

Original Research Article

Value chain analysis of leather in Thirupathur district of Tamil Nadu

ABSTRACT:

Value chain analysis for leather includes number of value addition activities and various stakeholders. A study was conducted to understand the value chain and market efficiency of leather products was done at Thirupathur district, as it is a major area for leather manufacturing. In Thirupathur district three taluks were taken for the study with thirty livestock farmers, thirty wholesalers, thirty retailers and thirty leather processing industries were contacted based on simple random sampling. The study had an objective of mapping and analysing the market efficiency of various channels from the study, there were three major channels were found in this study area. Channel I was the most efficient channel analysed by both Shepherd's and Acharya's market efficiency method as it is the shortest channel. Channel II and III were less efficient channels. The main constraint faced by the leather processing industries were poor drying facilities and unavailability of skin and hide throughout the processing year.

Key words: value chain map, price spread, marketing efficiency and constraints.

INTRODUCTION:

Leather value chain starts from rearing of animal husbandry and ends with the manufacture of leather goods. Bovine hides, sheep and goat skins are the major hides used and are processed in tanneries before becoming leather footwear, garments and accessories like travel bags and belts. Leather is also used for technical products and upholstery

Leather and its products are unique items, known for their versatility, style and fashion. In Asian countries, due to the growing affluence of population there are good prospects for sustainable development of the leather industry in the long run. Comparative advantages like raw material availability and low labour cost, coupled with environmental considerations have contributed to a shift in bringing the processing segment of the leather sector value chains towards the developing countries. In 2020 the major global exporters of leather were Italy, United states, Brazil, China and Germany. Italy exported around 2.9 billion U.S dollars of leather to the rest of the world and followed by United states with 1.12

billion U.S dollars and also other than some of the EU countries like Italy and Spain, most of the European countries serve as final export destinations. (<https://Leatherindia.org>)

In addition, key customers as well as consumer categories in the global value chain of leather and leather products are located in the USA, Australia, and Japan. Hong Kong has also emerged as a large global importer of semi-finished and finished leather for value addition and export. This provided an opportunity for India and other developing countries for a better positioning in the global trade

Leather industry:

In India the leather and leather products are well-known for consistently strong export revenues and is one of the country's top ten foreign exchange earners. In 2020-21 fiscal year, India exported \$3.68 billion worth of leather and leather goods it includes saddlery & harness. In 2020, India has 20 per cent of the cow and buffalo population and 11 per cent of the goat and sheep population in the world and it also had a plentiful supply of raw materials. Adding to this the advantages of trained manpower, cutting-edge technology, increased industrial compliance with international environmental requirements, and related industries unwavering support.

In India, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Agra, Noida, and Saharanpur, Maharashtra, Punjab, Karnataka, Hyderabad, Haryana, Gurgaon, Panchkula, Karnal, Delhi, Madhya Pradesh, Kerala and Ernakulam were the key manufacturing states for footwear, leather, and leather goods in India. (www.economicstimes.indiatimes.com)

Indian leather industry advantages:

India have own raw material supply around 3 billion square feet of leather were produced each year mean while some goat, calf, and sheep skins are in high demand and they also have strong and environmentally friendly tanning foundation and there is a updated manufacturing facilities.

Environmental impact:

Leather industry produces some environment impact those are the carbon footprint of livestock rearing, use of chemical in the tanning process (e.g., chromium, phthalate esters, nonyl phenol ethoxylate soaps, pentachlorophenol and solvents). Air pollution due to the

transformation process (hydrogen sulfide is formed during mixing with acids and ammonia liberated during delimiting, solvent vapours). And also some of the guidelines for environmental improvement in leather tanner sectors were Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) ,State Pollution Control Board (SPCBs) and Pollution Control Committee (PCCs) providing guidance to the industries for the effective prevention and control of pollution to safeguard the environment

Objective of the study

Leather is an important industry in Tamil Nadu mainly leather manufacturing industries were located in Thirupathur, Chennai, Ambur, Ranipet, Vaniyambadi, Vellore, Pernambut, Trichy, Dindigul and Erode. In leather manufacturing various value addition activities were involved so it is necessary to understand the value chain of leather industry this study was taken up with the following objectives

- To map the value chain of hide and to analyse the marketing efficiency of the intermediates.
- To find out the problems faced by the leather processing in the study area.

Research methodology:

To accomplish the above objectives, primary data was collected through structured questionnaire. The study area was confined with in Tirupathur district of Tamil Nadu which has four taluks and five blocks where the leather and tannery industry was located mainly in Vaniyambadi, Natrampalli, Ambur taluk and these three taluks were selected for the study. Sample respondents were selected based on simple random sampling method. About thirty cow, goat, sheep rearing farmers and thirty wholesalers, thirty retailers and thirty leather processing industry were contacted and value chain was tracked.

Tools for analysis:

Garrett ranking were the tools used in this study (Zalkuwi *et al.*, 2015). Garrett ranking was measured by using this below formula

$$\text{Per cent position} = \frac{100 \times (R_{ij} - 0.5)}{N_j}$$

where,

R_{ij} = Ranking given to the i^{th} attribute by the j^{th} individual

N_j = Number of attributes ranked by the j^{th} individual

In this study, Garrett ranking was used to identify the constraints faced by leather processing industry.

Marketing Efficiency:

Agarwal Approach

According to Acharya (2003), an ideal measure of marketing efficiency, particularly for comparing the efficiency of alternate markets channels should take into account all of the following:

- a) Total marketing costs (MC)
- b) Net marketing margin (MM)
- c) Prices received by the farmer (FP)
- d) Prices paid by the consumer (RP)

Further, the measure should reflect the following relationship between each of these variables and the marketing efficiency.

- i) Higher the (a), the lower the efficiency
- ii) Higher the (b), the lower the efficiency
- iii) Higher the (c), the higher the efficiency
- iv) Higher the (d), the lower the efficiency

As there is an exact relationship among four variables, *i.e.*, $a+b+c = d$, any three of these could be used to arrive at a measure for comparing the marketing efficiency.

The following measure is suggested by Acharya,

$$ME = FP \div (MC + MM)$$

Shepherd's formula:

Marketing efficiency is a measure of market performance. The movement of goods from producers to the ultimate consumers at the lowest possible cost consistent with the provision of service desired by the consumers is termed as efficient marketing.

Efficiency of supply chain was calculated with the help of the following formula. The higher this ratio, higher would be the efficiency and vice versa. This can be expressed in the following form:

$$ESC = [(V/I)-1]$$

Where,

ESC=Index of Efficiency of Supply Chain

V = Value of goods sold

I = Total marketing cost


Results and discussion:

Value chain mapping of hide:

The value chain mapping of hide had three channels where as in channel I it begins from farmers (43.5 percent) they sold the cow to slaughter house and from there they sold the meat to the direct consumers and skin to the wholesalers. The skin from the slaughter house collected in bulk and they preserve the skin by adding salt to it and after preservation is sold directly to the leather industry. In channel II livestock dealer was involved. Farmers (27.4 percent) sell the cow to the livestock dealer and then they sell to slaughterhouse and value chain is followed. In the case of channel III (29.1 percent farmers) were the collector collected the skin from the slaughter house and send to supplier and then to the retailers in each step the skin is preserved by adding chemicals and salt. Channel I was followed by 13 respondents, Channel II followed by 8 respondents and finally channel III was followed by 9 respondents most of the intermediates follows channel I because is it efficient the results were discussed in Table 1 and Fig 1 which is shown below.

Fig 1 Mapping of hide





(Source: primary data)

Price spread analysis:

The study of price spread helps to understand the value chain cost and the problems faced. Price spread was used by Kumaravel (2005). The three different major channels were traced through mapping of value chain of hide and presented in Table 1.

Table 1 price spread for channel I, II, III for hide (per unit)				
		Channel I	Channel II	Channel III
S. No	Particulars	Amount (Rupees/skin)	Amount (Rupees/skin)	Amount (Rupees/skin)
1	Producers/Farmers			
	Gross price received/unit	8(25)	8.2(25)	8.5(25)
	Net price received/unit	200.00 (33.33)	205.00 (32.03)	212.5 (34.2)
2	Livestock dealer			
	Purchase price/unit	-	205.00 (32.03)	-
	Holding cost	-	0.2 (0.03)	-
	Transport	-	0.4 (0.062)	-
	Margin /skin in Rs	-	31.9 (4.98)	-
	Sales price	-	237.5 (37.1)	-
3	Slaughter house			
	Purchase price	200.00 (33.3)	237.5 (37.1)	212.5 (34.2)
	Raw hide	200 (33.33)	237.5 (37.1)	212.5 (34.2)
	Labour cost	15 (2.5)	15.2 (2.37)	15 (2.41)
	Transport	2 (0.33)	2.2 (0.34)	2 (0.35)
	Margin @Rs/skin	8 (1.33)	5.1 (0.79)	0.5 (0.80)
	Sales price	225 (37.5)	260.00 (40.6)	230.00 (37.00)
4	Collector			
	Purchase price	-	-	230.00 (37.00)
	Transport	-	-	1 (0.16)
	Margin @Rs /skin	-	-	1 (0.16)
	Sales price	-	-	232.00 (37.4)

5	Supplier			
	Purchase price	-	-	232.00 (37.4)
	Transport	-	-	1.8 (0.29)
	Loading and unloading	-	-	1.3 (0.20)
	Marketing cost	-	-	3.1 (0.5)
	Margin @Rs /skin	-	-	4.9 (0.79)
	Sales price	-	-	240.00 (38.7)
6	Wholesaler			
	Purchase price	225 (37.5)	260.00 (40.6)	240.00 (38.7)
	Loading & unloading	1.5 (0.25)	1.6 (0.25)	1.8 (0.29)
	Transportation	3 (0.5)	3.2 (0.5)	3.5 (0.56)
	Processing cost	36.5 (6.08)	37.3 (5.82)	37.7 (6.08)
	Marketing cost (L+T)	4.5 (0.75)	4.8 (0.75)	5.3 (0.85)
	Margin @Rs/skin	9 (0.15)	2.7 (0.4)	6.5 (1.04)
	Warehousing cost	10 (1.66)	10.2 (1.5)	10.5 (1.69)
	Sales price	285.00 (47.5)	315.00 (49.2)	300.00 (48.38)
7	Retailer			
	Purchase price	-	315.00 (49.2)	300.00 (48.38)
	Transport	-	2 (0.31)	2.4 (0.38)
	Loading and unloading	-	1.5 (0.23)	1.5 (0.23)
	Storage cost	-	3.5 (0.54)	9.2 (1.48)
	Marketing cost(L+T)	-	3.5 (0.54)	3.9 (0.62)
	Margin @Rs/skin	-	13 (2.0)	3.9 (0.62)
	Sales price	-	335.00 (52.34)	317.00 (51.1)
8	Leather processing industry			

	Purchase price	285.00 (47.5)	335.00 (52.34)	317.00 (51.1)
	Labour cost	115.5 (19.2)	116 (18.12)	120 (19.3)
	Sorting, grading	9 (1.5)	9.5 (1.48)	10 (1.61)
	Quality testing	36.5 (6.08)	37.6 (5.87)	37.8 (6.09)
	Reworking of rejection	53.2 (0.88)	53.2 (8.31)	53.5 (8.62)
	Packaging	45 (7.5)	45.1 (7.04)	45.5 (7.33)
	Marketing cost (S+P)	54 (9)	54.6 (8.53)	55.5 (8.95)
	Technology and development	14 (2.33)	14.2 (2.21)	14.5 (2.33)
	Firm and infrastructure cost	19 (3.16)	19 (3.00)	19.3 (3.11)
	Margin @Rs/skin	22.8 (3.8)	10.4 (1.62)	2.4 (0.32)
	Sales price	600.00 (100.00)	640.00 (100.00)	620.00 (100.00)
	Price paid by leather processing industry	600.00 (100.00)	640.00 (100.00)	620.00 (100.00)

From Table 1 it was observed in Channel I farmers received a net payment of Rs 200/skin and it sold to the slaughterhouse and they purchased the skin for Rs 200 and it sold to wholesaler for Rs 225. Transportation, loading and unloading charges incurred by wholesalers. So, wholesaler played a major role in deciding the price from Rs 225 to Rs 285 and highest (47.5 per cent) purchase price was incurred by the leather industry in the channel I.

In Channel II farmers received a net payment of Rs 205/skin and then it moved to the livestock dealer. They were playing a major role in fixing price from Rs 205 to Rs 237 before to wholesaler.

In Channel III involved farmers, slaughter house, collector, supplier, wholesaler, retailer and leather processing industry. Slaughter house fix the price before supplying to collector from Rs 212.5 to Rs 230. According to the table, the price difference was Rs 600/skin, Rs 640/skin and Rs 620/skin for channel I, channel II and channel III respectively.

Marketing efficiency analysis:

Market performance is measured by marketing efficiency. The movement of goods from farmers to the end processing unit at lowest possible cost with the service provision preferred by the processing is termed as efficient marketing. The marketing efficiency of different channels was estimated using two methods, namely

- i. Shepherd's method
- ii. Acharya's approach

According to Shepherd's method, increased product value at lower marketing cost establishes higher efficiency. Where as in Acharya's approach higher efficiency is established only the price received by farmers is higher when compared with total marketing cost and total marketing margin. Hence, it would be an ideal way to calculate marketing efficiency

More than one method was used to check the accuracy of efficiency Manivenkatesh (2017) in his study on the value chain analysis used this similar method. The result is presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Marketing efficiency -Shepherd's and Acharya's approach for hide

Sl. No	Particulars	Channel 1	Channel 2	Channel 3
I	Value of goods sold (in Rupees)	600.00	640.00	620.00
ii	Total marketing cost	123.7	132.6	143.5
A	Shepherd's marketing efficiency [(i/ii)-1]	3.85	3.82	3.32
iii	Total marketing cost	123.7	132.6	143.5
Iv	Net marketing cost	39.8	63.1	19.2
V	Net price received by farmers	200	205	212.5
B	Acharya's marketing efficiency [v/(iii +iv)]	1.22	1.04	1.03

From table 2 it could be inferred that channel I i.e. Farmers-Slaughter house -Wholesaler-Leather processing industry was the efficient channel as it had the highest marketing efficiency when compared to other channels. It is evident from the value chain that there was processing of leather in Thirupattur district and all hide were processed to leather and leather products. After intense search it became clear that there was processing at all level when it comes to leather processing, indicating that this value chain opportunity remains tapped. It shows that there was a huge opportunity lurking behind leather processing.

Problems faced by the leather processing industries:

The various problems faced by the stakeholders were analysed and presented in this section.

Constraints faced by the sample respondents towards leather processing:

The constraints faced by the sample respondents in leather processing were analysed using Garrett’s ranking technique and are presents in Table 3 and it gave a clear picture about the problems faced by the industry

Table 3 Constraints faced by the leather processing industry

(n=30)

S. No	Constraints	Total score	Mean score	Rank
1	Poor drying facility during rainy days	2023	20.23	I
2	Non availability of skin and hide round the year for processing	1706	17.06	II
3	Scarcity of labour	1515	15.15	III
4	Non availability of storage facility for skin and hide	1441	14.41	IV
5	High electricity cost	1175	11.75	V

Poor drying facility during rainy days was the major constraint faced by the industry and is ranked first. Industry felt that non availability of skin and hide round the year for

processing was another constraint followed by scarcity of labour. These are some of the constraints faced by the industry like lack of storage facility and high electricity cost.

Conclusion

The value chain of hide had three different channels and channel I was the most efficient with marginal profit gained by leather industry was Rs 22.8 (3.8 per cent). Channel I had marketing efficiency score of 3.85 and 1.22 from Shepherd's and Acharya's methods respectively. Skilled labour, procurement of high-quality leather, well equipped machineries and by adhering the environment guidelines were necessary for successful running and also resulting quality leather. Poor drying facility especially during rainy season was the major problem found by leather industries in the study area. The policy makers can take efforts to adopt advanced technologies and infrastructure facilities to address the issues faced by the leather manufacturers.

References

1. Council for leather exports (CLE)
2. Federico, Brugnoli (November 2012). *"Life Cycle Assessment, Carbon Footprint in Leather Processing"*. United Nations Industrial Development Organization. UNIDO
3. Gillan, Kevin; Murray, Jason (May 2019). *Comprehensive Guide to Leather Repair and Restoration: Leather Repair Training Manual*. Advanced Leather Solutions, Inc. P. 16. Retrieved 10 June 2021.
4. <https://Leatherindia.org>
5. Jasdanwalla, Z.1966. "Marketing efficiency in Indian agriculture". "Marketing efficiency in in Indian agriculture"
6. ^ Jump up to:^a ^b *"Leather"*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. 5 March 2020. Retrieved 10 June 2021.
7. [^] Kwasny, Melissa (17 April 2019). *Putting on the Dog: The Animal Origins of What We Wear*. The University Press. ISBN 9781595348654. Retrieved 10 June 2021
8. *"Leather: Animals Abused and Killed for Their Skins"*. PETA. 15 December 2003. Retrieved 10 June 2021.
9. Regan, Tom (2004). *Empty Cages: Facing the Challenge of Animal Rights*. Rowman & Littlefield. P. 120. ISBN 9780742549937.

10. Scribd [https://www.scribd.com/doc/47487605/Henry Garret Ranking Technique](https://www.scribd.com/doc/47487605/Henry-Garret-Ranking-Technique)

11. www.economicstimes.indiatimes.com

UNDER PEER REVIEW