon. The comparison scenario involves reducing export price to levels that drive exports to zero in year 2010, with no change thereafter. The shock introduced for 2010 is -25 percent.

Results for mango exports are shown in Figure 7, which is limited to the reference scenario. Exports are projected to rise from 22,000 to 34,000 by 2020 corresponding to an annual growth of about 4 percent. Production is shown for both reference and no-export scenarios (Figure 8). Production in the latter is uniformly lower by about 20 - 26,000 t or an average of 2.2 to 2.3 percent.

Impact on producer prices is even less perceptible (Figure 9). Initially the difference producer price is widest at P0.23/kg (about 1 percent difference), where the no-export scenario price is lower. The difference however narrows to just P0.13/kg by 2020. Even this small difference practically vanishes in the case of retail price (Figure 10).

Initially the no-export scenario is also lower by about 0.4 percent; over time the retail price under the no-export scenario is slightly *higher* as inter-sectoral effects are felt.

These data and simulations offer a valuable perspective on the magnitudes involved, i.e. changes in revenue due to exporting of less than 3.5 percent at the industry level. Clearly a more targeted view, covering the subset of firms that do gain significantly from exporting, is needed to better understand the importance and distribution of benefits of export trade.



Figure 7: Exports under the reference scenario,

Figure 8: Production under reference and noexport scenarios, '000 t



Source: Author's calculations



The export market

Competitiveness of Philippine mango industry is based on natural endowment: The Philippines is gifted with an exotic variety that thrives well in selected areas of the country. In fresh form a major limitation of the Philippine mango is its thin skin, imposing high freighting cost over long distances. This limits the fresh mango market to Asia, of which the two major markets are Japan and Hong Kong. The former is the most lucrative market by far but imposes the most stringent quality requirements, including maximum residue limits, and mandatory Vapor Heat Treatment (VHT).

The other major product category in the export market is processed mango; in this case study

the focus is on dried mango. Logistics for processed mango is easier compared to fresh mango. Quality is also less of an issue; unlike fresh mango for Japan, processors are not particular about quality of mango skin; however the flesh must likewise be free from blemish as these affect quality of dried mango. Processed mango is mostly exported, with about 85 percent of dried mango production sent abroad. Processed mango is easy to ship worldwide and a couple of suppliers mention buyers in Europe (almost inaccessible to fresh mango exporters) as being major customers.

Entry to the export business is subject to large volume requirement (to make shipping economical). In turn this requires considerable working capital outlay, beyond the reach of many small traders. In the case of the Japanese market this is compounded by the high fixed cost of complying with quality standards, such as investing in a VHT (which could run up to a million dollars depending on capacity and quality). Meanwhile in the case of Hong Kong exports, the main challenge is the risk imposed by the consignment scheme, in which the Filipino exporter absorbs loss from output not sold in the destination market. Many traders who could possibly meet the volume requirements of exporting to Hong Kong are deterred by risk involved, as well as need to form trust relations with Hong Kong importers.

For mango processing, the processing plant itself represents a significant fixed investment (about P50 million). Development of marketing contacts seems less of a problem once a firm has established its reputation for quality.

Profile of exporters

Exporters whose destination market is Japan must have a VHT; the biggest cluster of VHT plants are found in the agro-industrial park of Food Terminal Inc. (FTI), a government-owned corporation. The park is located in the Taguig, eastern part of Metro Manila, in which there are only three locators .

For mango processing there is one cluster, located in Metro Cebu. About a dozen processors remain active; there is a single dominant firm, accounting for roughly 85 percent of output. The dominant firm has a capacity is 1,000 t of fresh mango input a day, whereas other processors can handle only a tenth of this; The also produces puree and juice.

Characteristics of enterprise heads are summarized in Table 6. Most have been at least two decades in the business; processors are the oldest firms in the business. Enterprise heads have mostly reached tertiary level, with majority having finished college; processors also tend to have the most years of schooling.

Category	Number	Years in business (average)	Years schooling (average)	Started in family business (number)	Membership in association	Had technical assistance (number)	With vertical linkage
Processor	5	31	15	3 [60]	5 [100]	0 [0]	5 [100]
Trader	27	19	13	12 [44]	15 [56]	16 [59]	10 [37]
Grower	14	26	15	7 [50]	11 [79]	10 [71]	4 [28]
Total	46	23	14	22 [48]	31 [67]	26 [56]	19 [46]

 Table 6: Characteristics of enterprises and enterprise heads

Note: Figures in square brackets denote percentages of each category.

Source: Author's data.

Nearly half of the respondents got their start in the mango industry as part of the family business; the proportion rises to 60 percent for processors. Two-thirds of the respondents are members of a mango business association; the proportion rises to 100 percent in the case of the processors.

Majority of enterprise heads received technical assistance, mainly for mango production; however none of the processors received technical assistance. Respondents were not always able to pinpoint whether the technical assistance was from government or not; however a significant number (5 out of the 26) specifically singled out chemical companies as source of technical assistance.

Two-thirds of enterprises were part of vertical commercial linkages. All the processors engaged in either or both contract buying and contract selling. As for the traders, as many as 21 out of the 27 are also growers, implying vertical integration between production and marketing; the rest of the 27 were engaged in informal contracts for purchasing mangoes.

Lastly, a small proportion (3 out of 14) of growers were also contracted as regular suppliers. Of these, only two out of the three receive advances for materials from the buyer. Many of the traders report having engaged in such "putting out" contracts in the past, but had discontinued these due to difficulty in recovering their advances. Hence supply arrangements gravitate to either spot contract or outright integration.

Challenges of exporting

As discussed in Section 2 there is considerable benefit from exporting, for the few enterprises that manage to break through to the export market. Exporting however faces some daunting challenges. First, as in selling to the domestic market, mango exporting is subject to seasonality of supply. Luzon harvest season of March to May requires large capacity of VHT plant to handle deliveries; for the rest of the year though equipment is largely idle. During off-season, supplies must come from Visayas and Mindanao. Similarly, processors have to contend with seasonality. Capacity is expanded to accommodate the Luzon harvest (which arrives with little difficulty in Cebu). During the lean months however, processor's agents must comb the Visayas and Mindanao regions to gather enough raw material.

In general, the main constraint identified by the Pearl2 (2004) report, applies even today and for both fresh and processed mango: exporters and traders mostly identify adequacy of supply of export grade mango as a constraint. Processors in particular are unconstrained by lack of orders from importers; rather lack of raw material compels them to turn down purchase orders from their buyers. Likewise growers mention difficulties in maintaining output levels, mentioning pest infestation and bad weather as culprits.

The second main problem is high cost of inputs. One trader was vocal in attributing high cost of inputs to government regulation, mainly in the form of regulatory barriers imposed by the Fertilizer and Pesticide Authority (FPA, an attached agency of DA). Among processors, high cost of sugar (a major input in dried mango production) has also been cited as a problem. This in turn is traced to high tariffs and regulatory barriers to sugar importation. Moreover, destination countries (such as China) would themselves maintain trade barriers against Philippine mango products, as reciprocity to similar trade barriers imposed by the Philippines on destination country exports (such as vegetables from China).

Lastly, for the processed sector, recognition in a crowded world market for preserved fruit requires more than just capitalizing on the superior taste of Philippine mango. Processors need to maintain high quality and offer variety of export items, which entails continuous research and product development. This is most evident in the dominant firm, which produces a wide array of products in its dried line, not to mention extensive offerings in its juice and puree lines.

Distribution of benefits from exporting: enterprise-level analysis

The following presents findings on distribution of benefits from exporting based on a more systematic quantitative analysis. Consider first a scatterplot between enterprise assets and RKG (Figure 11). Most enterprises are relatively small (assets of P10 million and below). Nevertheless there is a tendency for asset size to be associated with increasing RKG. The plot suggests important non-linearities, which we can adjust by performing a scatterplot on the natural logarithms of RKG and assets (Figure 12). The positive relationship is much clearer; also drawn is a linear trend line which suggests a strategy for multiple regression.



Figure 11: Scatterplot diagram between revenue per kilogram and enterprise assets

As indicated in the Methods section, other variables that may also be correlated with RKG are enterprise head characteristics, enterprise category variables, and a binary variable for vertical linkages (whether forward or backward). Summary statistics and pairwise correlation with RKG is shown in Table 7. There seems to be a discernible correlation between RKG and Assets, as well as with the Processor and Vertical linkage variables. However correlation with enterprise head characteristics is quite low.

Ordinary least squares regression isolates the importance of enterprise size and vertical linkages by incorporating various potentially influential variables. The following regressions and statistical tests are performed using STATA. The first specification directly applies the variables in Table 7 directly as independent variables in the regression. The results are shown in Table 8.

Source: Author's data.



Figure 12: Scatterplot diagram between revenue per kilogram and enterprise assets, in natural logarithm

Source: Author's data.

Variable	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Pairwise correlation with RKG
RKG	36.39	3.92	178.50	1.00
Asset (pesos)	59,700,000	0.00	2,300,000,000	0.27
Experience (years)	22.54	0.00	42.00	0.08
Schooling (years)	13.81	5.00	18.00	0.04
Processor	0.11	0.00	1.00	0.18
Trader	0.59	0.00	1.00	-0.05
Vertical linkage	0.41	0.00	1.00	0.37

Table 7: Summary statistics of the enterprise variables

Source: Author's data.

The coefficient of Assets is both quantitatively and statistically insignificant. In fact none of the coefficients are statistically significant, except for the Vertical linkage variable. The regression fails to pass the F-test for joint significance. Overall the model is a poor fit (with adjusted R^2) of only 0.07.

Table 8: Results of least squares regression on RKG

Variable	Coefficient	t-value	$P(t > t_c)$
Assets	0.000000176	1.37	0.178
Experience	0.0085838000	0.02	0.986
Schooling	0.8973938000	0.61	0.544
Processor	-0.5838684000	-0.04	0.972
Trader	9.9706960000	1.01	0.321
Vertical linkage	18.9114900000	2.13	0.04
Constant	8.4755140000	0.31	0.758

Note: F = 1.54; $P(F > F_c) = 0.19$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.07$.

Source: Author's data.

The poor fit of the simple linear model to the data suggests a specification problem, namely

failure to account for non-linearities in the data, which is already evident from the scatterplot of Figure 12. This failure is corrected by running a log-linear regression, results of which are shown in Table 9. The goodness-of-fit dramatically improves with adjusted-R² of 0. 185, a realistic magnitude considering the cross-section nature of the data. The Breusch-Pagan test for heteroscedasticity (null hypothesis of constant variance) yields a $\chi^2 = 0.015$ corresponding to $P(\chi^2 > \chi_c^2) = 0.70$, i.e. failure to reject the null. The Ramsey reset test (null of no omitted variables) yields an F-value of 1.54 or $P(F > F_c) = 0.22$, i.e. failure to reject the null at 0.05 level of significance. That is, standard tests fail to detect fundamental problems in model specification.

Variable	Coefficient	t-value	$P(t > t_c)$
Assets, in logs	0.141	2.93	0.01
Experience	-0.011	-1.08	0.29
Schooling	-0.021	-0.64	0.53
Processor	-0.771	-2.01	0.05
Trader	0.153	0.74	0.46
Vertical linkage	0.391	2.13	0.04
Constant	1.699	2.36	0.02

Table 9: Results of log-linear least squares regression on logarithm of RKG

Note: $\overline{F = 1.72}$; $P(F > F_c) = 0.15$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.10$.

Source: Author's data.

Moreover the asset variable is now significant with high t-value. The coefficient value implies that every 1 percent increase in assets increases RKG by 0.14 percent. In short, the quantitative analysis based on enterprise-level data confirms the first hypothesis, that larger enterprises tend to earn higher average revenue due to greater access to export markets.

Similarly there is confirmation of the second hypothesis, that vertical linkages contributes to gaining access to export markets. The coefficient of Vertical linkages is positive and significant at the 5% level. The mechanism is likely to be the improved enforcement of quality standards and volume requirements, compared to spot market, consistent with the author's qualitative impressions from field interviews.

The only other significant coefficient is Processor, which has a negative coefficient. The reason is that on a per kilogram fresh weight basis, dried mango commands a lower export premium compared to fresh mango. In terms of quality standard, export grade dried mango is in between domestic grade and fresh export grade.

5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The case study has found that benefits of exporting are relatively small at the industry level; nevertheless for a subset of firms who are able to consistently supply or procure export grade of mango, exporting offers a very lucrative option.

Vertical market structure, i.e. contracting relationship or vertical integration, was

hypothesized as a mechanism to improve product quality to export grade. The case study however confirms this hypothesis. Vertical linkages are a mechanism of ensuring mango supplies comply with quality and quantity requirements acceptable to the export market. Clearly, the private sector should take the lead in developing effective vertical linkages to increase value-adding in the mango supply chain. However other stakeholders such as the national and local government, and other members of the development community, should direct their efforts and resources to support the development of tighter links along the chain, such as providing better transport infrastructure, technical assistance, community organizing farmer registry (see below), and credit support.

On the other hand, horizontal market structure does appears to be an important factor in exporting. Economies of scale and ability to bear risk are present at the level of marketing and processing. These take the form of volume requirements (for shipping), the risk of poor sales or rejection by regulators in the destination market, and large fixed investments (treatment plant or processing plant).

However, there are no discernible scale economies at the level of primary production. This possibly accounts for prevalence of small farms in the mango production sector. Moreover large agribusiness interests who have ventured into mango farming (e.g. Dole Philippines) have failed to replicate the success of their other fruit ventures.

Even in marketing and processing, the importance of scale economies in the industry should not be overstated. Investment requirements, while they do rule out microenterprise-scale operations, are perfectly within reach of medium-size firms. Considerably more entry is possible with adequate and stable supply of quality raw material at reasonable cost. In fact entry has been recorded in both fresh and processed exports, though exits are also frequent; the largest firms, especially among processors, tend to be the longest-lived.

The Pearl2 Project (2004) report recommends creation of a database of suppliers with track record in supplying good quality mango; this is particularly timely as the DA is preparing a nationwide farmer's registry (http://www.da.gov.ph/index.php/2012-03-27-12-04-15/2012-04-17-09-30-59/1087-farmer-database-to-aid-aggie-sector-in-program-dev-t.) This database may also benefit private sector traders and processors, particularly new investors in mango exporting and processing.

Regulations and trade protection (on the side of the Philippines) have been cited as factors in elevating cost of chemicals and processing inputs (i.e. sugar). Importing countries have also refused to relax trade barriers as reciprocal treatment to high trade barriers imposed by the Philippines. These factors should be reviewed for possible ways to reduce cost through better policy.

A more stringent constraint however appears to be erratic yields and quality due to environmental factors (i.e. weather, pest, and disease). It appears that the level of technology of mango production has not matured to the point of comprehensive management and control of environmental risk, even for large-scale and technically sophisticated agribusiness firms. This suggests that R&D may continue to offer enormous gains for mango production and address the problems faced by small farmers. Past research success in the Philippines, home of the revolutionary flower induction technology, augurs well for investments in this area (see e.g. http://beta.searca.org/searca/index.php/45-dl-umali-award/45-2011-dl-umali-awardee).

Furthermore, as discussed in the Pearl2 (2004) report, lower production cost can already be realized under existing technologies, such as: property fertilizer management informed by soil testing; and reduction of pesticide use (through bagging and integrated pest management). Propagation of current and new technologies should be promoted through a responsive extension system in which public and private extension agents are key partners.

REFERENCES

Aveno, J., and M. Orden, 2004. Hot water treatment of mango: a study of four export corporations in the Philippines. King Mongkut Institute of Technology Ladkrabang Journal 4(1).

Bally, I., 2006. *Mangifera indica* (mango). Special Profiles for Pacific Island Agroforestry. <u>www.traditionaltree.org</u>.

Bureau of Agricultural Statistics, 2002. Marketing Costs Structure for Mango. Marketing Costs Structure Study Series No. 3. Agricultural Marketing Statistics Analysis Division, BAS, Quezon City, Philippines.

Briones, R., 2010. Scenarios and Options for Productivity Growth in Philippine Agriculture: An Application of the Agricultural Multimarket Model for Policy Evaluation (AMPLE). Discussion Paper No. 2010-05. PIDS, Makati.

Briones, R., 2012. Rice self sufficiency: is it feasible? Policy Notes 2012-12. PIDS, Makati.

De la Cruz, A., 2007. Contractual Arrangements in Agriculture (Northern and Central Luzon Component). Discussion Paper Series No. 2007 – 21. Philippine Institute for Development Studies, Makati, Philippines.

Digal, L., 2005. Benefit Diffusion and Linkage Development in the Philippine Tropical Fruits Sector. Paper presented at a conference on "Closing the Productivity Gap", World Bank and the National Economic and Development Authority, Asian Institute of Management Policy Center, 27 June.

Fatajo, L, L Galang, M. Jamandre, W. Panela, 2006. Analysis of the Price System and Trade Related Concerns of Philippine Mango. Research Paper, Central Luzon State University, Munoz, Philippines.

National Statistics Office [NSO], 2010. Census of Agriculture and Fisheries 2002. NSO, Manila.

Pearl2 Project, 2004. State of the Sector Report – Philippine Processed Mango. Technical Paper No. 1.

Sarmiento, J., R. Aguinaldo, L. Digal, A. Castillo, C. Balgos, 2012. Mango Production in Major Areas in Davao Region: Value Chain and Net Margin Analyses. Paper presented at the End-of-Program Conference and Dinner for the ACIAR-PCAARRD Southern Philippine Fruits and Vegetables Programs, July 1-3, Cebu Parklane International Hotel.