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1 Introduction

70% of hunger in Africa is concentrated in the rural areas, among the peasant farmers. At the same time it is those very peasant farmers (most of them women) who provide their population with the bulk of nationally produced food. The project with its fact finding missions and speakers tours of peasants and their support groups provided important insights into this seeming contradiction.

The objective of the project was to create awareness about the impact of EU trade policies on African peasant farmers. Germanwatch, BothENDS, FIAN Germany, FIAN International and UK Food Group along with farmers’ organisations and other CSOs from Zambia, Uganda and Ghana initiated the project “African smallholders in focus – a voice in EU trade policy”.

By advocacy work the project aimed at strengthening the voice of smallholder farmers in the WTO and EU negotiations. The project organised:

1. Studies about the impact of EPAs, IMF, World Bank and WTO policies on smallholder farmers;

2. Fact-finding missions with farmers, their organisations and NGOs to Zambia, Ghana and Uganda to get a better understanding of the impact of agricultural trade policies on farmers;

3. Exchange conference and meetings to develop a common strategy for our political work;

4. Photo exhibitions and public events to illustrate the impact of trade policy on smallholder farmers.
2. Major findings and events in the project period:

The dialogues with African peasant farmers both in Africa and in Europe came to the conclusion that African peasant agriculture has great potential to feed the African population and to overcome hunger and poverty (See conclusion Zambia report). At the same time African farmers and their support groups raised over and over again how African agriculture faces major challenges emanating primarily from the international and national policy environments, but also from climate change.

The project dealt primarily with trade related challenges to African peasant farmers, such as the EPAs. Farmers’ experiences with structural adjustment and deregulation were used to estimate possible impact of the EPAs. These experiences, however, showed already the major policy obstacles which African peasant farmers face in feeding their continent.

The investigative missions showed the severe negative impact of Structural Adjustment Programmes (IMF) on peasant agriculture. Moreover they pointed to the considerable negative impact of EU trade policies and underlined the worries about the EPAs. A couple of suggestions were made in this context by the project consortium including the African partners in the reports of the investigative missions (see annex).

The marginalizing forces for the African peasant farmers date back to its colonial history. The legacy of African agriculture producing for the colonial “motherlands” continues in its strongly promoted and internationally enforced export orientation and its integration into the “world market”. Under both paradigms the African food system (surviving on the backs of African peasant farmers, most of them women) was largely seen as irrelevant for policy makers – most of them located physically or at least mentally outside Africa. The idea of sourcing food on global food markets was propagated as a safe policy – at least until the food crisis hit in 2008. So far a major rethinking putting African peasant farmers at the centre of attention has not yet taking place. Hunger in African increased by 12% from 2008 to 2009.

Such a rethinking is also called for on the basis of the lacking ecological sustainability of agrarian models propagated for Africa by major international actors. 2008 was an important year also because study of the IAAASTD was published – the largest every scientific enterprise to investigate the future of agriculture world wide given the ecological, social and demographic challenges at hand. The study called for drastic policy change on behalf of a peasant-farmer-based agriculture combining modern agro-ecological technologies with the experience of traditional knowledge systems.

The African European Partnership (Lisbon Declaration 2007) was meant to be the policy framework for European-Africa relations. The EU – African partnership suggests that it is based on respect for human rights. The structure of this relationship, however, does not bear witness of these claims - in particular when it comes to the human right to food of peasant farmers who continue to suffer most from policies which do not comply with the FAO Right to Food Guidelines and at times violate ICESCR.

It is still based on the old paradigms – with trade interests playing centre stage. African farmers appear twice in the document. African agriculture does not seem to be merit careful thought – apart from a few items under the MDGs. MDG must be more than an “add on” to a specific trade framework in the declaration. Not only development needs to be rights-based, but all policy fields affecting human rights in Africa – including in particular trade and investment. Only on the basis of a thorough human rights analysis of these policies (Prior and post HR check) and the required policy changes can the EU African partnership be rights-based in the true sense of the word.

Laudable efforts of the Declaration to strengthen African farmers organisations may still raise doubts whether their role should be to “sell” the technocratic and agribusiness-oriented CAADP prescriptions to the African peasant farmers – as the policy reforms demanded by many of these organisations do not show in the document. If policies continue along the lines of business as usual this could be the last stroke to “break the camels back” as some peasant farmers in Ghana formulated.

Drastic policy changes are therefore necessary both in African countries, in the context of CAADP, and with the EU and other international actors. The recommended policy changes that emerged in the context of the dialogues held and the experiences made during the project can be grouped in three categories – those relating to the general policy framework towards African agriculture for all decision makers both in Africa and Europe, and those that relate primarily to the EU and other international actors.
3. General policy framework

The general policy framework calls for a new approach to agriculture – in Africa and elsewhere centered around the following agenda:

3.1 RESPECT THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF AFRICAN PEASANT FARMERS TO FEED THEMSELVES AND THEIR POPULATIONS

African peasant farmers, in particular women need to be appreciated for their current contribution to their populations’ food security, their innovative potential should be understood. Starting from the dignity of African peasant farmers their right to feed themselves and their populations should be respected and promoted.

3.2. SUBSCRIBE TO PEASANT-BASED SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE, FOOD SOVEREIGNTY

Africa needs to produce more food. Peasant farmers have shown that they can do so under an enabling environment. And peasant farmers can sustainably do so in contrast to agribusiness. Nevertheless western style agribusiness is propagated as the only way out for Africa – with western corporations profiting, and peasant farmers ruined.

3.3. DECLARE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL POLICIES FOR FARMER-BASED SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE

The time has come to recognize the crucial importance of African peasants in the transition to a new and more productive African agriculture which is at the same time sustainable and feeding the hungry masses of the continent.

The time has come to strengthen rural African communities and in particular the role of peasant women who care for food production – often without having land rights or titles.

The time has come to encourage peasants to build strong, independent and democratic organisations empowered with human rights and supported by civil society and governments.

Increased yields have to grow in the fields of the vulnerable – or else these will not benefit. What is needed is localisation instead of globalisation: local markets and infrastructure, self determined marketing groups.

Policies for farmer-based sustainable agriculture should be localised rather than globalised. They should start with the local knowledge and experience of the peasant farmers, strengthen knowledge exchange systems between them only on this basis introduce exchange of experience on modern agro-ecological experiences. A policy framework for the national and international actors in this context is given below. Genuine peasant farmers’ organisation should be part of the policy design.

IAASTD and similar studies should be actively used: They show that peasant farming can multiply per hectare yields if properly supported – and can do so sustainably and in a manner that conserves the rural social fabric and ecosystems.

3.4 PEASANT FARMERS NEED ACCESS TO LOCAL AND NATIONAL MARKETS AT STABLE PRICES

Peasant farmers need access to local and national markets at stable prices in order to increase production. These prices should be largely guaranteed by their national governments. Moreover these prices should reflect and incorporate the use of ecosystem resources. Market access requires rural infrastructure, storage facilities, rural roads, market places in rural cities and urban areas.

3.5 THE MAPUTO 10% SHOULD BE ALLOCATED - TO AGROECOLOGICAL PEASANT FARMING

When CAADP was adopted in Maputo in 2003, African states pledged to increase their budget allocations to agriculture at least to 10%. African governments should honour this commitment. More importantly, there should be a policy framework to ensure that the increase in budgetary allocations culminates into increased investment in smallholder agricultural development. This requires a thorough reform of CAADP devoted to investments in agroecological peasant farming.

3.6 IMMEDIATELY ADDRESS POVERTY THROUGH BASIC INCOME PROGRAMMES.

If there is no enabling environment, even soft loans to peasant farmers create a debt trap which may lead to ruin. Given the great disparities between urban and rural Africa (and between rural Africa and the rest of the world) and the transition costs and risks involved in the transition period to sustainable agriculture, the process of policy reform should contain an unconditional and non-selective cash transfers to the rural areas with generalized poverty. This will allow peasant farmers to survive and to invest. Studies have shown that (since financial reserves are absent among impoverished peasant farmers) investment and innovation can be greatly enhanced by a reliable regular outside cash income.
4. Specific recommendations to the African and European decision makers:

The following recommendations should be discussed both by decision makers and civil societies in a spirit of food sovereignty: People’s right to decide their own agricultural policies, and not have these decided by international banks, the EU, or the FAO. The recommendations reflect some of the discussions among the CSO project partners from Africa. They are shared here for a wider coverage and debate.

The first part concerns policies for the transition to sustainable peasant agriculture. Such an agroecological reform is required for two reasons: It is necessary to implement peasant farmers’ Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in particular their Right to Food and their right to feed their populations. Moreover states are obliged to fulfil future generations’ Right to Food, and therefore achieve sustainability in agriculture as soon as possible.

The second part concerns policies that protect peasant agriculture, in particular where sustainable practices already prevail, from being further undermined and destroyed by agribusiness. African states carry protect-bound obligations to this effect.

The following policies are recommended in this context:

4.1. REFORM EXTERNAL INSTITUTIONS AND PROFESSIONAL APPROACHES

In most countries a reform of institutions dealing with agriculture is necessary in order to promote a more productive and sustainable agriculture based on peasant farmers. Currently institutions are often not responsive to the needs of peasant farmers. Moreover there are agribusiness-related forces at work in some institutions which have a completely different agenda, even though there rhetoric may sound “smallholder-oriented”. Even where this is not the case, “traditional” professional approaches will have to be overcome. The following measures should be taken in particular:

- Formally adopt participatory methods and processes
- Introduce farmer to farmer extension methods which can then make demands on national research and extension systems. Reorient agricultural research accordingly.
- Strengthen grassroots organisations and CSOs, and develop stronger partnerships with them
- Reform teaching and training methods
- Strengthen rural infrastructure for local markets
- Address corruption, introduce transparency.

4.2. SUPPORT LOCAL GROUPS FOR COMMUNITY ACTION

Peasant farmers’ organisations need to be strengthened. This includes local farmers’ groups on village level and the community links between villages. Peasant farmers are the main producers and innovators. Their experience has to be shared within the village, between villages and regions in order to create a strong dynamics of change.

The following measures should be taken in particular:

- Encourage formation of local groups
- Develop local partnerships for action
- Strengthen farmers’ field schools
- Assign local responsibilities for preservation of ecosystems, soils, waters, biodiversity.

4.3. ENCOURAGE AGROECOLOGICAL PRACTICES

Peasant farmers’ investments in (and experiments with) new agroecological practices which will provide higher yields and conserve the productive capacity of their ecosystems needs the direct support of the state. It goes without saying that peasants farmers - and in particular peasant women - have to be sure they will reap the benefits of the transition cost they are incurring. Moreover states’ policies and institutions have to be responsive to the needs arising from the introduction of integrated pest management, integrated plant nutrition management, as well as soil and water management.

The following measures should be taken in particular:

- Grant peasant farmers (including women) appropriate property rights and security of tenure
- Introduce direct subsidies and grants for applying such practices
- Penalize inappropriate practices.
- Offer direct transitionary support to peasant farmers for introducing agroecological methods.
- Provide better information on food quality to consumers and the public
- Encourage national resource accounting
- Allocate at least 10% of the budget to agriculture. The related increase should support agroecological peasant farming.
4.4 REJECT EPAS AND SIMILAR TRADE AGREEMENTS

EPAs have an underlying logic that is inconsistent with the necessary policy reforms suggested above. EPAs aim at a globalisation, integrating markets on which African peasant farmers have a structural disadvantage against international agribusiness. Moreover globalisation fails to respect the locally based logic of sustainable agro-ecological farming and hands over the agricultural sector to foreign agribusiness interests.

In order to keep unfair and unwanted foreign competition at bay and exercise their right to food sovereignty, African states have to reserve their freedom to determine their own agricultural policies, including their freedom to raise tariffs for imports and exports according to these policies. EPAs curtail the policy space of African countries to protect their vulnerable producers and to introduce the reforms mentioned. In many African countries, tariffs are a major source of state income. Losing such income further curtails the capacity of African states to implement the policies needed. EPAs and other trade agreements of this nature, should therefore be rejected.

4.5 STOP OFF SHORE FARMING

“Off shore farming” is a euphemistic term for farming on other peoples’ lands. Africa is particularly hit because of its endowment with natural resources. As national resources are essential for international financial capital to make profits, and agrofuels as well as foods seem to be promising fields of enterprise in the wake of the current economic crisis, foreign direct investment in rural Africa increased rapidly a over the past years, often linked to land grabbing. Moreover the current food crisis underlines that it is irresponsible for states to base their citizen’s access to food on the possibility of buying food on volatile and speculative global markets where states and consumers of very different purchasing power compete. In particular those states with a scarcity of lands to sustain the (often unsustainably elevated) consumption patterns, started to become interested in farming in Africa and thought of directly producing in Africa for their home countries abroad. Moreover the agrofuels boom stimulated off shore farming. Even in countries with large areas of unused land, off shore farming (which is largely agribusiness driven) negatively impacts on agricultural policies towards peasant-based agroecological farming. Moreover it invites problems in future.
5. Specific recommendations to the EU and similar international actors

The EU is duty-bound under human rights law to internationally cooperate with African states in implementing a policy reform along the lines of the recommendations made under point 4. This duty can only be established, if sufficient evidence has been gathered to show that the measures recommended are necessary in order to fulfil present and future peasant farmers’ rights to feed themselves and their populations. This evidence, however, is available with IAASTD. Ignoring such evidence means ignoring the obligation of due diligence in international relations.

Moreover the EU is obliged under international human rights law respect peasant farmers’ access to food, resources, local and regional markets and to cooperate in the protection of such access against being destroyed by its own policies, by EU-based vested corporate interests and by agribusiness interests elsewhere. This implies the following requirements:

5.1. RESPECT THE AFRICAN POLICY SPACE, AND AFRICAN FOOD SOVEREIGNTY

The EU has to refrain from any intervention into agricultural policies of African states and their food sovereignty. Such policies have to be formulated by the African states themselves with full participation of peasant farmers’ organisations.

5.2. STOP PROMOTING EPA. REFORM THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY.

For the above mentioned reasons the EU should stop promoting EPAs. Instead of promoting the agenda of international agribusiness in the fields of intellectual property privileges, trade and unfair competition with local business and farmers in Africa, the EU should carry out reforms of its own agricultural policies to make European agricultural sustainable and to rule out export surges on the markets of vulnerable producers in Africa.

5.3 REFORM EU POLICIES IN INTERNATIONAL FOR AND TOWARDS TRANSNATIONAL CORPORATIONS.

The EU has to meet its obligations under international human rights law also when acting in international fora such as WTO, the World Bank and IMF. EU member states have to be aware that their human rights obligations continue while acting through the EU.

The role of states versus transnational corporations has to be strengthened and mechanisms have to be introduced to address the uneven power between transnational corporations and producers, consumers and governments. The EU as the home of many transnational corporations has a particular duty to regulate accordingly.

5.4 THE EU SHOULD STOP USING PRESSURE TACTICS TOWARDS AFRICA

In the field of EPAs and some other areas the EU has taken to pressure tactics which contradict the values proclaimed for example in the Lisbon Declaration on African European partnership and the standards which the European population expects from its politicians and negotiators. Instead the EU should ensure transparency, and participation both in Europe and in Africa. Concluding “agreements” while knowing that the affected African population, and often even the African parliaments, have not properly participated, is unacceptable. The EU has to make sure that the human right to political participation is respected when dealing with African states, and desist from making use of lacking transparency to promote the goals of EU-based corporations.

5.5 REFORM OF TRADE AND INVESTMENT POLICY TO PRIORITIZE AGRO-ECOLOGICAL PEASANT AGRICULTURE OVER THE AGROBUSINESS AGENDA:

The EU has to recall that its policy design towards Africa has to meet human rights obligations – also in the field of ESCR. The idea that promoting European business interests is identical with the common good in Europe (let alone Africa) is utterly mistaken. Trade Policy must be an integral part of a rights-based EU-Africa partnership, not a separate agenda as in the current African-European framework of Lisbon, leading to the Joint Africa Europe Strategy. Investment policies are not to be based primarily on the question whether such policies will maximise returns to capital invested, but have to be rights-based. This means that they have to primarily (with priority and maximum of available resources) address the investment needs of deprived parts of the African population and of threatened future populations. Moreover any investment policy requires a prior publicly accessible assessment of human rights impacts in Africa. Trade and investment have to be regulated accordingly.

Land grabbing for agribusiness-based globalisation needs to be stopped. Investment has to be first of all for local markets, then for national, subregional, regional and finally (if at all) global. Peasant farmers must remain in control of the resources: land and water - and seeds.
5.6 REFORMING EUROPEAN CONSUMPTION HABITS (AGROFUELS, FEED STUFFS).

Europe and other affluent parts of the world need to reform their consumption habits taking into consideration that these consumption habits (via globalisation) directly compete with the viability of sustainable peasant agriculture. Moreover they are themselves unsustainable and not globalizable.

The current excessive meat (and dairy) consumption in Europe based on imported feed stuffs taking the lands of peasant farmers overseas should be discouraged. Moreover agrofuels are no solution to the over-consumption of energy in Europe. There are sustainable solutions securing European energy without taking the lands and livelihoods of peasant farmers.
Overcoming the marginalisation of African peasant farmers requires profound policy changes. This implies rejecting some of the policy recommendations or prescriptions of the IMF, the EU and other international actors interfering with African food sovereignty. For the African governments there exist policies which are known to work for peasant farmers and for sustainability and would largely increase yields. Europe needs to revise its policies in the fields of trade and economic cooperation with Africa to support such measures. Implementing such policies requires political courage of the decision makers. An increased understanding of the population in Europe of what is at stake would help immensely. The project was a step in the direction of creating this awareness, others should follow.

6. Conclusion
Annex: Conclusions and Recommendations from three investigative missions.

1. INVESTIGATIVE MISSION TO UGANDA 2007

Recommendations of the report of the “Right to Food of Milk and Maize Farmers”

Based on the findings, the recommendation to the EU and EAC are:

1) to conduct a Human Rights Impact Assessment on the EPA before any further negotiations are held – as recommended by the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Oliver De Schutter, in his recent report to the Human Rights Council on the relationship between trade agreements under WTO and the State’s obligation to respect the human right to food (De Schutter 2009).

2) to revise the Interim EPA: Both the EU and the EAC have to make sure that the EPA will not limit the policy space of Uganda to protect and promote the right to adequate food for small-scale farmers. No liberalisation commitment or standstill clause shall hinder the Ugandan Government to increase tariffs whenever European imports threaten market access and incomes of food insecure people. The revision process, as well as further EPA negotiations, must allow substantial participation of parliaments and civil society organisations. We urgently request the EU not to put pressure on the EAC to conclude a comprehensive EPA, which would include services, investment, intellectual property rights or public procurement;

3) to revise the EU decision to increase the milk quota by 2 percent. Furthermore, we recommend to maintain the milk quota system beyond 2013 and to phase out export subsidies immediately. The recently reintroduced export subsidies need to be withdrawn. The EU must make sure that surplus dairy products are not exported to Uganda at dumping prices.

4) to support smallholder food production in its desire for official development assistance. Smallholder farmers feed the people and should get more support from governments and donors.

The World Food Programme should increase its efforts to purchase maize from Ugandan smallholder farmers. Measures could be:

- to pay on the spot,
- to assist the Ugandan Government to set up a credit scheme, which benefits smallholders, and which is accessible to them
- to accept lower quantities than 50 t.

The Ugandan Government should:

1) increase the efforts to facilitate access to internal markets through self determined marketing groups of farmers. These marketing groups will likely strengthen the bargaining power, especially of smallholders, towards informal vendors or middlemen and facilitate access to formal markets at fair prices that allow for a life in dignity and free from hunger;

2) increase the public spending on agriculture from 4 to 10 percent, as agreed in the Maputo Declaration. Uganda, with support of its development partners, should put special emphasis on promoting the access of smallholder farmers to inputs like high quality seeds (locally adapted in close cooperation with local communities), extension services, low interest loans, storing and processing facilities at affordable prices.

3) guarantee women the right to inherit land by law. This law should be developed together with women’s rights organisations and be enforced by public awareness raising campaigns and trainings for local authorities and land registrars. Furthermore, a policy needs to be put in place to fight domestic violence.

4) increase its efforts to improve quality of public schools and to reduce or to abolish school fees of secondary schools. School fees are the highest expenditures of the farmers and might discourage them from sending their children to secondary school. A higher educational level will help the future generation of farmers to improve their production and gain more bargaining power against traders.
2. INVESTIGATIVE MISSION TO ZAMBIA 2007

Conclusions of the report of the “Right to Food of Milk and Honey Farmers”

Despite the challenges facing the agricultural sector in Zambia, it still has a great potential to uplift the majority of the small-scale farmers out of poverty owing to its multiplier effect on the economy. Therefore it is the combined responsibility of the government of Zambia and of the international community to ensure that favorable trade and related policies are formulated and implemented in a way that ensures the realization of economic, social and cultural rights of the small-scale farmers. If agriculture is to thrive in Zambia and Africa as a whole, then national governments must address the bottle necks hindering the growth of the small-scale farmers such high cost of productive assets, lack of market for the produce, lack of value addition, post harvest losses, lower prices for the agricultural goods, lack of access to affordable finances, exploitative and unfair trade policies, insecurity of the traditional land tenure system. In case of failure to tackle the bottlenecks above, addressing poverty, ensuring national food security and the right to food of the small-scale farmers will remain pipe dreams.

Liberalisation policies that were implemented by the country in the early 1990's under the auspices of the IMF and the World Bank led to opening up the economy. This has for quite some time led to flooding of the local market with imported products from outside the country. Farmers have faced difficulties in terms of accessing the local market. This is due to the fact that most of them are unable to have the necessary income needed to take their children to school, buy the basic food stuffs to keep them going. Liberalisation of the economy led to the closure of many companies in Zambia and the majority of the people lost their jobs. Whilst this policy led to a wider variety of products on the market for the consumer, its grave consequences has outweighed its benefits.

The impact of liberalisation has set a good example to what is expected in the EPA once implemented. The impact of the EPAs will be more than that of liberalisation due to the fact that in addition to closing up the companies and farms due to stiff competition, the government will lose the much needed revenue to support the social sectors. This later will force the government to borrow and go back to the debt trap. Further even though there will be cheaper product on the market, most of the people will not have the purchasing power due to the fact that most of them will lose their jobs. A free trade agreement with the EU will not only have an impact on the commercial relations but will also limit the policy space in the field of support policies for the agriculture sector which employees about 70% of the population. This would compromise the country's ability to feed it own population.

From the fact finding mission, it can be recommended that both government of Zambia and the European Union should protect and fulfil the economic, social and cultural rights of the small-scale farmers in the ongoing EPAs negotiations. Measures should be put in place by the negotiating camps to protect the interests of the small-scale farmers by addressing the supply side constraints that have hindered the small-scale farmers to participate effectively in both local and international trade. Small-scale producers both in the dairy and honey sector still face difficulties in terms of high cost of production, strict and difficult market requirements such as labeling and safety standards. If the supply side constraints are not addressed, farmers will continue wallowing in poverty and will not reap any benefit if they are there in the EPAs. Further their right to food will continue to be violated despite the fact that they are the major producers of national food in the country.
3. INVESTIGATIVE MISSION TO GHANA 2007

Conclusions of the report of the “Right to Food of Tomato and Poultry Farmers”

It is evident that the poultry and tomato farmers’ vulnerability has increased as a result firstly of the liberalization implemented by the state of Ghana and forced by the IMF and secondly of the EU trade and agricultural policies, which allow and support overproduction and exports of tinned tomato and chicken parts at very low prices. The Right to Food of poultry farmers in Ashaiman and tomato farmers in Koluedor thus has been violated through the state of Ghana, the member states of the IMF and member states of the EU.

The study demonstrates that the IMF is the main “culprit” regarding the violation of the Right to Food of poultry and tomato farmers in Ghana, through its conditions and constant interference in the affairs of the state of Ghana. This drastically reduced the political space of the government to initiate pro-poor policies that would ensure the Right to Food of small-scale producers like those in Koluedor and Ashaiman. The forced liberalization that Ghana went through with the IMF at the center stage ensuring that Ghana liberalizes beyond the WTO rules was denying Ghana the opportunities under the WTO to take measures to ensure that small producers’ Right to Food is not violated. For tomato farmers, the lack of sufficient measures to ensure that excess tomato is processed and sold later is another factor for the loss of livelihoods. Cheap imports are currently depressing investments into the establishment of processing plants.

The EU member states contributed to the violations of the Right to Food of the small producers by allowing and supporting European companies to export poultry products and tomato paste at very cheap and unfair prices onto the Ghanaian market. The report shows that these exports had a negative impact on incomes of interviewed farmers and their ability to feed themselves adequately.

The findings indicate that the formulation of a low Common External Tariff (CET) for these products in the ECOWAS and further decreases in tariffs through an EPA with the EU will lead to further losses in market shares and incomes of the farmers and lead to further violations of their Right to adequate Food. It is very likely that this will not only affect the farmers interviewed by the investigative mission. Farmers fear that Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) will likely to be the last stroke to “break the camels’ back” of large parts of Ghanaian agriculture. Furthermore, the revenue loss for the state of Ghana caused by lower tariffs will probably mean diversion of resources from important sectors such as health and education, and the citizens might be tax burdened which will further increase the vulnerability of millions more to violations of their Right to Food and other human rights.