



# Whose Alliance?

The G8 and the Emergence of a Global Corporate Regime for Agriculture

} Coherence for the Right to Food

} Vision for Sustainable Agriculture

} Securing a Legitimate and Inclusive Process

May 2013

# In this paper

Executive Summary	3
Measuring up? G8 Commitments Require Coherence	4
A Misguided Vision	5
Process: A Question of Legitimacy	8
The New Alliance in Mozambique: The Devil is in the Detail	9
Conclusions and Recommendations to the G8	10
References	13

Ahead of the UK G8 Summit (17-18 June 2013, Lough Erne, Northern Ireland), this document presents CIDSE's and EAA's views and recommendations on the G8 New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition in Africa.

This paper was written by Gisele Henriques (CIDSE) and produced in collaboration with the Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance.

**Contacts:**

Gisele Henriques (main author), CIDSE, [henriques@cidse.org](mailto:henriques@cidse.org), +32 (0)2 233 37 54

Christine Campeau, Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance, [ccampeau@e-alliance.ch](mailto:ccampeau@e-alliance.ch), +41 (0)22 791 6080

Published in May 2013 by CIDSE, Rue Stévin 16, 1000 Brussels, Belgium

Cover image: Luca Sage

This paper is available in English, French and Spanish at [www.cidse.org/resources/](http://www.cidse.org/resources/)  
and at [www.e-alliance.ch/en/s/resources/](http://www.e-alliance.ch/en/s/resources/)

# Executive Summary

On 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> June 2013 the UK will host the next G8 Summit in Lough Erne, Northern Ireland. A food and nutrition summit will be held the week before.<sup>1</sup> This is an opportunity to put Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) at the forefront of global priorities and achieve policy coherence by linking with the initiatives of the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the foremost inclusive global platform on food and nutrition security.

According to David Cameron, the UK Prime Minister and host of the Summit, Lough Erne represents an opportunity for the G8 to continue to build on earlier pledges to eradicate hunger by “unleashing the power of the private sector.”<sup>2</sup> On the agenda are items such as advancing trade, ensuring tax compliance and promoting greater transparency, as well as the *New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition in Africa*.<sup>3</sup> Whilst welcoming the Alliance’s target of “helping lift 50 million people in sub-Saharan Africa out of poverty in the next 10 years”, civil society organisations (CSOs) and social movements harbour grave concerns regarding the approach of the New Alliance, which is being promoted as a “commitment by G8 nations, African countries, and private sector partners to support agricultural development.” While acknowledging that the private sector has a role to play in development, especially through small-scale enterprises (SMEs) that support local, national and regional food security strategies, we at CIDSE and the Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance (EAA) – which together represent almost one hundred Christian development organisations working for social justice and the realisation of the right to food – are concerned that the main purpose of this Alliance is to create reliable conditions for corporate investment in Africa’s agricultural sector. We are concerned that the New Alliance risks serving primarily as a vehicle for market access by multinational companies, paving the way for them to extend their reach into African markets and exert control over African resources.

We are deeply concerned about the New Alliance’s vision and approach which enshrines food security in a market orientation, rather than as a human right. We believe the initiative falls short of what is needed to eradicate hunger and could potentially undermine progress towards that end. This briefing outlines what we consider to be some of the major problems and risks with the New Alliance, as well as key recommendations. The analysis and recommendations are structured around three central themes: 1) Coherence, 2) Vision, and 3) Process.

We urge the G8 to uphold its commitments to Food and Nutrition Security by reorienting the focus from businesses to communities. Key recommendations toward that aim are detailed in the report and include:

- }] Ensuring that policies are firmly enshrined in the right to adequate food and securing coherent global governance, placing the UN Committee on World Food Security at its centre,
- }] Enabling the transition to real sustainable agriculture through support for agroecological models of production<sup>4</sup> and supporting local markets as the principal pathway to economic development, and
- }] Targeting support at small-scale food producers – particularly women – and securing a) their empowerment, and b) their access to and control over productive resources.



## What is the New Alliance?

In the wake of the 2007–08 food crises, G8 donors made a Hunger Pledge which resulted in the L'Aquila Food Security Initiative in 2009. Donors pledged to mobilise US\$22 billion over three years in support of “country-led plans for agriculture, with a coordinated and comprehensive strategy.” In May 2012, with only half the L'Aquila pledges having been disbursed, US President Barack Obama unveiled plans for the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition in Africa.

The New Alliance is a partnership between the G8, the African Union, the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), its Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), the governments of six African countries, and roughly 45 companies (comprising mostly multinational corporations and a few African businesses). The initial Camp David launch in May 2012 included Tanzania, Ghana and Ethiopia, and was shortly followed by Mozambique, Côte d'Ivoire, and Burkina Faso. Over time it is expected to expand to any other African country willing to join.

The aim of the initiative is to drive “sustained and inclusive growth”<sup>5</sup> for Africa's agricultural sector, with emphasis on “accelerating the flow of private capital”<sup>6</sup> to African agriculture. Mechanisms used to accomplish this include: designing cooperation agreements with host States, developing new tools to mobilise private capital and manage risk, shaping national investment plans and engaging and leveraging the capacity of private sector partners. The private sector has so far committed US\$3.5 billion in investments towards this effort.

## Measuring up? G8 Commitments Require Coherence

Over the years, G8 countries have signed up to a number of different pledges and promises to eradicate hunger. Among them are the *five Rome Principles*<sup>7</sup> agreed at the 2009 World Food Summit, and the *Paris*<sup>8</sup>, *Accra* and *Busan declarations*, which call on donors to design aid plans based on the needs of recipient countries and to work in coordination to ensure effectiveness. In addition to these, G8 countries have also signed onto the *Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realisation of the Right to Adequate Food*, and the reform of the CFS. Specifically, the reformed CFS works to support governments in ensuring the right to adequate food is realised for their populations. In 2012, the CFS negotiated and approved the *Global Strategic Framework (GSF)*: this overarching global framework is intended to provide States with guidance, and assist in coordinating action on food and nutrition security. The document constitutes a step forward in promoting new governance on food, agriculture and nutrition, by reaffirming States' obligations to protect, promote and fulfil the right to food. Another significant document

signed by G8 countries in 2012 was the *Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests*. This historic international agreement, negotiated by States, provides guidance on how to deal with tenure and access rights – both of which are key to food production. The guidelines recommend that safeguards be put in place to protect tenure rights of local people from risks that arise from large-scale land acquisitions.

In addition to these important global efforts, G8 countries have also committed to frameworks which guide engagement with the private sector, such as the *UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights*. These highlight States' duties to protect citizens and address corporate abuses of human rights. Although not a perfect instrument, this framework sets out important elements for human rights due diligence<sup>9</sup> by companies as a means of addressing adverse impacts arising from their operations. Meeting these Guiding Principles should be seen as a minimum standard<sup>10</sup> for States and companies as part of their obligations.

These international frameworks and initiatives represent serious commitments on the part of G8 countries which, if implemented coherently, have the potential to represent genuine progress towards the goal of eradicating hunger. The primary responsibility of G8 countries should therefore be the effective implementation of their commitments to the aforementioned frameworks. CIDSE and EAA are concerned that the approach implicit in the New Alliance

threatens to sideline many of these initiatives, and could even go so far as to undermine previous G8 States' commitments. For these reasons, we are concerned that the Alliance may pose a threat to the progressive realisation of the right to food in Africa. If the G8 is to achieve legitimacy in its interventions in global food governance, it must, as a minimum, uphold these existing and globally recognised standards.

## A Misguided Vision

Food insecurity is a problem which is both political and structural in nature.<sup>11</sup> We believe that the challenges are multi-dimensional and complex, and that the root causes of food insecurity must be properly addressed if there is to be any meaningful progress towards the eradication of hunger. Increasing food production alone is too narrow an approach: policies which hinder people's access to adequate food must also be considered. In our view, there is a real risk that the New Alliance's approach, partnered with the quest for a new Green Revolution in Africa, offers inadequate and inappropriate solutions to world hunger which could lead to serious, long-term repercussions for small-scale food producers.

Major risks include:

- }] Increasing the concentration of land and land grabbing,
- }] Encouraging the pursuit of large-scale models of production, which are focused on monocultures and pose severe environmental consequences, including soil degradation, amongst other issues,
- }] Focusing on export-oriented crops or most lucrative markets which could leave farmers at the mercy of volatile international commodity prices,
- }] Facilitating unpredictable and poorly remunerated seasonal labour through contract farming schemes,
- }] Encouraging the consolidation of power in input markets,
- }] Propagating a loss of agro-biodiversity, particularly where seeds are concerned, and
- }] Reducing impetus from States to act on public commitments to food and nutrition security, in that way relegating the task to corporate actors.

For some, Africa represents the “last frontier”<sup>12</sup> in global food and agricultural markets. According to a World Bank Report (2013),<sup>13</sup> “agriculture and agribusiness together are projected to be a US\$1 trillion industry in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) by 2030 (compared to US\$313 billion in 2010), and they should be at the top of the agenda for economic transformation and development.” The New Alliance seeks to facilitate opportunities for investors to capitalise upon the opportunities offered by Africa's untapped market. We feel that the risk with such an approach is that it is not clear if there will be sufficient safeguards to ensure that investment decisions are guided by the needs of communities rather than transnational and corporate actors whose primary orientation is profit.

African nations which sign up to the New Alliance are required to “refine policies in order to improve investment opportunities.”<sup>14</sup> Specifically, States are expected to facilitate investments and provide a positive business climate by mitigating risks, providing local market information and access (most notably for seeds, fertilizers and pesticides) and facilitating land deals.<sup>15</sup> Evidence from the Côte d'Ivoire's Cooperation Framework, for instance, outlines promises “to reform land laws and make other policy changes to facilitate foreign private investment in agriculture. In exchange, Côte d'Ivoire receives hundreds of millions of dollars in donor assistance, as well as promises from eight foreign companies and their local partners to invest nearly US\$800 million in the development of massive rice farms.”<sup>16</sup>



As part of the New Alliance's development process, national level investor forums were held to set up a Cooperation Framework for each country. It is primarily through these frameworks that policies are shaped. By urging countries to re-orientate national food policies to fit New Alliance recommendations, we believe the initiative *de facto* re-introduces concepts of conditionality, thus becoming the new face of structural adjustment.<sup>17</sup> The proposed objective of these frameworks is to align New Alliance activities with countries' CAADP<sup>18</sup> priorities and commitments, such as "more equitable distribution of wealth for local populations" and "environmentally sound agricultural production."<sup>19</sup> We fear however, that the corporate focus of the New Alliance primarily reflects an aspiration to open up African markets. Our concern is that such an aspiration is driven by a growth-oriented development model rather than an attempt to increase Africa's capacity to feed itself in a way that is both ecologically sustainable and focused on local economic development and the self-determination of people to decide their own food security policies. There is also a risk that such initiatives might lead to land grabbing<sup>20</sup> and ultimately undermine CAADP's vision.<sup>21</sup>

In our view, the New Alliance's focus on corporate sector poses two additional problems *vis-à-vis* the State. Firstly, there is a real risk that it could threaten the self-determination and sovereignty of African States by leaving them at the mercy of investor agreements. According to Olivier De Schutter, United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, countries should have the right to maintain the necessary policy flexibilities to insulate domestic markets from external factors which may exacerbate food insecurity.<sup>22</sup> Imposing conditions and encouraging States to alter national laws to fit New Alliance recommendations is dangerous and could bind States into agreements that interfere with previous commitments to ensure the right to food. Secondly, we feel it could weaken the role of the public sector in agriculture, as States become increasingly dependent on corporate actors to fill financial gaps. Given that private sector actors are accountable first and foremost to their shareholders, with their primary goal being the generation of profits,<sup>23</sup> this strategy raises some questions about the compatibility between their interests and the alleviation of hunger and poverty. According to Olivier

De Schutter, "one potential danger of development aid, in particular of private-led projects, is that the goals of poverty reduction and rural development could be relegated below the goal of raising food production."<sup>24</sup> Can we be sure that conflict of interests will not trump human rights and food security for millions of people?

The corporate capture of Africa's seeds exemplifies some of the risks of the New Alliance. One of its initiatives is the *Scaling Seeds and Other Technologies Partnership*, which aims to increase "the adoption of improved seed varieties, fertilizers and other technologies and to help countries establish credible 10-year targets for priority commodities and developing roadmaps for public and private sector actions necessary to relieve constraints to the adoption of specific technologies."<sup>25</sup> Currently, small-scale food producers in Africa save 60-70 percent of (maize) seed on-farm, with 30-40 percent being acquired from relatives, neighbours and other community sources through informal seed networks.<sup>26</sup> These seeds are open pollinated varieties which allow farmers to save and select the best seeds that are more resilient and appropriate to their conditions. Under the Scaling Seeds and Other Technologies initiative, policies are to be refined, so that hybrid, largely sterile seeds, owned by companies could be sold to farmers, thus threatening to break down their traditional, informal systems.

Another matter of concern is the instruments to be used for measuring progress. In all country cases initiated thus far, policy indicators for adhering to the Alliance's conditions include an improved score on the Doing Business Index,<sup>27</sup> an increased monetary value of new private sector investment in agriculture, and a percentage increase in private investment in commercial production and sale of seeds. We consider these measures to be problematic, since they fail to account for real progress in Food and Nutrition Security. The World Bank's Doing Business Index as a measure of progress is particularly problematic. The Bank's own Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) stated in a 2008 report that the Doing Business survey is prejudiced in favour of deregulation, overstates its conclusions, and shows "no statistically significant relationship" between its indicators and broader economic growth, much less improvements in national well-being.<sup>28</sup>

In sum, the New Alliance thus far reveals several flaws with its vision and approach. Firstly, evidence suggests a focus on promoting large-scale, industrialised models of production in an effort to secure a Green Revolution for Africa, despite the evidence demonstrating the harmful impacts of the original Green Revolution in Asia, including severe environmental degradation, concentration of land, increased debt, a deepening of a class division between farmers<sup>29</sup> and the marginalisation of smallholders. Secondly, despite claiming to uphold the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, we hold some serious concerns about how land deals are being facilitated, particularly about the fact that “land is often used as collateral, which could undermine the sovereignty of African States and at worst, risk widespread displacement.”<sup>30</sup> A proposal leaked in March 2013 indicates the intent to launch a Global Land Transparency

Initiative during the UK G8 Summit. Although this initiative is not directly linked to the New Alliance, it could have significant repercussions for land acquisitions in Africa. Civil society organisations and social movements fear that this initiative may actually undermine the Voluntary Guidelines<sup>31</sup> and compromise its implementation in Africa. Thirdly, the initiative claims to be of benefit to small-scale food producers by including them in value chains. These chains are however often dominated by large, powerful multinational companies. There appears to be a dominance of these companies within the earmarked investment volumes, raising valid questions around who will truly benefit. Without appropriate safeguards and accountability, the New Alliance risks promoting the interests of the corporate sector over the food security and livelihoods of the millions of smallholders whom the G8 wants to lift out of poverty.

## Food Sovereignty: A Framework for Self Determination and the Realisation of the Right to Food

Food sovereignty is a policy framework which addresses the root problems of hunger and poverty by refocusing the control of food production and consumption within democratic processes rooted in localised food systems. It embraces not only the control of production and markets, but also people’s access to and control over land, water and genetic resources. It assumes the recognition and empowerment of people and communities to realise their economic, social, cultural, and political rights and needs regarding food choices, access and production. It is defined as:

“The right of peoples to define their own food and agriculture; to protect and regulate domestic agricultural production and trade in order to achieve sustainable development objectives; to determine the extent to which they want to be self reliant; to restrict the dumping of products in their markets. Food sovereignty does not negate trade, but rather it promotes the formulation of trade policies and practices that serve the rights of peoples to food and to safe, healthy and ecologically sustainable production”.

Food sovereignty includes:

- } The right of farmers and peasants to produce food, and the right of consumers to be free to decide what they consume and where the food they consume comes from,
- } The right of countries to protect themselves from underpriced agricultural and food imports,
- } The active participation of people and their organisations in national agricultural policies, and
- } The recognition of women’s rights and their central role in food production.

Given that it secures producers’ access and control over productive resources, food sovereignty also fosters stewardship, resulting in the use of more sustainable models of production. Food sovereignty, the right to food, and food security are therefore three important and complementary tools which can support governments in tackling food insecurity.

Excerpts from this section were taken from “Food Sovereignty: Towards democracy in localised food systems” by Michael Windfuhr and Jennie Jonsén. FIAN-International 2005.



## Process: A Question of Legitimacy

As the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform dealing with Food and Nutrition Security the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS) is the legitimate policy-making organ for guiding international policies and coordinating action. Its central role is critical to ensure coherence and avoid policy fragmentation. The nature of the New Alliance, as a joint venture of the G8 and the *Grow Africa*<sup>32</sup> initiative, threatens to place too much influence in the hands of powerful private sector actors who are not subject to the same level of accountability as their governmental counterparts. Unlike G8 countries, companies are not bound by crucial legal frameworks, nor by development cooperation agreements such as the five Rome Principles and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. As such, CIDSE and EAA are concerned that any potential benefits resulting from the New Alliance may be tightly, and perhaps exclusively, linked to returns that are the priority for businesses and their bottom line (such as the generation of profits, the capture of market share, the expansion of distribution networks, the securing of new business partners, customer loyalty and brand recognition). Essentially, this poses a risk that powerful national or multinational investors may capture the market and leave the poorest with depleted soils and water resources.

Of equal concern is the New Alliance's aim to apply the *Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment* (PRAI)<sup>33</sup> in their plans. These Principles are the result of a joint initiative by the FAO, IFAD, UNCTAD and the World Bank Group – an initiative which has not been endorsed by the CFS and is under heavy criticism by CSOs, social movements and many national governments. The CFS' own principles

for *responsible agricultural investment* (rai) must be prioritised if we are to have coherent policies which apply to all stakeholders equally. As affirmed by CSOs and social movements during the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the CFS: “The food security and sovereignty of Africa cannot be secured through international cooperation that ignores the policy frameworks already formulated with the participation of the peasants and the producers of the continent.”<sup>34</sup>

The heavy dominance of foreign private sector actors engaged in the New Alliance risks eschewing the possibility of inclusive and participatory dialogue amongst a wider representation of stakeholders, including small-scale food producers themselves. In terms of process, the New Alliance's Cooperation Frameworks have been developed without the participation of African CSOs and social movements, who, in an open letter to the G8,<sup>35</sup> voiced their shared concern over this exclusion, citing that any effort to tackle hunger needs to include those most affected and to involve not only bigger, international CSO groups, but also local groups which are best placed to inform and monitor the situation on the ground. Thus far, the New Alliance's proposed function for small-scale food producers appears to be more concerned with their role in contract farming schemes, than as leaders and equal partners in policy development and implementation. This exclusion echoes a broader cry by local civil society and social movements around the lack of transparency of New Alliance activities in their countries. Under such circumstances, accountability measures become even more crucial. As it stands under the initiative so far, these are still largely inadequate.



# The New Alliance in Mozambique: The Devil in the Detail

We believe that the implementation of the New Alliance in Mozambique, through the agricultural growth corridors approach, concretely exemplifies some of the risks involved and crystallises the reality behind its practical implementation.

The New Alliance plan for Mozambique aims to provide support to the agricultural sector and accelerate the implementation of the National Investment Plan for Agriculture and Food Security (PNISA). It aims to do so through Grow Africa, with the “overall goal of facilitating increases in private investment and scaling innovation”.<sup>36</sup> The plan focuses on growth corridors identified by the government as having significant agricultural potential. Agricultural growth corridors have been launched over recent years in several African countries as initiatives to increase agricultural production. These corridors<sup>37</sup> are seen as value chain instruments for facilitating access to markets, and are indicative of the model of development being sought, with public-private partnerships (PPPs) being offered as the key to facing the challenges around poverty and hunger.

One of the promises of the New Alliance is that it will increase small-scale food producers’ access to market chains, resulting in significant development gains. But their inclusion into the value chains facilitated by these growth corridors would require time and involve high transaction costs. According to an IIED and Oxfam report, the value chain approach only works effectively for 2-10 percent of small producers, due to a number of factors which keeps them at the “mercy of larger producers.”<sup>38</sup> Some of the challenges include: lack of market information, poor infrastructure and distance from markets, rigorous demands in terms of standards and the often opaque role of middlemen. For many local smallholders there is a concern that these corridors would further contribute to their marginalisation from the best agricultural lands and contribute to land and water grabbing.<sup>39</sup>

Evidence from the Maputo Development Corridor (MDC), for instance, suggests that the focus on small-scale producers and traders may easily be lost when the bottom line requires certain actions which may not be in line with social and ecological objectives. According to research released earlier this year by the European Centre for Development and Policy Management, “a positive reading of the Maputo Development Corridor is that it led to vastly improved infrastructures linking South Africa and Mozambique, as well as considerable investments. A sceptical reading is that it has served political interests, and the more powerful South African private sector and Mozambican elites – principally those engaged in extractives – with little benefit for poor people and small-scale producers”. The study finds that while corridors can do much for farmers, “they risk being *corridors of power* rather than *corridors of plenty*.”<sup>40</sup>

One of the justifications in the corridor approach has been that it would take advantage of unused, idle or underutilised land. However, research in Mozambique indicates that “almost no land is genuinely unoccupied;”<sup>41</sup> in fact, some of the most fertile land in the country is being used under these schemes. The issue of land tenure and registration in Mozambique is complex, with large tracts of land lying in the hands of political and economic elites, and, at present, no public land registry. According to the Oakland Institute, contracts for larger land deals between the government and investors are kept secret and are only announced publicly for concessions over 10,000 ha.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, “since the system of acquiring land rights lacks transparency [it] allows the well-connected to obtain large holdings at virtually no cost encouraging rent-seeking behaviour.”<sup>43</sup>



Key policy commitments made by the Government of Mozambique (GoM) in its New Alliance Cooperation Framework include:

- ] Improving incentives for the private sector, especially in developing and implementing domestic input and seed policies. This entails ceasing the distribution of free and unimproved seeds and allowing for private sector accreditation for inspection,
- ] Reforming land use rights (DUAT) systems and accelerating issuance of DUATs. This includes the development and approval of regulations and procedures that authorise communities to engage in partnerships through leases or sub-leases,
- ] Promotion of the liberalisation and facilitation of trade and marketing of agricultural products, and
- ] Approving Food Fortification regulations (including bio-fortification).

In addition to investment promises, the private sector has committed, through their letters of intent, to “prepare and execute, and intend to advise, shape and participate in broad, inclusive and sustained private sector consultative

mechanisms with the host government.”<sup>44</sup> As for accountability, the government and their private sector partners aim to review progress on the basis of jointly determined benchmarks, which includes evaluating the “GoM’s progress in implementing its policy commitments and consulting with private investors.”<sup>45</sup>

The lead interlocutors with the GoM for this plan are the United States and Japan. As of September 2012, 19 companies were prepared to sign letters of intent outlining their objectives under this partnership; 13 of these companies are international (many of which are from the US and Japan) and carry out significant activities in the fertilizer and seed sectors, as well as in the agrofuels, petrochemicals and mining sectors. The remaining Mozambican registered companies have a largely international trade orientation to their projects. As such, close examination of the Cooperation Framework for the New Alliance in Mozambique suggests that diversified and resilient small-scale food production for improved food security is not the primary objective.

## Conclusions and Recommendations to the G8

In sum, CIDSE and EAA hold serious concerns that the New Alliance exemplifies an emerging corporate regime for global agriculture. Our reservation is that the initiative encourages African food production for export rather than for securing local and regional needs, in addition to converting Africans into raw materials providers and consumers of food produced by multinational agri-business trying to break into the African market. It is imperative that all G8 aid to agriculture **support quality investments** which are coherent with internationally agreed principles on human rights and aid effectiveness, and which adhere to principles of environmentally sustainable production.

We believe that small-scale food producers should be able to live their lives in dignity through secured and sustainable livelihoods.

National governments have a role in this by securing smallholder production is commercially viable and investing in it, through, for instance, the creation of markets for local and sustainably produced products procured from smallholders<sup>46</sup>. This will also help them go beyond subsistence to play a vital role in local markets. If the New Alliance or any other partnership is to play a productive role in agricultural development, there needs to be strong evidence that these kinds of partnerships can actually deliver for small-scale food producers – such evidence is still largely lacking. In a bid to counteract some of the potentially devastating impacts of the New Alliance on Africa’s poor, CIDSE and EAA recommend action along three axes: 1) improving policy coherence for the right to food, 2) reorienting the vision and pathways to sustainable agricultural development, and 3) ensuring transparency, participation and accountability in the process.

## Coherence for the Right to Food

}] **Coherent policies, grounded firmly in human rights**, must be the cornerstone for all initiatives pertaining to Food and Nutrition Security. This is currently not the case under the New Alliance. G8 countries should step up efforts to implement and monitor the Right to Food Guidelines and support African governments to do so by integrating these guidelines into their development cooperation agreements,

}] The Committee on World Food Security must continue to be recognised and respected as the legitimate policy-making body orienting international efforts on Food and Nutrition Security; **G8 countries should align their initiatives to the policies of the CFS** and help support its processes, such as the consultations for responsible agricultural investment (rai) principles and the operationalisation of the GSF, and not create parallel structures,

}] The **CFS Voluntary Guidelines on Land Tenure** should be made the formal framework for any initiative on land supported by the G8, and its human rights standards must be applied as corporate minimum standards in land deals. A voluntary approach is insufficient, and strict regulation and enforcement of these guidelines is imperative to prevent land grabbing. G8 countries could further support food security in Africa by ensuring coherence among various sectors that affect development, such as energy and trade. Specifically, G8 countries should put an end to agrofuels<sup>47</sup> mandates and subsidies and join the increasing international consensus that recognises the perverse impact that these policies are having on food security in developing countries.

## Vision for Sustainable Agriculture

}] **Agroecological production**<sup>48</sup> which sustains yields and optimises the use of local resources while minimising the negative environmental and socio-economic impacts of intensive practices<sup>49</sup> must be supported. G8 countries should “promote, enhance and support sustainable agriculture”, a commitment of the UN Rio+20 conference outcome document. In order for this to be realised, governments need to ensure that small-scale food producers’ rights over land, water, traditional seed varieties and other natural resources are respected and protected,

}] Investments in agriculture that are rooted in local economies have a significantly greater multiplier effect towards poverty reduction. **Development of local markets** should be the primary pathway supported by governments, not the further liberalisation of trade and facilitation of international markets as currently planned by the G8 for the UK Summit. Procuring locally from smallholders is one way in which governments can secure a source of income for the most vulnerable who are often left out of larger investment schemes,

}] To help address issues of food price volatility, G8 countries could provide support for the establishment of **regional food reserves** such as the one being piloted by ECOWAS. They should also encourage the private sector to provide transparent and timely information on production and stocks, as is being requested under the *Agricultural Market Information System* (AMIS) recently launched in the FAO,

}] Governments should **assure fair food prices** and commercial outlets at the local level, promoting rural production in urban areas, investing in local infrastructure, linking small-scale food producers with small- and medium-sized local enterprises for in-country commercialisation, and by prioritising local and national food consumption,

}] There is a need to invest in technological innovations that are appropriate to the realities and constraints faced by smallholders. This must be clearly targeted to the scale and model of production employed by those we aim to lift out of poverty. The focus on high-tech North-to-South technology transfers which see farmers as passive recipients of technology is doomed to failure. This approach costs billions, and it is the African farmer who would indebt himself to pay the bills. We consider that not only would this type of technology transfer not work, it also risks disrupting the resilient models currently used by farmers. **Technology transfers and research and development must be farmer-led** and reflect their on-farm realities and conditions. Genetically modified (GM) seeds are a threat to food security: they weaken resilient food systems and boast multiple ecological liabilities. The G8 must in no circumstance support the propagation of GM crops in Africa. The prominence of international seed companies, such as Monsanto, in this initiative poses risks in this regard, and



] The G8 must ensure that it does **not support any kind of initiative which compromises nutrition**. On-farm diversity is critical for nutrition. Encouraging countries to select a handful of crops for export limits farmers' ability to diversify their production and nutrition and furthermore threatens their resilience to adapt to climate change.

## Securing a Legitimate and Inclusive Process

] Policy making must be based on **inclusive and active participation** by those most affected by food insecurity. The G8 must support spaces for African CSOs and social movements' inclusion in any of its proposed plans, for instance, by promoting participatory accountability mechanisms through which communities could monitor those operating in their land. The G8 could do much more for the eradication of hunger in Africa if it supported the self-determination of people to decide and inform the policies that affect them; food sovereignty is a useful framework in this respect and deserves attention,

] **Specific and targeted support for women farmers** is fundamental to any Food and Nutrition Security strategy. Women are mentioned as the targets under the New Alliance, but there is little substance on how to operationalise this. Women's access to productive resources – most notably land, extension services, and support to women's cooperatives – are key elements to combating discrimination, and bring multiple benefits to women themselves, their families and communities. Clear gender objectives and sex-disaggregated data need to be integrated into programmes which empower women by involving them in the design, implementation, and monitoring of agricultural policies,<sup>50</sup>

] The G8 must seek **improved accountability and transparency** and demand the same from its private sector partners. This should focus not only on financial commitments but also on the quality of the support provided. One of the main aims of the New Alliance is

to increase the incomes of small-scale food producers by encouraging them to be a part of value chains controlled by large companies and intermediaries; this requires entering in contractual relations with these companies. There are currently no systems to monitor the quality or fairness of these contracts or the relations between small-scale food producers and the companies on which they depend. Similarly, there is no monitoring of the pricing or credit practices of the foreign companies which will extend their distribution networks (fertilizers, seeds and other agricultural inputs) under the New Alliance. Legally binding regulatory frameworks which support improved accountability and transparency are needed to protect small-scale food producers.

G8 countries could play an important role in supporting the transition to meaningful, sustainable agriculture in Africa, where resilience is prioritised and the social, economic and ecological assets of local communities are protected and strengthened. Ultimately, it is sustained, quality public investment which enables small-scale food producers to invest in their own holdings that will secure Food and Nutrition Security for Africa. Unfortunately, the current approach taken by the New Alliance risks increasing Africa's dependence on foreign capital and on investors interested in influencing its policies and accessing African markets. As noted in the FAO's State of Food and Agriculture report 2012<sup>51</sup>, "farmers' investment dwarfs expenditures on agriculture by international donors and private foreign investors. The overwhelming dominance of farmers' own investment means that they must be central to any strategy aimed at increasing the quantity and effectiveness of agricultural investment." In light of this and the evidence outlined above, we strongly urge the G8 to rethink its strategy and place smallholders and those most affected by food insecurity at the forefront of its policies, rather than relegating them to the backseat behind agribusiness.

# References

- 1 Department for International Development-UKaid (2013), Food: British charities launch drive to end hunger, [www.dfid.gov.uk/News/Latest-news/2013/hunger-campaign-ngos/](http://www.dfid.gov.uk/News/Latest-news/2013/hunger-campaign-ngos/)
- 2 Cameron, David (2012), A G8 meeting that goes back to first principles, [euobserver.com/opinion/118265](http://euobserver.com/opinion/118265)
- 3 The White House (2012), Fact Sheet: G-8 Action on Food Security and Nutrition, [www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/05/18/fact-sheet-g-8-action-food-security-and-nutrition](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/05/18/fact-sheet-g-8-action-food-security-and-nutrition)
- 4 An environment in which formal science and technology and local and traditional knowledge are seen as part of an integral AKST (agricultural knowledge, science and technology) system can increase equitable access to technologies for a broad range of producers and natural resource managers, [www.agassessment.org/reports/IAASTD/EN/Agriculture%20at%20a%20Crossroads\\_Synthesis%20Report%20\(English\).pdf](http://www.agassessment.org/reports/IAASTD/EN/Agriculture%20at%20a%20Crossroads_Synthesis%20Report%20(English).pdf)
- 5 *ibid* endnote 3
- 6 The European Council (2012), EU at G8: Acting together, [www.european-council.europa.eu/home-page/highlights/eu-at-g8-acting-together?lang=en](http://www.european-council.europa.eu/home-page/highlights/eu-at-g8-acting-together?lang=en)
- 7 FAO (2009), Declaration of the World Summit on Food Security, [www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/wsfs/Summit/Docs/Final\\_Declaration/WSFS09\\_Declaration.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/wsfs/Summit/Docs/Final_Declaration/WSFS09_Declaration.pdf)
- 8 OECD, Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action, [www.oecd.org/dac/aideffectiveness/parisdeclarationandaccraagendaforaction.htm](http://www.oecd.org/dac/aideffectiveness/parisdeclarationandaccraagendaforaction.htm)
- 9 A company process “to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how they address their impacts on human rights.”
- 10 CIDSE (2013), The UN Protect, Respect and Remedy Framework and the Guiding Principles: Driving Change?, [www.cidse.org/content/publications/business-a-human-rights/bahr-in-the-united-nations/un-framework-guiding-principles.html](http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/business-a-human-rights/bahr-in-the-united-nations/un-framework-guiding-principles.html)
- 11 CIDSE (2011), Food Price Volatility: Consequences and Impacts on the Right to Food, [www.cidse.org/content/publications/just-food/food-price-volatility/food\\_price\\_volatility.html](http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/just-food/food-price-volatility/food_price_volatility.html)
- 12 The World Bank (2013), Growing Africa: Unlocking the Potential of Agribusiness, [siteresources.worldbank.org/INTAFRICA/Resources/africa-agribusiness-report-2013.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTAFRICA/Resources/africa-agribusiness-report-2013.pdf)
- 13 *ibid*
- 14 USAID (2012), Key Facts the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition, [transition.usaid.gov/press/factsheets/2012/fs120518.html](http://transition.usaid.gov/press/factsheets/2012/fs120518.html)
- 15 Grain (2013), The G-8 and land grabs in Africa, [www.grain.org/article/entries/4663-the-g8-and-land-grabs-in-africa](http://www.grain.org/article/entries/4663-the-g8-and-land-grabs-in-africa)
- 16 *ibid*
- 17 Working Group Food and Agriculture of the Forum on Environment & Development (2013), “G8 Initiative, New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition in Africa paves the way for radical opening of markets for international seed and agrarian corporations in African countries”
- 18 Through NEPAD, the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) addresses policy and capacity issues across the entire agricultural sector and African continent. CAADP is entirely African-led and African-owned and represents African leaders’ collective vision for agriculture in Africa. This ambitious and comprehensive vision for agricultural reform in Africa aims for an average annual growth rate of 6 percent in agriculture by 2015. See: [www.nepad-caadp.net/](http://www.nepad-caadp.net/)
- 19 See: [www.nepad-caadp.net/about-caadp.php](http://www.nepad-caadp.net/about-caadp.php)
- 20 Entraide et Fraternité (2012), L’appât du grain, L’agrobusiness - Quels enjeux pour l’agriculture paysanne?, [www.cidse.org/content/publications/just-food/land-land-grabbing/lappat\\_du\\_grain.html](http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/just-food/land-land-grabbing/lappat_du_grain.html)



- 21 CAADP has a huge opportunity to promote good agricultural research by following the findings of the IAASTD. However, CAADP is largely not following the IAASTD roadmap. APRODEV and PELUM research into CAADP's 4th pillar on research finds that it is promoting a farming model, associated with the Green Revolution, that encourages heavy reliance on expensive external inputs, such as chemical fertilizers and pesticides, as well as hybrid seeds bought from agribusiness companies; this comes at the expense of promoting sustainable agriculture approaches which are likely to benefit poor farmers much more. CAADP's lead partner in agricultural research, the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa, has also advocated for strong IPR regimes that threaten farmers' rights to retain and exchange their traditional seeds ignoring the consensus on sustainable, agro-ecological farming models as a viable solution for African agriculture. See: [aprodev.eu/files/Trade/aprodev\\_pelum\\_briefing\\_on\\_caadp\\_final2012.pdf](http://aprodev.eu/files/Trade/aprodev_pelum_briefing_on_caadp_final2012.pdf)
- 22 De Schutter, Olivier (2009), International Trade in Agriculture and the Right to Food, [library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/genf/06819.pdf](http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/genf/06819.pdf)
- 23 Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (2012), [triplecrisis.com/g-8-punts-on-food-security-to-the-private-sector](http://triplecrisis.com/g-8-punts-on-food-security-to-the-private-sector)
- 24 De Schutter, Olivier (2012), Privatising aid is a dangerous strategy, [www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/dec/11/privatising-aid-dangerous](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/dec/11/privatising-aid-dangerous)
- 25 Final Update on the US G8 Presidency (2012), [www.state.gov/documents/organization/202643.pdf](http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/202643.pdf)
- 26 African Center for Biosafety (2012), South Africa's Seed Systems: Challenges to Food Sovereignty, [www.acbio.org.za/images/stories/dmddocuments/Seed\\_study-2012.pdf](http://www.acbio.org.za/images/stories/dmddocuments/Seed_study-2012.pdf)
- 27 [www.state.gov/documents/organization/190625.pdf](http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/190625.pdf)
- 28 The World Bank (2008), Doing Business, an Independent Evaluation, [siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTDOIBUS/Resources/db\\_evaluation.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTDOIBUS/Resources/db_evaluation.pdf)
- 29 Patel, Raj (2012), Journal of Peasant Studies 2012 "The Long Green Revolution", [www.academia.edu/2157100/The\\_Long\\_Green\\_Revolution](http://www.academia.edu/2157100/The_Long_Green_Revolution)
- 30 Think Africa Press (2013), The G-8 Alliance: Gambling in Food Security, [thinkafricapress.com/agriculture/g8-alliance-gambling-food-security](http://thinkafricapress.com/agriculture/g8-alliance-gambling-food-security)
- 31 See: [www.grain.org/article/entries/4663-the-g8-and-land-grabs-in-africa](http://www.grain.org/article/entries/4663-the-g8-and-land-grabs-in-africa)
- 32 The Grow Africa Forum is a partnership of the World Economic Forum (WEF), African Union (AU), and NEPAD meant to develop investment blueprints and facilitate dialogue between partner countries and the private sector. This initiative was born of discussions at the World Economic Forum where a new vision for African Agriculture was developed with limited transparency and no inclusion of smallholders, see: [growafrica.com/about](http://growafrica.com/about)
- 33 FAO, IFAD, UNCTAD and The World Bank Group (2010), Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment that Respects Rights, Livelihoods and Resources, [unctad.org/en/docs/ciicrp3\\_en.pdf](http://unctad.org/en/docs/ciicrp3_en.pdf)
- 34 International Food Security & Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism Forum (2012), Final Report in preparation for the 39th session of the Committee On World Food Security, p.14–15, [www.csm4cfs.org/files/News/100/csm\\_forum\\_2012\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://www.csm4cfs.org/files/News/100/csm_forum_2012_report_en.pdf)
- 35 Stick to Africa's Plan (2012), [africasplansforg8.org/](http://africasplansforg8.org/)
- 36 G8 New Alliance, G8 Cooperation Framework to support the "New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition" in Ghana, [www.state.gov/documents/organization/190626.pdf](http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/190626.pdf)

- 37 Ironically, the territories encompassing these corridors often correspond to their colonial predecessors, as is the case of the Beira Agricultural Growth Corridor (BAGC) for instance, which is exactly the same geographical area that was contracted out to The Mozambique Company, in the late 19th century; in that way reviving a colonial legacy when private sector interests were allowed to dictate the extraction of the continent's natural and human resources
- 38 Vorley et al. (2012), *Tipping the Balance*, [dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/8729/G03470.pdf?sequence=1](http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/8729/G03470.pdf?sequence=1)
- 39 *ibid*
- 40 Byers, B. and Rampa, F. (2013), *Corridors of power or plenty? Lessons from Tanzania and Mozambique and implications for CAADP*, ECDPM Discussion Paper 138, [www.ecdpm.org/Web\\_ECDPM/Web/Content/Navigation.nsf/index2?readform&http://www.ecdpm.org/Web\\_ECDPM/Web/Content/Content.nsf/0/CF1BFEC64FF96345C1257AFE003154D1?OpenDocument](http://www.ecdpm.org/Web_ECDPM/Web/Content/Navigation.nsf/index2?readform&http://www.ecdpm.org/Web_ECDPM/Web/Content/Content.nsf/0/CF1BFEC64FF96345C1257AFE003154D1?OpenDocument)
- 41 *ibid*.
- 42 Hanlon et al. (2011), *Understanding Land Investment Deals in Africa - Country Report Mozambique, Review of African Political Economy*, [www.rinoceros.org/IMG/pdf/ProCana\\_Case.pdf](http://www.rinoceros.org/IMG/pdf/ProCana_Case.pdf)
- 43 The World Bank (2005), *Mozambique Country Economic Memorandum*, [www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/2005/11/01/000160016\\_20051101095922/Rendered/PDF/326150MZ.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/2005/11/01/000160016_20051101095922/Rendered/PDF/326150MZ.pdf)
- 44 G8 New Alliance, *Cooperation Framework to Support the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition in Mozambique*, [feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/Mozambique%20Coop%20Framework%20ENG%20FINAL%20w.cover%20REVISED.pdf](http://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/Mozambique%20Coop%20Framework%20ENG%20FINAL%20w.cover%20REVISED.pdf)
- 45 *ibid*
- 46 Local procurement schemes are being used successfully in many countries as a means by which governments can support smallholders' income generation. India and Brazil are cited as best practice cases. The World Food Programme is also employing a similar approach through the Purchase for Progress Initiative, [www.wfp.org/purchase-progress](http://www.wfp.org/purchase-progress)
- 47 CIDSE and EAA use the technically accurate term 'agrofuels' rather than 'biofuels' for reasons stated in the 2012 CIDSE paper: *Agriculture: From Problem to Solution. Achieving the Right to Food in a Climate Constrained World*, [www.cidse.org/content/publications/just-food/food-and-climate/agriculture\\_from\\_problem\\_to\\_solution.html](http://www.cidse.org/content/publications/just-food/food-and-climate/agriculture_from_problem_to_solution.html) and as defined in the FAO's Corporate Document Repository, [www.fao.org/docrep/007/j4504E/j4504e07.htm](http://www.fao.org/docrep/007/j4504E/j4504e07.htm)
- 48 As an applied science, agroecology uses ecological concepts and principles for the design and management of sustainable agricultural systems in which natural, locally-available resources for soil fertility and biological control are privileged over costly external inputs such as chemical fertilizers and pesticides. See: EAA (2012), *Nourishing the World Sustainably, Scaling up Agroecology*, [www.campaignforrealfarming.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Nourishing-the-World-Sustainably-Scaling\\_up\\_acro-ecology.pdf](http://www.campaignforrealfarming.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Nourishing-the-World-Sustainably-Scaling_up_acro-ecology.pdf)
- 49 CIDSE (2012), *Agriculture: From Problem to Solution. Achieving the Right to Food in a Climate Constrained World*, see endnote 46 for web link
- 50 De Schutter, Olivier (2012), *Women's rights and the right to food*, [www.srfood.org/images/stories/pdf/officialreports/20130304\\_gender\\_en.pdf](http://www.srfood.org/images/stories/pdf/officialreports/20130304_gender_en.pdf)
- 51 FAO (2012), *The State of Food and Agriculture 2012, Executive Summary*, p.2, [www.fao.org/docrep/017/i2885e/i2885e00.pdf/](http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/i2885e/i2885e00.pdf/)

# CIDSE

together for global justice

## CIDSE members



Austria



Belgium



Belgium



Canada



England and Wales



France



Germany



Ireland



Italy



Luxembourg



the Netherlands



Portugal



Slovakia



Scotland



Spain



Switzerland



USA



The Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance (EAA) is an international network of over 80 churches and Christian organizations, with members representing Catholic, Evangelical, Orthodox and Protestant traditions. Our members, who represent tens of millions of Christians around the world, are committed to speaking and acting together on issues of common concern. We are called by our faith to stand for justice, peace and a sustainable world.

[www.e-alliance.ch](http://www.e-alliance.ch)



CIDSE is an international alliance of Catholic development agencies. Its members share a common strategy in their efforts to eradicate poverty and establish global justice. CIDSE's advocacy work covers global governance; resources for development; climate justice; food, agriculture & sustainable trade; and business and human rights.

[www.cidse.org](http://www.cidse.org)