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Smallholder farmers are responsible for most of the food consumed in the world, as well as most of the investments made in agriculture (CFS, 2016; FAO 2017). They operate largely in a range of local and national markets that are embedded in territorial food systems, also known as “territorial markets”.

From a consumer perspective, these markets serve as key retail outlets for access to the foods needed for healthy diets, in particular fresh fruits and vegetables, fish, meat and staple foods.

Despite their importance however, data concerning territorial markets – such as the availability of food groups, food retailers and consumer profiles – are not often included in national data collection systems. As a result, they are often neglected in strategies aimed at improving nutrition, reducing poverty and fostering local economies.

This is the context in which FAO conducted a mapping of territorial markets in Ecuador. The objective of the mapping was to identify the business and operational models that work best, to therefore serve as entry points for the implementation of policy and investment strategies towards more inclusive and nutrition-sensitive markets.
Mapping territorial markets in Ecuador

The mapping process, which was based on a methodology and set of guidelines as developed by FAO and partners (FAO, 2021), began in Ecuador in September 2021. Data on territorial markets in the country (including for both retailers and consumers) were collected by the non-governmental organization the Corporation for Development and Productive Creativity (“Corporación para el Desarrollo y la Creatividad Productiva” or FUNDES, in Spanish).

The mapping exercise took place in six markets, selected according to a number of predetermined criteria. As illustrated in Figure 1, the markets included in the sample are located in Portoviejo Canton.

For each market in the sample, the mapping process involved three stages:

1. preliminary market analysis to determine a representative sample of retailers;
2. data collection from the representative sample of food retailers; and
3. data collection from a non-probabilistic sample of consumers (large enough to reflect the

---

**Figure 1. Localization of selected territorial markets**

Source: Adapted from Map No. 3878 Rev.4 UNITED NATIONS, June 2016. Department of Field Support, Geographical Information Section.

---

1 The six markets were selected based on the following criteria: (i) markets that are recognized by consumers as food markets; (ii) markets in which at least ten retailers operate; (iii) markets that are held with regular frequency; and (iv) markets offering products produced by family farmers.
existing diversity of the overall consumer base).

As a first step, the preliminary market analysis collected information on (i) the given market’s profile (including name, department, district, market frequency, typology of market and GPS coordinates) and (ii) the distribution of retailers within the given market, based on sex, age and type of food (i.e. group) sold.

As a second step, and based on the preliminary market analysis, a representative sample of 128 retailers was established, in order to administer a second survey (retailers’ survey) composed of 42 questions. The results of this second survey were then analysed to assess the market’s performance across the following four synthetic indicators, each of which aggregates key information (variables) collected through the survey: food diversity indicator, gender inclusion indicator, business environment indicator and producer–consumer link indicator.

Finally, a third round of data collection was conducted with a randomly selected sample of 88 consumers who were making their food purchases in the selected markets. This third survey (consumers’ survey) was composed of 27 questions. The results of the consumers’ survey were then analysed to assess the market’s performance against a fifth synthetic indicator: the minimum day-to-day contribution to healthy and diversified diets indicator.

The following sections provide an overview of the results of the mapping process for all six markets across each of the five indicators or dimensions identified, including disaggregated key findings, along with a presentation of results for each synthetic indicator by market.

### Table 1. Preliminary market analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Market frequency</th>
<th>Typology of market</th>
<th>Average no. of retailers operating in the market</th>
<th>No. of retailers interviewed (128)</th>
<th>No. of consumers interviewed (88)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feria Libre Escuela México</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feria Libre Estadio</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feria Libre Los Tamarindos</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado #1</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Wholesale and retail</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado #2</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Wholesale and retail</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado de Picoazá</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

2 A synthetic indicator is a composite measure that mathematically combines several pieces of information into a single measure, allowing for the evaluation and comparison of multidimensional phenomena. Synthetic indicators were useful to the mapping process, as they allowed for the aggregation of several kinds of data on each market (as collected through the survey), and for the assessment of each market’s performance against the given dimension.
Food diversity

Key findings

The first key finding concerns the total volumes of products sold in the territorial markets that were mapped. As seen in Figure 2, the food group “Other Fruits” has by far the highest volume of sales, with an estimate of more than 5,000 tonnes sold per month across all six markets. The “Grains, white roots and tubers, and plantains” and the “Vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables” food groups then follow, ranking second and third respectively. Compared to these three, the other food groups have extremely low volumes of sales.

With regard to the diversity of food offered, Table 2 lists the availability of different food products for each food group across the six markets analysed. As the table illustrates, there is a wide variety of food products offered not only for the “Fruits” and “Fish and seafood” food groups, but also for “Processed foods and beverages”. On the other hand, the number of different food products available for the “Nuts and seeds”, “Meat”, “Poultry” and “Eggs” food groups is far more limited.

Figure 2. Estimated volumes of products sold, by food group (tonnes/month)

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.
Table 2. Availability of different food products in selected markets, by food group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food group</th>
<th>Food products offered by retailers</th>
<th>No. of different products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grains, white roots and tubers, and plantains</td>
<td>Potatoes, Cassava, Rice, Celery root, Turnips, Plantain</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses</td>
<td>Beans, Peas, Lentils</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuts and seeds</td>
<td>Walnuts, Almonds</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy products</td>
<td>Milk, Cheese, Butter</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>Pork, beef</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and seafood</td>
<td>Longfin white tuna (Pescado albacora), Marlin (Pescado picudo), Moonfish (Pescado carita), Prawns, Octopus, Squid, Shellfish, California corbina (Corbina), Mojarra, Sand bass (Camotillo), Snook fish (Robalo), Pacific sierra (Sierra), Tollo, Mahi-mahi (Dorado)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>Chicken eggs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables</td>
<td>Carrot, Papaya, Cantaloupe, Watermelon, Sweet pepper, Spinach, Passion fruit, Pumpkin</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vegetables</td>
<td>Peppers, Celery, Cucumber, Onion, Tomato, Artichoke</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits</td>
<td>Maracuja, Apple, Lemon, Orange, Pineapple, Mandarin, Papaya, Grapefruit, Melon, Watermelon, Avocado, Tamarillo, Grape, Kiwi, Blackberry, Prune (Reina claudia), Strawberry, Pear, Mammee (Mamey), Sweet granadilla, Soursop (Guanabana), Star fruit (Fruta china), Banana, Loquat (Nispero), Peach, Dragon fruit</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processed foods and beverages</td>
<td>Aji (Chilli sauce), Fried plantain chips (Chifle), Fried plantain and cheese balls (Bolon de queso), Cured meat, Fried pork rinds (Chicharron), Coloured rice, Fried meat, Sugar, Oil</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

Food diversity indicator

Figure 3 shows the food diversity indicator, as calculated for each market. Feria Libre Los Tamarindos scores the highest in food diversity, followed by Mercado de Picoazá, whereas Feria Libre Escuela México scores the lowest by far. Overall, the values of the food diversity indicators are quite high (with 4 out of 6 markets scoring higher than 0.6), suggesting that there is a great diversity of products on offer in the different markets.

The food diversity indicator takes into account the number of food products available for each food group offered. The indicator is expressed as a value between 0 and 1, where 0 indicates the lowest level of food diversity (i.e. none of the food products is offered at the market), and 1 indicates the maximum level of food diversity (i.e. four or more products for each food group are available at the market).
Gender inclusion

Key findings

Data collected on gender distribution indicate that the majority of food retailers operating in the selected markets are men (74 percent, across all six markets), while only 26 percent are women. Figure 4 provides the gender distribution by individual market.

When net take-home income is disaggregated by gender (as shown in Figure 5), results show a gap between male and female retailers. On average, the monthly net take-home income of female retailers is 35 percent lower than that of male retailers – USD 158 vs USD 246 per month, respectively.

To assess whether women and men have equal opportunities to develop their business, data on access to credit were also disaggregated by gender.

As shown in Figure 6, the share of female retailers with access to credit is higher than that of male retailers in the case of formal credit, but there are more men than women with access to informal credit. The share of female retailers with no access to credit – due to a lack of opportunities or capacities – is also higher than that of male retailers. Finally, of the retailers who reported that they do not need credit, the share of men is significantly higher than that of women. Taken together, these data show that compared to men, women still face greater challenges in accessing credit and financial services, affecting their capacity to scale up their businesses (as may be confirmed in considering the significant difference in average net take-home income between women and men).
Figure 4. Gender distribution of retailers, by market

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

Figure 5. Average net take-home income, by gender (USD/month)

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.
Figure 7 shows the gender inclusion indicator, as calculated for each market.

As seen in the figure, Feria Libre Escuela México has the lowest score, indicating that it is the market where women retailers face the most challenges in fully benefitting from their participation in the market, as compared to men. On the other hand, the scores for both Feria Libre Estadio and Mercado de Picoazá indicate that women retailers benefit more than men from their participation in these two markets.

---

Gender inclusion indicator

*The gender inclusion indicator takes into account the gender income gap (calculated as the ratio of women’s net take-home income to men’s) and the gap between male and female retailers who do not have access to financial services. The synthetic indicator is expressed as a value between 0 and +∞, where 1 indicates equal inclusion of men and women, a value close to 0 indicates that women are not included, and a value higher than 1 indicates that men are not included.*
Figure 7. Gender inclusion indicator, by market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Gender Inclusion Indicator Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercado de Picoazá</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado #2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado #1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feria Libre Los Tamarindos</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feria Libre Estadio</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feria Libre Escuela Mexico</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

Business environment

Key findings

Assessing each territorial market’s business environment involved a consideration of market infrastructure, as well as access to credit (both formal and informal) and financial services. As shown in Figure 8, retailers in all six markets have access to both formal and informal credit. However, in almost all of the cases (with the exception of Mercado #1, where the share is 50 percent), these percentages are relatively low compared to those who do not have access to credit due to lack of opportunities or capacities. At Feria Libre Los Tamarindos in particular, 60 percent of retailers report not having access to credit due to a lack of opportunities or capacities. Feria Libre Estadio on the other hand, has the highest percentage of retailers reporting that they do not need any credit or loans.

With regard to infrastructure availability across all six markets, and as shown in Figure 9, while electricity, water, retailers’ booths and toilets are available for the vast majority of retailers, there is a significant lack of warehouses – and in particular of cold warehouses.

Business environment indicator

Figure 10 shows the business environment indicator, as calculated for each market.

As seen in the figure, Mercado de Picoazá scores the highest indicator at almost 0.6, followed by Mercado #2 and Mercado #1. The other three markets score far lower by comparison, with Feria Libre Los Tamarindos scoring just above 0.1.

---

5 The business environment indicator takes into account existing infrastructure in the markets, along with retailer access to formal financial services. The indicator is expressed as a value between 0 and 1, where 0 indicates a business environment that is not favourable to food retailers, and 1 indicates an environment that is favourable to them.
Figure 8. Access to credit or loans, by market

![Access to credit or loans, by market chart]

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

Figure 9. Infrastructure availability, by type of infrastructure

![Infrastructure availability chart]

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.
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Producer-consumer link

Key findings

This aspect of the market analysis sought to differentiate between retailers who are also producers and retailers who are not, and to better understand the length of the supply chain.

With regard to product sourcing, Figure 11 shows that there is no significant difference among the mapped markets; the vast majority of retailers operating in these markets sell a mix of products that are self-produced and purchased from other producers or traders.

Retailers who were not also producers were asked to indicate the source for the products they purchase. As illustrated in Figure 12, their responses show that the vast majority of retailers sell products bought from other retailers or traders, led by Feria Libre Escuela Mexico, where 100 percent of the retailers surveyed sell only products sourced from traders rather than from farmers or producers. Mercado #1 and Mercado #2 are the only markets with a significant share of retailers buying products both from traders and producers, with Mercado #1 having the largest share of this kind. Overall, the shares of retailers sourcing their products directly from farmers are low.
**Figure 11. Product sourcing, by market**

- Mercado de Picoazá
- Mercado #2
- Mercado #1
- Feria Libre Los Tamarindo
- Feria Libre Estadio
- Feria Libre Escuela México

- Exclusively my production
- Partly my production, partly purchased from other producers/traders
- Exclusively purchased from other producers/traders

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

**Figure 12. Product sourcing for retailers who sell products they have purchased, by market**

- Mercado de Picoazá
- Mercado #2
- Mercado #1
- Feria Libre Los Tamarindo
- Feria Libre Estadio
- Feria Libre Escuela México

- Both farmers and traders
- Only farmers
- Only traders

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.
**Producer-consumer link indicator**

Figure 13 shows the producer–consumer link indicator, as calculated for each market. Feria Libre Los Tamarindos scores the highest among the six markets. However, both here and across the other five markets, the scores for the producer–consumer link indicator are themselves relatively low (with all six markets scoring less than 0.1 and two markets scoring 0). In other words, very few retailers sell products that they produce themselves or purchase directly from farmers, thus resulting in supply chains with more intermediaries involved.

![Figure 13. Producer-consumer link indicator, by market](image)

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

---

6 The producer–consumer link indicator takes into account the share of retailers who are also producers themselves, and the share of retailers who, for products they do not produce, purchase directly from farmers. The indicator is expressed as a value between 0 and 1, where 1 indicates a short supply chain, in which farmers are directly linked to markets without intermediaries.
Minimum day-to-day contribution to healthy and diversified diets

Key findings

Territorial markets are essential outlets for the territories in which they are embedded, and play a significant role in influencing diet-related health and nutrition among local consumers by ensuring exposure, availability and accessibility for a wide variety of products.

In order to fully understand the contribution of territorial markets to consumer diets, shoppers in each market were interviewed regarding the food groups they had consumed from in the preceding 24 hours, and their responses were analysed.

Figure 14 provides an overview of the results, and of the quality of the diet of interviewed consumers. As seen in the figure, the majority of consumers reported having eaten staple foods, vegetables, processed foods, pulses and fish in the preceding 24 hours, whereas only a minority reported having eaten nuts and seeds.

Figure 15 reflects the distribution of consumers by the number of food groups consumed, and indicates that the majority consumed foods from at least eight different food groups in the 24 hours preceding the survey.

The frequency with which consumers shop at territorial markets is central to their importance in ensuring people’s access to food. In each of the six markets, consumers were asked how often they visit the market to make their food purchases. As seen in Figure 16, Mercado de Picoazá enjoys the highest frequency (with 50 percent of respondents visiting every day and the other 50 percent more than once a week), while Feria Libre Los Tamarindos has the lowest frequency.

Figure 14. Food groups consumed in the preceding 24 hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grains, white roots and tubers and plaintains</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vegetables</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and seafood</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processed foods and beverages</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuts and seed</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy products</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fruits</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.
Figure 15. Distribution of consumers by number of food groups consumed

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

Figure 16. Shopping frequency, by market

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.
Figure 17 reflects the purchasing frequency for each food group. As seen in the figure, the most frequently purchased food group across all markets is “Pulses (beans, peas and lentils)”, followed by “Vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables”, “Eggs”, “Grains, white roots and tubers, and plantains” and “Other fruits”, whereas the least frequently purchased food groups are “Nuts and seeds” and “Processed foods and beverages”. Other animal-source products such as fish and dairy (and apart from eggs) are also low on the list.

Figure 18 shows the minimum contribution of all six territorial markets to the day-to-day food consumption for each food group. As shown in the figure, the food group for which the markets contribute most to consumers’ daily food consumption is “Eggs”, followed by “Pulses (beans, peas and lentils)”, “Vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables” and “Grains, white roots and tubers, and plantains”. The food group for which markets contribute least to daily food consumption is “Processed foods and beverages”, followed by “Nuts and seeds” and “Dairy products”.

**Figure 17. Consumer purchasing frequency, by food group**

- Pulses (beans, peas and lentils)
- Vitamin A-rich fruit and vegetables
- Eggs
- Grains, white roots and tubers and plantains
- Other fruits
- Poultry
- Meat
- Fish and seafood
- Dairy products
- Other vegetables
- Processed foods and beverage
- Nuts and seeds

- Every time I come to the market
- Most of the time when I come to the market
- Sometimes when I come to the market
- Never

**Source:** Authors’ own elaboration.

---

7 The minimum contribution of markets to day-to-day food consumption estimates how much of the food consumed in a given day (by food group) comes from the mapped markets. For each food group, it is calculated as the share (%) of consumers who consumed products from the food group in the preceding 24 hours, who purchase products from the food group every time or most of the times they visit the mapped markets, and who visit the markets every day or more than once a week, over the total number of consumers who consume from the food group. The obtained value expresses the minimum contribution of the mapped markets to the day-to-day food consumption of the given food group.
Figure 19 shows the minimum contribution of each market to the day-to-day purchase of healthy food baskets among their respective consumers. As the figure illustrates, the variations between markets are significant, with Feria Libre Los Tamarindos and Feria Libre Estadio showing the lowest minimum contribution (at less than 20 percent), while Mercado de Picoazá stands out with the highest contribution, at 56 percent.

The minimum contribution of a market to the day-to-day purchase of healthy food baskets by its consumers estimates the number of consumers who purchase the entirety of their healthy food basket in a specific territorial market. It is calculated as the share (%) of consumers who consumed from at least five different food groups (at least three of which must include: a source of carbohydrates, a source of protein and a source of vitamins and fibre), and purchased all products from these food groups at the given territorial market, over the total number of consumers. The obtained value expresses the minimum contribution of the market to the purchase of healthy food baskets.

Figure 20 shows the minimum day-to-day contribution to healthy and diversified diets indicator, as calculated for each market. All the markets that were mapped score higher than 0.14, indicating that they have some relevance in ensuring access to healthy and diversified diets to their consumers. The scores for Mercado #2 and Mercado de Picoazá are the highest (at 0.39 and 0.48 respectively), indicating that these markets have the highest relevance with regard to ensuring healthy and diversified diets for their consumers.

The minimum day-to-day contribution to healthy and diversified diets indicator takes into account the share of consumers relying on a given territorial market for their day-to-day consumption of specific food groups, along with the share of consumers relying on the market to purchase a healthy food basket. The indicator is expressed as a value between 0 and 1, where 1 indicates that the market contributes to ensuring access to healthy and diversified diets for all its consumers.
Figure 19. Minimum contribution to the day-to-day purchase of healthy food baskets, by market*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercado de Picoazá</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado #2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado #1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feria Libre Estadio</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.
Note: This indicator was calculated only for markets taking place at least twice a week.

Figure 20. Minimum day-to-day contribution to healthy and diversified diets indicator, by market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercado de Picoazá</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado #2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado #1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feria Libre Estadio</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.
Note: This indicator was calculated only for markets taking place at least twice a week.
CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings discussed in this report, the following conclusions may be noted:

- Across all six markets, “Other fruits” and “Grains, white roots and tubers, and plantains” are the food groups with the highest volumes of sales by far, with the food groups that rank just after – “Vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables”, “Pulses” and “Other vegetables” – following far behind.

- In terms of the gender gap, net take-home income for female retailers is 35 percent less than for male retailers. The share of women retailers with no access to credit due to a lack of opportunities or capacities is also higher than that of male retailers.

- The business environment can be improved for both men and women: across all six of the mapped markets, the share of retailers who have access to both formal and informal credit is significantly smaller than the share who do not have access due to a lack of opportunities and capacities. Concerning the available infrastructure, there is also room for improvement in all the mapped markets, particularly concerning warehouses and cold warehouses.

- The findings related to the producer–consumer link indicator show that all the mapped markets are characterized by relatively long supply chains; i.e. there are multiple intermediaries between production and consumption.

- The findings related to the minimum contribution of the markets to healthy and diversified diets indicate how relevant these markets are in this regard, particularly Mercado #2 and Mercado de Picoazá. In addition, and with regard to their contribution to the daily consumption of specific food groups, these markets also serve as crucial outlets for ensuring the daily consumption of “Vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables”, “Eggs” and “Pulses” for more than 40 percent of their consumers.
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