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INTRODUCTION

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 Malawi. 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 Process**

The mapping process, which was based on a methodology and set of guidelines as developed by FAO and partners (FAO, 2021), began in Malawi in August 2021. FAO provided training on data collection methods and tools, after which data on territorial markets in the country were collected by the Malawi Confederation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry (MCCCI) for the retailers’ component, and by the Consumers Association of Malawi (CAMA) for the consumers’ component.

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 two different districts of Malawi (Nkhata Bay and Mzimba).

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 existing diversity of the overall consumer base).

---

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


---

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.
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 423 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 each market’s performance across the following four synthetic indicators,\(^2\) 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 data round of collection was conducted with a randomly selected sample of 1,054 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>District</th>
<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 (423)</th>
<th>No. of consumers interviewed (1,054)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mzimba</td>
<td>Ekwendeni market</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jenda market</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mzimba Boma market</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkhata Bay</td>
<td>Chintheche market</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mpamba market</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nkhata Bay Boma market</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>197</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 dimensions.
**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 “Grains, white roots and tubers, and plantains” has by far the highest volumes of sales, with an estimate of more than 1,200 tonnes sold per month across all six markets. On the other hand, the “Meat” and “Dairy products” groups have the lowest volumes of sales (at 38 and 43 tonnes per month, respectively).

With regard to the diversity of food offered, Table 2 lists the availability of different food products for each group across the six markets analysed. As the table illustrates, “Processed foods and beverages” is the group with the largest number of options, but there is also a wide variety of food products offered for “Grains, white roots and tubers, and plantains”, “Pulses” and “Vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables”. “Nuts and seeds”, “Poultry” and “Eggs” on the other hand, are each represented by only one variety of product.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Group</th>
<th>Volumes (tonnes/month)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grains, white roots and tubers, and plantains</td>
<td>3,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables</td>
<td>1,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vegetables</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and seafood</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy products</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processed food and beverage</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuts and seeds</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Authors’ own elaboration.*
<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>Maize (or Corn), Millet, Rice, <em>Ugali wa sembe (Ufa)</em>, Irish potatoes, White sweet potatoes, Orange sweet potatoes, Pasta, Sorghum, Yam, Cassava, Green bananas, Plantains</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses</td>
<td>Green beans, White beans, Kidney (red) beans, Lentils, Sugar beans, Cowpeas, Black beans (<em>Mzaza</em>), Green peas (<em>Sawawa</em>), Black-eyed beans (<em>Samba</em>), Soybeans, Pigeon peas</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuts and seeds</td>
<td>Groundnuts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy products</td>
<td>Fresh milk, Sour milk, Yoghurt, Custard (Dessert), Milk powder, Dairy drinks</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>Pork, Beef, Goat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>Chicken eggs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin A-rich fruits and vegetables</td>
<td>Mustard greens, Groundnut leaves, Sweet potato leaves, Pumpkin leaves, Chinese vegetables and other dark green leafy vegetables,* Papaya, Mango, Carrots, Passionfruit</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vegetables</td>
<td>Cabbage, Tomato, Eggplant, Sweet pepper, Cucumber</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fruits</td>
<td>Avocado, Jackfruit, Guava, Watermelon, Banana, Pineapple, Apple, Baobab, Lemon, Oranges</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processed foods and beverages</td>
<td>Artisanal processed foods and beverages: Traditional cakes (<em>Chimimina</em>), Mandasi, Doughnuts, Pancakes, Fried sweet potatoes, French fries, Fried cassava, Fried plantains, Roasted nuts, Popcorn, Deep fried pork, Kombucha, Fruitcake, Chocolate eclairs, Cooked fresh nuts, Roasted beef kebab, Roasted fresh corn, Traditional oven scones, Rice samosa</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrially processed products: Soft and fizzy drinks, Energy drinks, Biscuits, Chips, Candies, Processed fruit juices, Lollipops, Soya pieces</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Authors’ own elaboration.*
Food diversity indicator

Figure 3 shows the food diversity indicator, as calculated for each market.

Nkata Bay Boma market scores the highest in food diversity, while Jenda and Ekwendeni markets share the lowest score. The values for the indicator are quite high overall, indicating a significant level of diversity in the products offered across the different markets.

Gender inclusion

Key findings

Data collected on gender distribution indicate that the majority of food retailers operating in the selected markets are women (approximately 60 percent) while around 40 percent are men. Figure 4 provides the gender distribution by individual market.

---

**Figure 3. Food diversity indicator, by market**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nkata Bay Boma</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzimba</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpamba</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenda</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekwendeni</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinteche</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

---

3 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 food diversity (i.e. four or more products for each food group are available at the market).
Figure 4. Gender distribution of retailers, by market

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

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

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

As seen in the figure, Jenda market is the only market whose score indicates a favourable situation for women (as compared to men) in terms of net take-home income and access to credit and loans. All of the other markets that were mapped score below 1, with Nkhata Bay Boma market scoring lowest of all, indicating the biggest gap between male and female retailers.

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.
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 all cases, these percentages are relatively low compared to those who do not have access to credit due to lack of opportunities or capacities. At Jenda market in particular, more than 70 percent of retailers report not having access to credit due to a lack of opportunities or capacities. Mzimba market 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 water and toilets are available for the vast majority of retailers, and electricity and retailers’ booths are available for more than 70 percent, warehouses are instead available for only a minority (39 percent), and cold warehouses in particular are almost completely unavailable.
Figure 8. Access to credit or loans, by market

- Nkata Bay Boma
  - No, because of lack of opportunities or capacities: 50%
  - Yes, I have access to formal credit: 30%
  - No, I don’t need credit: 20%
  - Yes, I have access to informal credit: 10%

- Mzimba
  - No, because of lack of opportunities or capacities: 40%
  - Yes, I have access to formal credit: 30%
  - No, I don’t need credit: 20%
  - Yes, I have access to informal credit: 10%

- Mpamba
  - No, because of lack of opportunities or capacities: 30%
  - Yes, I have access to formal credit: 30%
  - No, I don’t need credit: 20%
  - Yes, I have access to informal credit: 10%

- Jenda
  - No, because of lack of opportunities or capacities: 40%
  - Yes, I have access to formal credit: 20%
  - No, I don’t need credit: 20%
  - Yes, I have access to informal credit: 20%

- Ekwendeni
  - No, because of lack of opportunities or capacities: 50%
  - Yes, I have access to formal credit: 30%
  - No, I don’t need credit: 20%
  - Yes, I have access to informal credit: 10%

- Chinteche
  - No, because of lack of opportunities or capacities: 40%
  - Yes, I have access to formal credit: 30%
  - No, I don’t need credit: 20%
  - Yes, I have access to informal credit: 10%

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

Figure 9. Infrastructure availability, by type of infrastructure

- Electricity: 90%
- Water: 100%
- Toilets: 90%
- Warehouses: 30%
- Cold warehouses: 0%
- Retailers’ booths: 70%

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.
Business environment indicator

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

None of the markets scores higher than 0.55 for this indicator: Nkhata Bay Boma market scores the highest at 0.51, followed by Jenda and Mzimba markets, and Mpamba market scores the lowest. The reason Nkhata Bay Boma market has better infrastructure is likely due to its location at the district headquarters of Nkhata Bay district, which is a popular tourist zone; in addition, the entire market space is currently being upgraded. On the other hand, Mpamba market is located far away from most of the urban zones that tend to attract investments in infrastructure.

---

Producer-consumer link

Key findings

This aspect of the market analysis sought to better understand the length of the supply chain, as well as the sourcing of products sold in the market (by differentiating between retailers who are also producers and retailers who are not).

With regard to product sourcing, Figure 11 shows, for each market: (1) the share of retailers who sell only food products they have produced; (2) the share of retailers who sell both food products they have produced and food products they have purchased; and (3) the share of retailers who sell only products they have purchased. As seen in the figure, the results do not indicate major differences in the

---

Figure 10. Business environment indicator, by market

![Business environment indicator graph]

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

---

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.
nature of the mapped markets. In fact, the vast majority of retailers operating in the markets sell a mix of products they have produced and products they have purchased from others. Mpamba market seems to have a slightly higher share of the other two types of retailers, although they still represent a minority relative to the other group.

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 for four of the six markets, more than 30 percent of such retailers purchase their products exclusively from farmers.

Figure 11. Product sourcing, by market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Nkata Bay Boma</th>
<th>Mzimba</th>
<th>Mpamba</th>
<th>Jenda</th>
<th>Ekwendeni</th>
<th>Chinteche</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively my production</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly my production, partly purchased from other producers/traders</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively purchased from other producers/traders</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

Producer-consumer link indicator

Figure 13 shows the producer–consumer link indicator, as calculated for each market.

All six markets scored higher than 0.58 for this indicator, with Ekwendeni market scoring the highest at 0.66, followed by Chinteche market and Jenda market. These findings suggest that in most cases, the supply chain is relatively short, and that there are few or no intermediaries between producers and retailers.

---

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

![Bar chart showing product sourcing for retailers](chart12.png)

- **Source:** Authors’ own elaboration.

**Figure 13.** Producer-consumer link indicator, by market

![Bar chart showing producer-consumer link indicator](chart13.png)

- **Source:** Authors’ own elaboration.
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, processed foods, vegetables and fish in the preceding 24 hours, whereas only a minority reported having eaten poultry or eggs.

Figure 15 reflects the distribution of consumers by the number of food groups consumed, and indicates that the majority consumed foods from at least five 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, the vast majority of consumers shop at their given market every day, especially in the case of Chintheche market, where the share of consumers who shop there daily is 79 percent.

Figure 14. Food groups consumed in the preceding 24 hours

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

![Bar chart showing the distribution of consumers by the number of food groups consumed.]

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

Figure 16. Shopping frequency, by market

![Horizontal bar chart showing shopping frequency by market.]

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.
**Figure 17** reflects the purchasing frequency for each food group. As seen in the figure, “Other vegetables” and “Fish and seafood” rank as the most frequently purchased food groups, while all the other food groups are purchased only occasionally by the majority of consumers who shop at these markets (with “Meat”, “Poultry” and “Nuts and seeds” being the food groups least frequently purchased).

**Figure 18** shows the minimum contribution of all six territorial markets to the day-to-day food consumption for each food group.7

As shown in the figure, the contributions for all food groups far exceed 20 percent, reaching almost 80 percent for “Fish and seafood” and for “Other vegetables”, and exceeding 50 percent for “Other fruits” and for “Dairy products”.

---

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

- **Other vegetables**: 80% – 100%
- **Fish and seafood**: 80% – 100%
- **Vitamin A-rich fruit and vegetables**: 20% – 40%
- **Other fruits**: 20% – 40%
- **Dairy products**: 80% – 100%
- **Processed foods and beverage**: 20% – 40%
- **Grains, white roots and tubers and plaintains**: 50% – 60%
- **Eggs**: 60% – 70%
- **Pulses**: 60% – 70%
- **Nuts and seeds**: 60% – 70%
- **Meat**: 10% – 20%
- **Poultry**: 10% – 20%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Every time I come to the market</th>
<th>Most of the time when I come to the market</th>
<th>Sometimes when I come to the market</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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, all markets for which the indicator was calculated show a similar contribution (between 40 and 50 percent), thus indicating that these markets play a critical role in ensuring day-to-day access to healthy diets among local consumers.

Minimum day-to-day contribution to healthy and diversified diets indicator

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 0.25, indicating that they are crucial in ensuring access to healthy and diversified diets for many of their consumers. The score for Ekwendeni market is the highest (at 0.42), indicating its importance in ensuring healthy and diversified diets among its consumers.

---

Figure 18. Minimum contribution of markets to day-to-day food consumption, by food group

Source: Authors’ own elaboration.

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.

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**

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**

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, “Grains, white roots and tubers, and plantains” is the food group with the highest volumes of sales, while foods rich in animal protein such as “Meat”, “Dairy products” and “Poultry” have the lowest volumes.

- Although women make up the majority of retailers operating in all the mapped markets, the gender gap remains a key issue to be addressed, particularly in terms of net-take home income and opportunities for access to formal credit.

- The lack of opportunities or capacities for access to credit is also a major challenge for the scaling-up of retailer businesses. Market infrastructure should also be improved to ensure a more conducive business environment, particularly for cold chain storage, which is totally absent.

- The findings related to the producer–consumer link indicator show that all of the mapped markets are characterized by relatively short supply chains, with few intermediaries between production and consumption.

- The findings related to the minimum contribution of the markets to healthy and diversified diets clearly indicate their relevance in this regard, given that all markets score between 0.26 and 0.42. In addition, and with regard to the daily consumption of specific food groups, these markets also serve as crucial outlets for ensuring the daily consumption of vegetables and fish for 75 and 78 percent of consumers, respectively.
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