



Effects of Certification Systems for Agricultural Commodity Production on Socio-economic Outcomes of Beneficiaries in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: a Systematic Review

Carlos Oya, Deborah Johnston, Dafni Skalidou, Evans Muchiri, Florian Schaefer, Claire Stansfield, Kelly Dickson

Submitted to the Coordinating Group of:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Crime and Justice
<input type="checkbox"/>	Education
<input type="checkbox"/>	Disability
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	International Development
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nutrition
<input type="checkbox"/>	Social Welfare
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:

Plans to co-register:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Cochrane	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/>	Maybe		

Date Submitted:

Date Revision Submitted:

Approval Date:

Publication Date: 02 January 2015

Note: Campbell Collaboration Systematic Review Title Registration Template version date: 24 February 2013

TITLE OF THE REVIEW

Effects of Certification Systems for Agricultural Commodity Production on Socio-economic Outcomes in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: a Systematic Review

BACKGROUND

The role of international trade in reducing poverty and increasing welfare remains an issue of controversy and debate (Winters, 2003; McCulloch et al., 2001). Open economies may perform better in the long term, Winters (2002) argues, but in the short term trade liberalization can have adverse effects on the most vulnerable actors in the economy and some risk getting trapped in poverty. This is likely to happen to agricultural producers in developing countries, as Nicholls and Opal (2004) highlight, where deficient microeconomic conditions (poor market information, limited access to markets and credit, lack of ability to adapt rapidly to market changes, among others) are coupled with chronic macroeconomic failures, such as lack of infrastructure and investment, heavy dependence on few primary commodities and corruption. Primary commodities producers are often particularly vulnerable to price volatility and inadequate and asymmetric price transmission mechanisms. In addition, international markets for agricultural commodities are increasingly demanding in terms of quality and production conditions, whether related to social or environmental sustainability (Gibbon and Ponte 2005; Henson and Humphrey 2010). A wide range of voluntary private standards (or codes of conduct) have emerged in the past few decades to complement public standards to deal with trade of agricultural commodities, typically monitored through private audits and third-party certification (Barrientos et al. 2003; Schuster and Maertens 2015; Henson and Humphrey 2010).

Certification schemes (CS) for agricultural commodity production generally aim to improve on the effects of free trade by offering better trading conditions, enhancing product quality, raising productivity or a combination of these aspects. The introduction of codified standards itself, in the form of a label following an auditing process, may induce behavioural changes in farmers resulting, for example, in specific investments that benefit production conditions and open access to better market opportunities without any direct intervention at farm level by the certifying body. In short, different certification schemes are best understood as bundles of interventions, guided by a variety of theories of change. As a result, certification schemes differ greatly in the populations they target, in the outcomes they seek to certify and in the audit and certification process itself. There are certification schemes which operate primarily to enhance the quality achieved by agricultural producers to ensure they qualify for better market niches more amenable to sustainable income generation, as is the case of MPS for flowers and EUREPGAP for horticultural produce. Other schemes more directly seek to establish ethical trading conditions by offering alternative markets with higher prices. Amongst these certification schemes, one influential set are Ethical Trading

Initiative (ETI) schemes and particularly Fair Trade (FT) schemes, which aim to address the adverse effects of international trade by offering better trading conditions to, and securing the rights of, marginalized agricultural producers, workers and their communities and helping them to organise to achieve these goals (Dragusanu et al. 2014). FT schemes, unlike other CS more concerned about the quality and characteristics of the product, were primarily designed to directly affect socio-economic outcomes and empowerment of agricultural producers and workers through different direct interventions. FT, for instance, operates through a set of standardised and audited interventions (floor prices, provision of a social premium, credit-availability, assistance to access the market, etc.) which are conditional on a number of requirements related to democracy, participation, transparency and the adherence to environmental and labour standards. Sometimes, these interventions may happen alongside additional interventions by NGOs that adhere to the FT ethos and market FT products, as is the case of OXFAM or TechnoServe. By implementing such interventions, FT and other schemes are expected to produce positive outcomes that improve the welfare of beneficiaries in terms of higher and more stable incomes, better services to improve business, as well as education, health and other aspects of human welfare, and decent working conditions for wage workers. These interventions are expected to directly and indirectly empower marginalized agricultural producers, workers and their communities.

This systematic review will address the extent to which, and under what conditions, interventions under various certification schemes for agricultural commodity production result in higher socio-economic welfare for agricultural producers and workers in low and middle income countries (LMICs). Results will highly and immediately relevant to both policy and practice, since they will provide guidance to certifying organisations, such as those who are members of the ISEAL Alliance, sectoral codes of conduct (such as MPS) and broadly ethical trading partners, as to the most effective elements of their interventions. Certifications are also becoming increasingly important to successful entry into global value chains, and are therefore receiving more and more attention in development policy circles. In addition, some of these CS, for example Fair Trade schemes, also receive public funding from government agencies aiming to improve rural livelihoods (e.g. DFID).

Moreover, each intervention may have differing effectiveness for different groups of rural inhabitants, particularly between rural inhabitants who focus on the production of certified products and those who are mostly dependent on wage labour. It has been argued that evidence of effects on wage workers under different schemes is still limited, and some organisations, such as FT, recognise that standards and auditing procedures need review in this respect as exemplified by a recent Fairtrade International recent call for evaluation studies and evidence on the impact of smallholder certification on wage workers (<http://www.fairtrade.net/vacancies.html> on 28th August 2014; see also FTEPR 2014 on the issue of wage workers in FT certified smallholder farms). There are of course other CS, which focus on wage employment conditions and labour standards as is the case of some ETI

certifications and the well-known SA800 code established by Social Accountability International (<http://www.sa-intl.org/>). The results of this review can thus be useful for these umbrella networks and other organisations involved in certification with different interventions, such as Utz Certified, MPS and other certifications around the social sustainability umbrella. But of course, results are also likely to be useful to stakeholders not directly related with these certifying bodies. For instance, organisations that provide financial or technical support to such certification efforts can also benefit from this comprehensive effectiveness review. Consumer groups or associations may also be interested, as they can gain knowledge to better inform their campaigns and priorities. Lastly, we hope the review also be of use for agricultural producer organisations, which invest resources in the certification processes of their members.

OBJECTIVES

The main objective of the review is to synthesise and evaluate evidence on the effects of certification schemes in agricultural commodity production and their interventions on key socio-economic welfare outcomes at the level of the individual producer or worker. Although there is an increasing number of studies, both independent academic and commissioned research, the evidence base for the effects of such interventions on the economic and human welfare of their beneficiaries remains limited, and is likely to be characterised by high risk of bias. An up-to-date systematic review is necessary to assess the quality of this growing evidence, and synthesise the most important and reliable findings, which may help direct research towards areas where knowledge about the effects of various certification schemes of agricultural commodities on the selected outcomes is most limited. Within the guiding review questions below, this systematic review will synthesise outcomes along the causal chain, making a distinction between intermediate outcomes such as price levels and volatility or provision of community infrastructure and services, and endpoint outcomes, including measures of household welfare such as household income, health and education outcomes.

The review will seek to answer the following questions:

Primary Review Question:

1. What are the effects of certification schemes for agricultural commodities, and their associated interventions, in terms of endpoint socio-economic outcomes for household/individual welfare, such as income (incl. farm income), consumption, assets, working conditions, education, health and empowerment in low and middle income countries?

Subsidiary review question:

- 1.1. Under what circumstances and why do certification schemes for agricultural commodities have the *intended* and/or *unintended effects*? What are the barriers and facilitators to such certification's *intended* and/or *unintended* effects?

EXISTING REVIEWS

As briefly noted above the current evidence base for the overall impact of interventions resulting from certification schemes for agricultural commodity production on agricultural producers and workers is quite limited. There have however been some attempts to arrive systematically review the evidence. A study by the International Trade Centre (2011a), one of a four part review series on certification schemes (“private standards”), for instance seeks to present the overall findings of the relevant literature using systematic review methods. Unfortunately, the study uses vote counting, rather than true meta-analytic methods, to synthesise the evidence and no information on effect sizes is presented. While a quality appraisal was undertaken, the results of this exercise for individual studies are not shared with the reader in any detail. The search methods used by the study also cast doubts on how comprehensive its literature coverage is. Searching seems to have been limited almost exclusively to two databases containing only academic journals. Similarly, a similar review by Blackman & Rivera (2010) also uses systematic review methods to synthesize the available evidence on sustainability standards. Sadly, this review suffers from very similar issues as the study by the International Trade Centre, namely relying on simple vote counting method, a lack of details on quality appraisal and an unconvincing search strategy. In short, the existing reviews of the evidence suffer from serious shortcomings that make them unsuitable for research or policy use and the need for a high-quality systematic review using more sophisticated methods of synthesis remains. There have also been many studies that have basically mapped the various codes of conduct, especially for wage workers, and the way these incorporate issues of gender and how they operate, but these tend to be focused on the nature, process and actors in these schemes rather than on their impact (see Barrientos et al. 2003 for a seminal study of this kind of mapping).

The situation is not much different considering only the literature on FT interventions, for which more reviews are available. Partly as a result of the rapid increase in sales of FT products (Krier, 2007; Reynolds, 2000), the number of studies assessing the impact of FT has substantially increased from 2000 (possibly as a result of criticism regarding the lack of studies, Ronchi, 2002; Weitzman, 2006). Nevertheless, very little efforts have been made so far to synthesise this body of research. In an attempt to compile existing studies on the impact of FT, a literature review was commissioned by the Fairtrade Foundation to map and analyse the impact of FT certification (Nelson and Pound, 2009), while a similar compilation was conducted by Vagneron and Roquigny (2011). Further, Terstappen et al. (2012) undertook a systematic scoping review on the social dimensions of FT, gender, health, labour

and equity in particular. Overall, the three reviews present an account of the existing research, identify some methodological issues (Terstappen et al., 2012; Nelson and Pound, 2009) and make future research recommendations (Terstappen et al., 2012; Vagneron and Roquigny, 2011). None of these reviews, however, provides an audit trail of the searching and synthesis process, nor do they systematically assess the quality of the studies they include. Moreover, they do not contribute with statistical meta-analysis of effect sizes or rigorous and exhaustive syntheses of the qualitative evidence.

Efforts are recently made to increase both the quantity and quality of the evidence on the impact of FT. However, as reported by Terstappen et al. (2012), FTEPR (2014) and Ruben (2013) the main bulk of studies is still characterised by evaluation designs vulnerable to validity threats, while description of data collection and analysis tends to be poor, preventing assessments of the quality of the evidence. Moreover, some biases towards more attention to independent agricultural producers as opposed to wage workers have also been reported (International Trade Centre, 2011b: 19). Therefore, the need for a systematic review with an inclusive framework, which will identify this expanding body of literature and critically appraise its quality, becomes clear and timely.

INTERVENTION

Interventions:

The review will include studies on the effects of farm level interventions in the production of agricultural commodities under certification schemes that have clearly defined socio-economic goals. The certification schemes, such as interventions that follow the FT principles, as defined by the World Fair Trade Organisation (WFTO), as well as other for examples under the social sustainability umbrella, must aim directly and explicitly to improve the wellbeing of beneficiaries. The exact goals and the underlying theory of change differ from scheme to scheme. For example, the primary aim of FT Interventions focuses on the welfare of beneficiaries and the conditions of their activities through the provision of prices that deliver a basic livelihood for agricultural producers (Dragusanu et al. 2014). Other social certification schemes, such as UTZ, aim to include farming practices to improve the productivity and quality of commodities, so as to obtain better prices for those involved in their production.

Interventions which simply aim at advocating the objectives and activities of, for example, FT or other forms of ethical trade will be excluded, as they are designed to raise awareness among consumers without directly affecting the welfare of beneficiary agricultural producers and workers. Interventions and certification for the use of environmentally friendly production processes will also be excluded as they are not directly related to the welfare and working conditions of agricultural producers and workers. For the same reason,

interventions whose primary outcome is environmental sustainability will also be excluded. However, there are certification schemes, like Rainforest Alliance, that have environmental sustainability as a primary outcome, but also have explicit objectives in relation to improvements in labour standards. Therefore, studies that include evidence of the impacts of Rainforest Alliance, or similar scheme, on their intended labour standards will be included. By contrast, organic certification will be excluded because there are no explicit intended socio-economic outcomes and the primary goal is to ensure environmental sustainability and consumer safety. There may be some studies that report on socio-economic outcomes associated with organic certification, but these are essentially unintended outcomes and these studies aim to engage with the debate about the possible negative effect of organic farming on productivity and therefore farm incomes (e.g. Bolwig et al. 2009).

Certification can be provided by a variety of certifying bodies, which fall under the broad category of social sustainability standards. For instance, FT certification may be provided by the Fairtrade International (FLO), or alternative trade organisations within the WFTO. One of the inclusion criteria (e.g. Nestle's AAA standard) will be excluded. All interventions included in this systematic review should have one or more of the following components:

1. Price and contract interventions which guarantee a floor price to agricultural producers, offer a price premium, provide credit and/or pre-payment and long term contracts.
2. Market access interventions which facilitate access to alternative and/or additional markets for poor agricultural producers, including labels that signal quality or traceability premia, which are expected to directly benefit farmers through higher prices.
3. Provision of technical assistance to individual agricultural producers for better farming practices that are designed to increase the quality and productivity of their commodities, which would result in higher incomes and better market access.
4. Social premium interventions that pay a premium for social development projects which can be invested to improve production, marketing and/or community services and infrastructure.
5. Interventions which provide technical assistance to agricultural producers organisations or workers' organisations. Such interventions may include capacity building of farmers for production, or improvements in quality, and marketing improvements and monitoring of discriminations against vulnerable social groups.
6. Labour standards interventions which set standards for living wages and working conditions. Such interventions include the monitoring of workers' rights and labour standards violations, and educational activities on workers' rights and labour standards.

In order to meaningfully define the boundaries of this review, studies must report interventions that follow the principles set by social sustainability certifying bodies, as long as the interventions described above are relevant, and as long as at least one of the primary outcomes of these certification schemes is the wellbeing and empowerment of beneficiaries, rather than environmental sustainability. A challenge for this review will be that different

certification schemes that aim to improve the welfare of agricultural producers and worker in agriculture differ in their model of intervention and in their theory of change. For example FT schemes focus on prices and market access, while MPS is mainly about sustainable quality and social standards, and UTZ certifications, while similar to FT schemes in terms of the broad aims, work in terms of improvements in farming practices and quality rather than price mechanisms. Moreover, each certification scheme may also incorporate different grades of certification, as in the case of MPS for flowers. Therefore, information about the different types of certification schemes and their *modus operandi* will be used as moderators in the meta-analysis.

The review is particularly interested in studies that make comparisons between various types of certification, as they will have evidence on comparative effects of different interventions. However, it is important to note that certification as such is not an intervention. We count as interventions actions taken by certification schemes, and carried out by the various certification schemes in order to meet their socio-economic goals. The certification is the result of a set of interventions.

Theory of Change and pathways to effects:

Given the wide variety of certification schemes, their intended outcomes and methods of intervention there is no single theory of change that is valid for all types of certification schemes. However, we will produce a simplified synthetic ToC that summarises the key linkages in the causal chain between interventions, intermediate outcomes and endpoint outcomes. The protocol will also include examples of specific ToCs associated with some of the most influential certification schemes, as in the case of FT.

Below are examples of how different types of interventions, which are used by different certification schemes, may affect intended outcomes, and therefore the assumed causal chains, which will be analysed in this review.

1. **Price and contract interventions.** Interventions to offer price premium or floor prices are expected to → contribute to higher and more stable producer prices, which can → result in higher net profits for agricultural producers, assuming they are not offset by high certification costs. In addition, both pre-payment, credit and longer-term contracts can → improve income stability and reduce vulnerability to shocks. These effects can → result in higher income and consumption at household level.
2. **Market access interventions.** As an alternative and/or additional market certification schemes can → contribute to: higher prices; better contracts; strengthened market power and negotiation capacities of producer organizations and ultimately → to their members' empowerment.

3. **Product quality.** Better farming practices and suitable technical assistance are expected to →lead to higher agricultural incomes and strengthened market power of beneficiaries thereby →raising their capacity to invest in their own production
4. **Social premium.** The social premium → can be invested in a variety of assets/infrastructure leading to possible positive outcomes → better education and health access/outcomes; incomes if economic infrastructure/assets improve; empowerment via strengthened beneficiary organizations; better working conditions.
5. **Monitoring of producer organisation practices and technical assistance to producer organisations and individual agricultural producers.** Democracy standards and other organisational improvements can → result in strengthened organizations in terms of their legitimacy, participation and capacity to negotiate, which → can lead to members' empowerment and access to better services.
6. **Labour standards.** Their implementation can directly → impact workers' welfare through of living/better wages, and better working conditions, especially when health and safety conditions improve and affect workers' health. Outcomes should be reviewed for workers employed by all types of agricultural producers from smallholder to large scale organisations

POPULATION

The review will include *agricultural producers* and *wage workers* living in low and middle income countries, as defined by the World Bank at the time the intervention was carried out. The target group may include individuals, households or producers' and workers' organisations. Depending on the availability of data in the included studies, the review will examine whether findings differ according to gender, age, socio-economic status, location, type of production (smallholder vs plantation), type of product, types of certification scheme, and length of participation in the supply chain of the relevant agricultural certification schemes.

The review will exclude studies that report on the impact agricultural certification schemes on consumers.

OUTCOMES

The review will include studies that contain data on outcomes related to relevant theories of change, which will be detailed in the protocol.

Outcomes may be direct or indirect. The focus of the review is on the endpoint outcomes for welfare and empowerment of beneficiaries and the conditions of their activities. The review will however also include studies that report on both intermediate and endpoint outcomes:

- *Intermediate* outcomes include:

- net returns to certified production
- quality of commodities
- productivity of commodities
- price and income volatility
- wages
- non-wage labour conditions
- organisational empowerment of producers' and workers' organisations
- investments in services and infrastructure.
- *Endpoint* outcomes include:
 - household income or consumption or other measure of socio-economic status (e.g. asset index)
 - health and education of adults and children
 - gender equity in the outcomes above
 - producers' and workers' empowerment. At this stage it is not yet clear whether studies produce consistent measures of 'empowerment' and whether some of them overlap with outcomes mentioned above. The protocol will more specifically discuss the key indicators of empowerment and how they relate to intermediate outcomes.
- Adverse or *unintended* effects of certification, which can affect the above endpoint outcomes, such as effects on production costs (certification costs), debt, and workload, and local market conditions (i.e. local prices, access to local markets) will also be included.

STUDY DESIGNS

The review will adopt a theory-based, mixed methods approach and will include a broad range of evidence from both quantitative and qualitative research (Snilstveit, 2012). In order to assess the effects of the agricultural certification schemes, the review will include studies using experimental and quasi-experimental designs. In order to investigate under which circumstances interventions resulting from certification work and for whom, the review will include qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods studies which collect and analyse primary data from beneficiaries, extension agents or experts. Additionally, we will draw on background programme/project documentation, project completion reports and process evaluations. Advocacy research that does not incorporate reliable and substantial factual evidence will be excluded in order to ensure the independence of the literature included.

Study design and method of analysis:

1. What are the effects of certification schemes for agricultural commodities, and their associated interventions, in terms of endpoint socio-economic outcomes for household/individual welfare, such as income (incl. farm income), consumption, assets, working conditions, education, health and empowerment in low and middle income countries?

Studies eligible for inclusion to answer the main review question are: experimental design (where randomised assignment to the intervention is made at cluster level), quasi-experimental designs (including controlled before and after (CBA) studies with contemporaneous data collection and with two or more control and intervention sites, regression discontinuity designs (RDD), difference-in-difference analysis (DID), instrumental variable estimation (IV), and interrupted time series studies (ITSs)), as well as ex post observational studies with non-treated comparison groups and adequate control for confounding.

Studies that do not control for confounding using these methods, such as those based on inter-temporal comparison groups (pre-test post-test with no non-intervention comparison group), will be excluded. Examples of eligible studies that have been identified through an initial scoping search are the following:

- Quasi-experimental studies that measure the effect of agricultural certification schemes on agricultural producers and their families using Instrumental Variables (such as Becchetti and Costantino, 2008; Becchetti and Michetti, 2010 in the case of FT evaluations) and Propensity Score Matching (PSM) techniques (Ruben and Zuniga, 2011; Ruben et al., 2009).

The review will include studies which compare agricultural producers or wage workers receiving a relevant intervention with a control group that either receives no intervention, or receives an intervention related to other types of product certification. Comparison may be in terms of before/after i.e. a time before the introduction of certification, and/or cross-sectional, i.e. a group of non-participants or a location where certification has not yet been introduced. Individuals will be associated with outcomes of certification where there are groups of agricultural producers or workers, producers' organisations or trade unions, or geographic areas when these correspond to locations dominated by, or with very strong presence of, certifying organisations. An example identified by early scoping:

- Quasi-experimental studies that compare the effect of different agricultural certification schemes on agricultural producers and their families against uncertified control groups using PSM to control for confounding (Chiputwa, Spielman and Qaim, 2014)
2. Under what circumstances and why do certification schemes for agricultural commodities have the *intended* and/or *unintended effects*? What are the barriers and facilitators to such certification's *intended* and/or *unintended* effects?

Studies eligible to answer this review question are: background project documentation, project completion reports and process evaluations obtained on the interventions evaluated in the effects review; other qualitative studies, ethnographies and other types of studies that present evidence on the outcomes of certification interventions. As Mallett et al (2012: 453) suggest in the case of FT, qualitative evidence will examine 'how' and 'for whom' certification works, by (a) paying attention to direct and indirect linkages between

interventions and outcomes; (b) understanding mediating factors; and (c) explaining heterogeneous distributional outcomes (e.g. gender and socio-economic status). Examples of eligible studies include:

- non-experimental studies that examine the direct and indirect impacts of agricultural certification schemes, such as of FT in this case, using qualitative and mixed methods such as interviews (Ronchi, 2002) or participatory action research and survey (Bacon, 2010).

We will develop a two-stage approach to quality appraisal for the review of qualitative studies, using set of criteria developed from the CASP guidelines. In the first screening round, irrelevant studies (in terms of population, etc.) and studies of especially low quality (e.g. that do not report on sampling methods) will be excluded. The second round of screening will sort studies into two or more quality categories, allowing us to use study quality as a moderator in synthesising information.

REVIEW AUTHORS

Lead review author: The lead author is the person who develops and co-ordinates the review team, discusses and assigns roles for individual members of the review team, liaises with the editorial base and takes responsibility for the on-going updates of the review.

Name:	Carlos Oya (Lead PI)
Title:	Reader in Political Economy of Development
Affiliation:	SOAS, University of London
Address:	Department of Development Studies, SOAS, University of London Thornhaugh St, Russell Square
City, State, Province or County:	London
Postal Code:	WC1H 0XG
Country:	United Kingdom
Phone:	+44 207 898 4566
Email:	co2@soas.ac.uk

Co-author(s): (There should be at least one co-author)

Name:	Deborah Johnston (PI)
Title:	Reader in Development Economics
Affiliation:	SOAS, University of London
Address:	Department of Economics, SOAS, University of London Thornhaugh St, Russell Square

City, State, Province or County:	London
Postal Code:	WC1H 0XG
Country:	United Kingdom
Phone:	+44 207 898 4494
Email:	dj3@soas.ac.uk
Name:	Dafni Skalidou
Title:	PhD candidate
Affiliation:	School of International Development/ University of East Anglia
Address:	Norwich Research Park
City, State, Province or County:	Norwich
Postal Code:	NR4 7TJ
Country:	United Kingdom
Phone:	
Email:	D.Skalidou@uea.ac.uk , dskalidou@yahoo.gr
Name:	Florian Schaefer
Title:	PhD candidate
Affiliation:	SOAS, University of London
Address:	Department of Development Studies, SOAS, University of London Thornhaugh St, Russell Square
City, State, Province or County:	London
Postal Code:	WC1H 0XG
Country:	United Kingdom
Phone:	
Email:	fs12@soas.ac.uk
Name:	Evans Muchiri
Title:	Researcher
Affiliation:	Freelance
Address:	TBC
City, State, Province or County:	Nairobi
Postal Code:	TBC
Country:	Kenya
Phone:	

Email:	evanmuchiri@gmail.com
Name:	Claire Stansfield
Title:	Information officer
Affiliation:	EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education
Address:	Institute of Education, University of London 20 Bedford Way
City, State, Province or County:	London
Postal Code:	WC1H 0AL
Country:	United Kingdom
Phone:	+44 (0)20 7612 6816
Email:	c.stansfield@ioe.ac.uk
Name:	Kelly Dickson
Title:	Research Officer
Affiliation:	EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education
Address:	EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education
City, State, Province or County:	Institute of Education, University of London
Postal Code:	20 Bedford Way
Country:	London
Phone:	+44 (0)20 7612 6127
Email:	k.dickson@ioe.ac.uk

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- **Content:** Carlos Oya, Deborah Johnston and Dafni Skalidou have all substantial expertise in issues related to certification scheme interventions and their impact, through their own independent research. Carlos Oya will participate in all stages of the SR process for leadership and coordination and will be assisted by Deborah Johnston in this task.
- **Systematic review methods:** All team members except for Florian Schaefer have direct experience in systematic review methods, in particular Dafni Skalidou, Kelly Dickson, Claire Stansfield and Evans Muchiri who have worked in leading organisations in systematic reviews (EPPI-IOE and International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)). Carlos Oya and Deborah Johnston both have good knowledge of systematic review methods and have

applied them in recent research. All staff members have already received further specialist training in systematic review methods conducted by 3ie on 17th and 18th November 2014.

- **Statistical analysis:** Evans Muchiri and Florian Schaefer have expertise in statistical analysis, with Evans having substantial experience in meta-analysis for systematic reviews. Dafni Skalidou also has skills in statistical analysis for systematic reviews. Evans and Florian will conduct the bulk of statistical analysis with guidance from Carlos Oya and assistance from Dafni Skalidou.
- **Information retrieval:** Dafni Skalidou, Evans Muchiri, and Kelly Dickson all have substantial expertise in information retrieval for SRs. Claire Stansfield is a leading specialist in this field. The other team members can also participate and coordinate information retrieval thanks to their substantial experience in conventional literature reviews and knowledge of subject. Research assistants will be hired for the searching, assisting Evans and Florian, following general guidance from Claire Stansfield, oversight by Carlos Oya and coordinated by Dafni Skalidou.

POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Carlos Oya and Deborah Johnston were investigators in a DFID-funded research project which, among other aims, assessed the effects of Fairtrade certification on wages and work conditions of workers employed by a range of agricultural producers, including smallholder farmers, as the first study that collected data on wage workers employed by smallholder members of Fairtrade-certified organisations (see FTEPR 2014). A conventional literature review had been conducted for this project. The project ended on 31st March 2014 and the report published on 23rd May 2014. This participation, which was in the form of independent academic research, does not in any way affect the impartiality of the researchers involved. We see this SR as another step towards more independent research in this field. Moreover, any primary studies in which the PIs and other team members have been involved will be coded by *other* team members.

Dafni Skalidou has worked with Fairtrade organisations in Spain and South America in the past, but is no longer professionally related to any of them. She is currently doing her doctoral research on the impact of Fair Trade on cocoa farmers and banana plantation workers in Ghana. Her work is funded by the University of East Anglia and is totally independent from any FT organisation. Dafni has also worked with the 3ie-Systematic Reviews team in the past, however, her working contract was finalised in September 2013.

FUNDING

This systematic review is supported by the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie), as part of their Systematic Review Grants (Call 6). The deadline for submission of the

final protocol is 19th December 2014. The scheduled date for submission of a first draft of the review findings is 29th January 2016, with a final deadline scheduled for 29th April 2016.

PRELIMINARY TIMEFRAME

Note, if the protocol or review are not submitted within 6 months and 18months of title registration, respectively, the review area is opened up for other authors.

- Date you plan to submit a draft protocol: 19/12/2014
- Date you plan to submit a draft review: 29/01/2016

DECLARATION

Authors' responsibilities

By completing this form, you accept responsibility for preparing, maintaining, and updating the review in accordance with Campbell Collaboration policy. The Coordinating Group will provide as much support as possible to assist with the preparation of the review.

A draft protocol must be submitted to the Coordinating Group within one year of title acceptance. If drafts are not submitted before the agreed deadlines, or if we are unable to contact you for an extended period, the Coordinating Group has the right to de-register the title or transfer the title to alternative authors. The Coordinating Group also has the right to de-register or transfer the title if it does not meet the standards of the Coordinating Group and/or the Campbell Collaboration.

You accept responsibility for maintaining the review in light of new evidence, comments and criticisms, and other developments, and updating the review every five years, when substantial new evidence becomes available, or, if requested, transferring responsibility for maintaining the review to others as agreed with the Coordinating Group.

Publication in the Campbell Library

The support of the Coordinating Group in preparing your review is conditional upon your agreement to publish the protocol, finished review and subsequent updates in the Campbell Library. Concurrent publication in other journals is encouraged. However, a Campbell systematic review should be published either before, or at the same time as, its publication in other journals. Authors should not publish Campbell reviews in journals before they are ready for publication in the Campbell Library. Authors should remember to include a statement mentioning the published Campbell review in any non-Campbell publications of the review.

I understand the commitment required to undertake a Campbell review, and agree to publish in the Campbell Library. Signed on behalf of the authors:

Form completed by: Carlos Oya

**Date: 20 November
2014**