EDITORIAL *by Wilma Strothenke*

In 2009, the number of undernourished people in the world surpassed, for the first time in history, one billion. This is far from the 400 million envisaged for 2015 by the World Food Summit 1996. As part of the attempts to overcome the world food crisis, several initiatives towards improved governance of the world food system were begun. UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Olivier de Schutter, suggests how the new role of a reformed Committee on World Food Security could be shaped.

The use of vast stretches of land for agrofuel production instead of food production is one of the root causes underlying the crisis. The oil-rich "Wonder plant," Jatropha, however, does not render the promised fruit, but exacerbates the situation of small farmers and pastoralists in India. A recent case study on Kenya illustrates an additional threat to the right to food derived from the crisis - large scale land grabbing by foreign companies in countries with wide-spread hunger and malnutrition.

The crisis will also further aggravate the situation of marginalised and poor people. For instance, African smallholder peasants that are affected by the impacts of global and European agricultural trade policies, and particularly vulnerable groups such as HIV-infected children and their families.

In order to alleviate and eventually eradicate hunger, it is essential that the next World Food Summit 2009 will result in drastic changes in agrarian policies with a focus on sustainable food production by - mostly women - peasant farmers. Their right to food will be a crucial term of reference in order to overcome the political obstacles to the profound reforms necessary.

vol.4 _ n.1, 2009

RIGHT_TO_FOOD QUARTERLY

FIAN

Governing World Food Security:
A New Role for the Committee on World Food Security[1] *by Olivier De Schutter*

We know what explains hunger and malnutrition: highly unequal income distributions, inadequate social protection schemes, weak protection of agricultural workers, gender, ethnic and other types of discrimination, increasingly dualistic farming systems under which smallholders find it difficult to survive from farming, poor connection to markets, high input prices, insecure land tenure systems and unequal access to resources. And the list is longer: failure to adequately regulate the food chain, inequitable international trade systems, unregulated markets which do not guarantee remunerative prices, insufficient or inadequately targeted investments in agriculture, and speculation in futures markets of agricultural commodities. These causes reflect the absence of recognition of the right to food and of the need for appropriate mechanisms to ensure that the right to food is complied with.

Yet, it is reasonable to suggest that these different causes are now better understood, and that we know, in large part, how to address these obstacles to the realisation of the right to food, even if until now we have collectively failed to make significant progress in overcoming them. We need now to understand what went wrong, and what can be done to change this.

UNDERSTANDING THE CURRENT GOVERNANCE SITUATION

Our failure to take decisive action to eradicate hunger and extreme malnutrition is due to a combination of five factors. Firstly, while hunger stems from a large number of causes, many efforts have focused exclusively on producing enough food to feed the world, paying too little attention to the political economy of hunger, particularly to questions of accessibility and equity, the effects of marginalisation and disempowerment of certain population groups as well as imbalances in the food system. We now understand hunger and malnutrition in a much more holistic way – and we see the fight against them as requiring collective action in areas other than agriculture, rural development and food aid.

Secondly, global governance of world food security is fragmented. Various UN agencies (including ILO, the World Bank and IMF) provide policy guidance to countries on the various issues listed above, while the WTO offers technical advice on multilateral trade negotiations. This often results in conflicting advice to countries, as each agency tends to concentrate on furthering its own area of specialization. Coordination among these agencies needs urgently to be improved, and that their efforts are channeled towards the overarching goal of combating hunger and severe malnutrition. Equally important is to enhance the legitimacy and ownership of their policy recommendations by establishing strong partnerships with governments and civil society organisations.

Thirdly, there is still no consensus on a range of issues that need to be addressed. For example, we know that the neglect of agriculture in public policies and development cooperation during the period 1980-2007 was a mistake. Modes of agricultural development have too often favoured large-scale plantations, without significantly benefiting smallholders. We know that social safety nets must be improved and greatly expanded,. We now recognise the contribution improved accountability can make to food and nutrition security, through the recognition of the right to food and the adoption of national strategies for the realisation of the right to food. We are learning from past mistakes, which is resulting in misguided policies being remedied or abandoned. However, other potential causes of hunger and malnutrition remain contested or are not being addressed at all. For instance, the relationship of agro-fuel production to food security remains controversial. The impact on the right to food of different modes of agricultural development also remains the subject of intense debate,

Fourthly, political will has been insufficient to remove the structural causes underlying hunger. Commitments remain vague without any government or institution being held accountable for specific actions, while no follow-up is organised at international level other than to report on the number of hungry. This is aggravated by often imperfect coordination within the government sector due to a lack of strong leadership from the highest level of government. Accountability must be improved, by governments setting clear policy objectives and time-bound goals and through regular monitoring of progress made.

Fifthly, national right-to-food strategies remain largely insufficient. Only a handful of governments have set up accountability mechanisms to protect the right to food. Smallholder farmers are all too often marginalised from public policies, both as a result of political disempowerment and mistaken assumptions by policy-makers that small-scale agriculture is less productive than large-scale plantations. Agricultural workers are insufficiently protected, particularly as regards their rights to a living wage, to collective bargaining, to health and safety at work. Only a small number of governments have established well-functioning social protection schemes, shielding the most vulnerable from increases in food prices. More incentives must be created in order to ensure that participatory strategies are established at the national level which ensure swift progress towards the realisation of the right to food, and which focus efforts on the most vulnerable (small-scale farmers, landless laborers, and the urban poor).

THE GOVERNANCE ROLE OF THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY (CFS)

To combat hunger and malnutrition through better global governance, a renewed Committee on World Food Security (CFS) should fundamentally aim at overcoming the obstacles mentioned above, by assuming three core functions: coordination, learning, and monitoring. These in turn translate into the following five operational considerations.

a. ***A platform for coordination between international agencies, governments, and civil society organizations.*** The CFS should constitute a platform from which all relevant UN agencies with activities relevant to food and nutrition security and the right to food, including the ILO, the World Bank, the

1 The UN Special Rapporteur on the right to food has presented several reports and statements related to the topic of this article, among them : « Building Resilence: a human rights framwork for world food and nutrition security » (Report to the Human Rights Council, September 2008); « Taking the Right to Food Seriously » (Statement after the High-Level Meeting on Food Security for All in Madrid, 26-27 January 2009 ; and « Mission to the World Trade Organization » (Report presented to the Human Rights Council, March 2009).

IMF, and the WTO, would channel their actions, with the aim of improving the consistency and coherence of their policy recommendations. The inclusion of hunger and malnutrition reduction objectives in the CFS's would ensure that the efforts of the international community as a whole are consistent with these objectives. It would serve to encourage agencies to take full account of the impact on food security, nutrition and the right to food of the ways they implement their mandates.

Secondly, States should be represented at a high level, preferably by a delegate mandated by an inter-departmental taskforce on the eradication of hunger and severe malnutrition established at national level. Thirdly, the legitimacy of the CFS as well as its ability to act effectively would further be enhanced by ensuring adequate representation of civil society, To ensure full representation of different constituencies, the CFS should evolve into a tri-partite structure (governments, international agencies, civil society).

b. ***Setting goals and offering guidelines to stimulate action.*** The main task of the CFS should be to monitor progress towards the achievement of time-bound goals for the eradication of hunger and other severe forms of malnutrition. A set of guidelines could be adopted by the CFS on a regular basis, that would outline what needs to be done by both the international community and national governments, and could identify areas in which international cooperation is required to support national efforts to eradicate hunger and malnutrition. The CFS guidelines would be revised regularly on the basis of the successes and failures of national and international policies. Thus, the CFS would fulfil an essential collective learning function. It seems particularly important that these guidelines address the full range of obstacles to the realisation of the human right to adequate food, such as climate change, employment and social safety nets, rights of agricultural workers, education, land policies, governance of the food chain, trade, and food aid. Specific attention should be given to nutritional dimensions and to the needs of children as well as of lactating and pregnant women. Gender and targeting of vulnerable groups should be addressed as cross-sectional issues. To the fullest extent possible, the FAO 2004 Voluntary Guidelines for the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security should be taken as a departure point for the elaboration of the CFS guidelines The CFS guidelines should serve to identify practical objectives, to be achieved within specified timeframes, and should adopt indicators linked to each of the targets.

c. ***Monitoring of the implementation of the guidelines.*** It is crucial that the CFS guidelines are followed-up by concrete action through a four-step process covering a cycle of four years:

- a) **adoption of guidelines by the CFS**, based on a joint assessment of which actions need to be taken in order to eradicate hunger and severe malnutrition;
- b) adoption by governments and international agencies of a set of **targets to be achieved.**
- c) **reporting** by governments and international agencies to the CFS and examination by the CFS of the progress made towards the targets announced,. This then results in recommendations addressed to the states and agencies concerned, including recommendations to improve levels of international assistance and cooperation ;
- d) **revision of the CFS guidelines** on the basis of an assessment of the obstacles faced by states and international agencies in the achievements of set targets.

d. ***The High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition.*** This Panel should have as its primary task to assist the CFS in fulfilling its role. It would provide the scientific expertise needed to analyse the reports submitted by states and international agencies, and to develop the guidelines on a regular basis. Since the CFS guidelines would touch not only upon agricultural production, but also upon issues such as development, gender equality or nutrition, the composition of the Panel should be multi-disciplinary: agronomists, agricultural and development economists, nutritionists, and specialists in human rights. A priority for the panel should be to assist states and international agencies to translate into concrete guidelines the evaluation presented by the International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD).

e. ***The role of the right to adequate food.*** The right to adequate food should have an important role to play in this renewed CFS. First, in the adoption of the CFS guidelines, the ultimate objective should be the full realisation of the right to food. Second, since there is now a large consensus about the need to rely on the right to food as a basis for accountability, it seems clear that, as part of the proposed reporting process, the states would report on the implementation of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for the Progressive Realization of the Right to Food. This in turn will provide guidance on the composition of both the CFS and the Panel: the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights could usefully contribute to the CFS and therefore should be a member, Human rights specialists should also be included in the Panel. A link with the existing human rights monitoring bodies (UN CESCR and Special Rapporteur on the right to food) could be achieved through representation of these bodies in the Panel.

The above proposals are made in a constructive spirit, with a view towards contributing to the debate on the CFS reform – and not to preempt it. But they are also guided by the conviction that we cannot afford to miss this opportunity to rebuild the global governance of the food system. If nothing decisive is done, the number of hungry will continue to grow. We can change this, provided we make the right choices. If we fail, we will therefore share a responsibility in the continuation of an unacceptable situation.

See the full submission on http://www.srfood.org/index.php/en/documents-issued/other-documents-issued.

Olivier de Schutter is the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food

Land grabbing in Kenya *by Ralf Leonhard and Rolf Künnemann*

The food crisis is not over – it is growing. Prices for the poor are at double the pre-crisis level. After decades of slow decline the prevalence of hunger worldwide is on the increase again. The structural violations of the right to food, which led to the crisis, continue as before – and worse: In fact the crisis even led to additional threats to the right to food. One of them is large scale land grabbing by foreign companies in countries with widespread hunger and malnutrition.

In November 2008, Kenya's president Mwai Kibaki paid a three day official visit to the Gulf emirate of Qatar at the end of which he announced that emir Sheikh Hamad bin Khalif Al Thani had promised to invest 3.5 billion US-dollars in the extension of Lamu port in Coast Province[1]. According to Kenyan Planning Minister Wycliffe Oparanya, Qatar would finance the project "without conditionality". However, Qatar, where no more than one per cent of land is arable, has requested Kenya to lease it 100,000 acres (40,469 Hectares) of land in the Tana delta for farming.[2]

Since the Tana deal was reported in the Kenyan press in early December 2008, no further details have been made known. Indeed, even high ranking public officials have no knowledge from official sources. As the deal is an agreement between two heads of state, the ministers just have to be informed. No discussion about viability or ecological impact is provided for.

Tana River is Kenya's largest river. Its delta on the northern coast has created one of the most fertile agricultural areas in the country. What used to be Tana River District was divided in 2007 into Tana River District and Tana Delta District. Together they have a population of just over 200.000. The Bantu ethnic groups engage in farming while the Cushites, Orma, Wardei and Somali, are mainly pastoralists. Some of the farmers also engage in small scale fishing in the rivers and numerous ponds. The pastoralist communities live mainly in the hinterland of the district in villages around watering points, dams, wells and boreholes where there is pasture. During the dry seasons, the pastoralists move with their cattle to the Tana River delta where they frequently get into conflict with Bantu agriculturalists. In the rainy season, they return to the hinterland with their livestock.

Nearly all land in Tana River and Tana Delta districts is trust land and the overwhelming majority of the settlers do not have title deeds to their ancestral lands. This means that the authorities consider them as squatters although they may have lived in the same place for generations. This legal situation makes them vulnerable to land grabs by powerful persons who use the district administration and Ministry of Lands and Settlement to acquire title deeds for land occupied and tilled by others.

While the farming communities demand titling to secure their land, the pastoralists are opposed as they feel more secure in common land ownership that will allow them to graze their cattle freely. The common land ownership is recognized by Kenyan law and administered as trust land.

If the plans come true, around 40,000 hectares of this high potential land will be leased to the emirate of Qatar to provide horticultural produce for the Qataris. It has not officially been made known where this plantation is to be located. According to locals, the only place possible is in the middle of the delta where the river parts. Another large portion of the delta is earmarked by Kenyan Mumias Sugar Company Ltd. for sugarcane monoculture for the production of agrofuels. "The National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) has approved a controversial plan to grow sugarcane for sugar and agrofuels on an internationally important coastal wetland—the Tana River Delta. More than 20,000 ha of the Tana River Delta will be destroyed and replaced with sugarcane for agrofuel"[3]. The land belongs to Tarda, the Tana and Athi River Development Authority. Mumias, which is the largest sugar company of the country and the first to be partly privatized, is the lease-holder and will invest.

Both mega projects are likely to displace tens of thousands of small farmers, who have settled there and survive on food crops like maize, cassava, beans, vegetables and mango. The delta has also been used as grazing land for generations of cattle of pastoralist tribes. At least 2000 pastoralists depend on the fertile pastures during the long dry season. The realization of the projects would spell doom. The grazing land, community land held in trust by the county council, would be fenced off and converted into plantations. Access to the river would be blocked.

There is no law which demands that the social impact of a project be examined. But under Kenya's environmental law, any proposed law or policy is supposed to be subjected to an environmental impact assessment (EIA), which would give all concerned parties a chance to interrogate its contents. In the case of the Tana River delta projects, the severity of the ecological impact is obvious.

NEMA (National Environment Management Authority) can refuse to give permission (ultimate authority before allocation). The EIA is done according to minimum standards laid down in the Environmental Management and Coordination Act (EMCA) of 1999. Under the law, the utilization of land and land based resources should adhere to the principles of sustainability and intergenerational equity, the principle of prevention, the precautionary principle, the polluter pays principle, and public participation.[4] In Tana River delta, no proper public consultation was done. However, the EIA states no adverse impact of the proposed project.

Impact on the right to food is not considered in any Kenyan law. Moreover the question whether compensation is given to people who lose their livelihoods, is up to the government. Government generally does not feel obliged to give full compensation, particularly if the affected parties do not possess legal title deeds.

The FAO/IFAD/IEED report[5] reads in this regard: "The Qatar-Kenya deal ... has drawn particular media attention as the project, implying the alienation of land and export of food crops, was revealed just as Kenya had experienced severe droughts and failed harvests, forcing the government to admit it would have to declare a national food shortage emergency"[6]

1 www.nation.co.ke/News/-/1056/496966/-/tm5rcj/-/index.htm

2 www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/qatar/3543887/Qatar-to-lease-100000-acres-in-Kenya-in-return-for-port-loan.html

3 http://www.tanariverdelta.org/tana/press/articles/paul_matiku.html

4 David Hunter, James Salzman and Durwood Zaelke, INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND POLICY 379-438 (New York: Foundation Press, 2nd ed., 2005

5 FAO, IIED and IFAD, 2009: Land grab or development opportunity? Agricultural investment and international land deals in Africa, http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/ak241e/ak241e00.htm

6 Ochieng-Oron, M., 2009, "Ministry Says it Was Not Consulted over Qatar Land Deal",

Kenya Wetland Forum, a platform which assembles more than 50 organizations, including government agencies, has launched a petition against the sugar plantations which has both socially and ecologically motivated objections. Kenyan Nobel laureate and environmentalist Wangari Maathai warned: "We cannot just start messing around with the wetland because we need biofuel and sugar"[7]. Nature Kenya, a government agency, has elaborated a cost-benefit-analysis on the alternatives in the Tana River delta which shows that the income generated by traditional farming, fishing and cattle grazing is almost three times higher than potential sugar cane[8].

Ralf Leonhard is an independent journalist and board member of FIAN Austria and travelled for a research mission on land grabbing to Kenya in April 2009. A report of the mission will be available soon at www.fian.org.

Rolf Künnemann is Human Rights Director at FIAN International Secretariat.

Business Daily Africa, 16 January, http://www.bdafrica.com/index.php?option=com_search&searchword=vegetab.

7 http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/L14523234.htm

8 Interview on May 13th, 2009

Jatropha cultivation in India – Agrofuels on the rise *by Sabine Pabst*

Farmer Om Prakash Yadav lives with his family in Newai Tehsil, in the dry northern Indian state of Rajasthan. A sophisticated form of agriculture, adapted to the climatic conditions of this arid region, constituted the livelihood of the family for generations. In 2006, an adviser persuaded Om Prakash and other farmers from the village to plant the "wonder plant" Jatropha on their fields – suggesting that the undemanding plant would yield a great profit within a few years. Under the hot sun in Rajasthan, the plants withered, however, and farmers were forced to water the plants so they did not completely lose out on their harvest. But the promised yield did not come to fruition. Om Prakash is now empty-handed. He can neither sell the oil of the Jatropha plant, nor can he reap what he has previously harvested.

Agrofuels can be drawn from the oil-rich fruit of the Jatropha bushes. The plant sustains itself with relatively little water and grows well on marginal soils. In view of rising oil prices and a growing energy consumption, the Indian government granted top priority to the cultivation of Jatropha. Since 2003, a "biofuel" strategy has been applied in India. The aim is to achieve an admixture quota of 20 percent agrofuel (mainly from Jatropha) and ethanol by 2017. To meet this goal, the shrub with oily seeds must be planted on an expanse the size of 14 million hectares. Already car manufacturers, oil corporations, banks, agribusiness, the biotech industry, and others have entered into the lucrative business surrounding the "wonder plant".

Critics rightly fear that this expansion is only possible at the expense of food production and small farmers. With its national mission for Jatropha agrodiesel, the Indian government began growing Jatropha on 3 million acres of land in 19 states in 2007. Some states, for example Chhattisgarh in central India, have established corresponding authorities to promote the cultivation of Jatropha. A package of grants and advice to farmers, as well as support from private enterprise for the cultivation of Jatropha, should help to achieve this ambitious goal.The state of Rajasthanhas initiated so-called "green land titles" (green patta) through legislative amendment, which allows 5,000 hectares of communal land to be transferred to private companies - in a country where the majority of small farmers do not even have one hectare of land and millions of people are landless.

Not only farmers, but also pastoralists will be facing massive problems in the future. In the village of Joligrant, in the northern Indian state of Uttarkhand, these problems are already evident. Since the Government instituted Jatropha plantations on community land, and in forest areas, livestock owners are no longer able to procure the fodder for their animals and are forced to sell them. The access to public grazing land is now strictly regulated, or has become altogether impossible.

Most state governments stress that the cultivation of Jatropha should only take place on so-called "waste and degraded" land. However, the reality is that in the densely populated country of India, there exists no such land that could not, in one way or another, be used by marginalized sections of the population- such as for grazing land, for the construction of rainfed agriculture, to collect firewood, medicinal herbs, honey, etc. The term "wasteland" is in itself misleading, (the exact definition varies from state to state), mostly because it is communal land, for which no property tax is paid - but is by no means unused wasteland. These areas, which are estimated to compose 25 percent of India's total land area, have been used by millions of poor people in various ways for centuries to sustain their meager livelihoods.

Even the residents of the village Larua in the central Indian state of Chhattisgarh have not benefited from the introduction of Jatropha. The woodlands, where residents have grown their food for 30 years, were quickly turned into a Jatropha plantation 3 years ago. The residents were promised that they would be given replacement land as compensation. However, these lands have still not been allocated. Thus, for many, no other choice remains but to be hired out as migrant workers.

A recent study carried out by FIAN and the Heinrich Böll Foundation on the topic called "Fuelling Poverty – an Agrofuel Guideline for India"[1], draws the following conclusion: "Jatropha cultivation promotes the transfer of land without regard for land rights and appropriate compensation payments, destroying the livelihood of farmers, hindering grazing opportunities for livestock farmers, and is a further negative factor in the competition for scarce land and water resources."

Sabine Pabst is Country Officer for Asia at FIAN International Secretariat

1 *Fuelling Poverty? An Agrofuel Guideline for India.* Guideline for monitoring the status of the right to food in the context of expansions of agro-fuel at community level, including case studies. Published by FIAN West Bengal, FIAN International, with support from Heinrich-Böll-Foundation, February 2009, download at www.fian.org

World agricultural trade and human rights *by Armin Paasch and Rolf Künnemann*

Case studies on violations of the right to food of African peasants

The current hunger crisis makes it clearer than ever that global agricultural trade, and the rules underlying it, can have considerable – positive or negative – effects on the human right to food. Although this general recognition has now become virtually uncontested at an international level, opinions differ as to the political conclusions that should be drawn. The new UN strategy on the hunger crisis plans a radical opening up of markets on all levels. The debate concerning the type of trade policy, which is in accordance with human rights, should, however, not follow ideological models, but should be conducted on the basis of scientifically verifiable empirical data.

EPAS BETWEEN THE EU AND ACP STATES LIMIT POLICY SPACE TO PROTECT HUMAN RIGHTS

Three studies by FIAN, Both Ends, Germanwatch and the UK Food Group investigated the role of the EU[1]. In 2007 and 2008, they analysed the effects of the European agricultural and trade policy on small producers of tomatoes and chicken breeders in Ghana, and of dairy farmers in Zambia and Uganda. The objects of the investigation were both the problems which were already visible, and the dangers for the right to food that could emerge from the recently negotiated Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs).

Negative consequences of the EU agricultural exports, particularly for tomato farmers and chicken breeders in Ghana, were identified in these studies. The FAO's data show that since the opening of the market in 1992, Ghana has been afflicted again and again by import floods of tomato paste and poultry meat – much of it from the EU. In Ghana, the poultry keepers in Ashaiman, close to the port of Tema, were immediately affected. While they had formerly earned their living by selling eggs and chickens for meat, the latter mainstay completely disappeared within a few years, according to all those interviewed, due to the unbeatably cheap imported chickens. While in 2004, according to the FAO, Ghanaians offered their poultry meat for sale at around €2.60 per kilo, whereas the European meat was sold at €1.50 per kilo. In the case of the tomato farmers, the process of being squeezed out has taken a more complicated form: in the past 10 years, the imported tomato paste has found its way into cooking and eating habits, primarily in the towns, and hence, increasingly competes with the domestic fresh tomatoes. Moreover, the cheap imports prevent Ghana from developing its own tomato industry with processing facilities which would be essential for stable sales for the local farmers. The result is that many families of tomato farmers and poultry keepers in the communities concerned have to reduce their meals in number, volume and quality over a number of months, become increasingly indebted, and, therefore, become even more vulnerable to external adversities. Their right to food is no longer fulfilled.

Key factors for this development are the opening of the market and the dismantling of state support as part of the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs). On the one hand it was the Ghanaian government who implemented these, but on the other hand this happened primarily because of the corresponding credit conditions of the IMF. Moreover, in 2003 the IMF prevented the tariff increase not only for rice imports from 20 to 25 percent, but also for poultry imports from 20 to 40 percent. Both changes had been part of the same act, Act 641, which was suspended due to pressure from the IMF. In addition, any increase in tariffs towards the EU will generally no longer be possible for Ghana in the future. According to the EPA interim agreement with the EU, which the government signed on 13 December 2007, Ghana is obliged to reduce the tariffs for over 80 percent of imports to zero by the year 2023. To date, it is not clear whether tomatoes and poultry belong to this 80 percent, or if they can be exempt from the lowering of the tariff because of being "sensitive products". Yet, even in the latter case, the farmers are not yet out of trouble. A Standstill Clause in the agreement forbids Ghana to raise the tariff even for these products over the level which is currently applied. In concrete terms this means: Ghana had the right up until now, under WTO rules, to increase its tariffs on tomato or poultry imports from 20 to 99 percent (bound tariff), which is forbidden, as of now, for European imports. In this way, Ghana loses all its trade policy space, which would be necessary to protect the right to food of the affected tomato and poultry farmers.

Human rights obligations were breached, both by the state of Ghana and by external actors, in particular the EU and its members states. The EU has breached its respect-bound obligation by promoting exports that deprived Ghanaians of their livelihoods. This promotion was done with the support of 300 million Euros to European tomato exporters, and through export subsidies. Moreover, the EU exerted undue pressure on the Ghanaian government in the EPA negotiations that resulted in the by-passing of the human right to political participation of the stake-holders in Ghana. For poultry exports to Ghana, no active export assistance was provided by the EU. Nevertheless, the EU may have neglected its obligation to protect the right to food of the Ghanaian poultry keepers. Despite numerous complaints about the devastating effects of the cheap exports, the EU did not introduce any effective measures to counteract the export practices of the European companies responsible.

NEW THREATS FROM THE EU AGRICULTURAL REFORM AND *GLOBAL EUROPE*

The FIAN studies on milk farmers in Uganda (2009) and Zambia (2008), have shown that even though there have not been undue increases in imports of milk powder from the EU, there are serious fears that this could change in the future. Up to now, the European milk quota, i.e. the upper limit of production, was already more than ten percent above European consumption. In April 2008, the EU increased this quota by a further 2 percent, and the Commission suggests further increases of one percent per year. In 2015, the quota should then be entirely abolished.

The EU hopes to increase exports for skimmed milk powder, which in the past has often been sold in great quantities on African markets. For the milk farmers in Zambia and Uganda this is grim news. Even the last quota increase of April will raise the volume of milk on the world market by an estimated 0.5 percent. For many dairy farmers in Zambia whose producers'

1 These studies were carried out in the framework of "African smallholders in focus – a voice in EU trade policy", a common project of Germanwatch, FIAN, UK Food Group, Both Ends, see also http://www.fian.org/programs-and-campaigns/projects/african-smallholders-in-focus-a-voice-in-eu-trade-policy

prices are closely oriented to the world market price because of their close connection to the formal sector, this could already have considerable negative effects.

If production increases, according to the calculation of the Commission, the European milk price will fall and European milk products will find their way into the world market even without export subsidies. According to the proposal of the Commission, however, the EU is to retain the liberty to make use of subsidies again if the world market prices fall below the EU-internal prices again. This is despite the fact that the EU, within the framework of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), had already promised a definite end to export subsidies by 2013.

Against the background of the Commission's plans on the structuring of the milk market, the fact that the EPAs restrict freedom to determine trade policy for the protection of the farmers in Uganda und Zambia could have fatal effects in the long term. Since the product lists for the interim agreement are not yet accessible, the exact implications cannot be definitely assessed yet. However, what is clear is that the Standstill Clause included in the agreements, just as in Ghana, prohibits any raising of the tariffs over the current level, even for those products which are rated as being "sensitive". Uganda and Zambia would then no longer be in a position to protect the domestic dairy farmers' right to feed themselves.

The problem is not restricted to dairy farmers, and it is not limited to Africa. The economic partnerships with the ACP states are only the beginning. "Global Europe – Competing in the World" is the title of the EU trade strategy which was presented in October 2006 by the Trade Commissioner, and was waved through by the EU Council without public discussion. This was a decision of far-reaching consequences, as the EU is planning to make new free trade and investment agreements in all regions of the world in accordance with the new strategy. The negotiations have already begun with India, South Korea, the Andean Community, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the countries of Central America. Radical tariff cuts in trade in industrial and agricultural goods are to be one component. However, the EU is, above all, targeting those areas that are high on the agenda of European corporate groups: more protection of intellectual property, easier access to energy and raw materials, the opening up of the service sector and of public procurement, as well as the loosening of investment restrictions abroad. Some of these themes had already been categorically rejected by the countries in the Global South in the WTO negotiations, but they are back again on the EU agenda. According to the International Federation for Human Rights (FIDH) the EU agenda threatens not only the right to food, but also the right to health, a sufficiently high standard of living, education, work and development.

The results of the studies underline that the demand for more market access contained in almost all official strategies to overcome the hunger crisis is highly questionable from the human rights point of view. The lobby work for comprehensive market access announced in the Comprehensive Framework of Action, developed by the High Level Task Force on the Global Food Crisis in 2008, is not acceptable against this background. In particular, the subscribing to certain ideological trade policies must under no circumstances become the condition for receiving international assistance to address hunger.

REFERENCES

Bertow K. und A. Schultheis 2007: *Impact of EU's Agricultural Trade Policy on Smallholders in Africa.* Germanwatch, Both Ends, FIAN & UK Food Group. Bonn 2007.

FIAN International 2008: *Right to Food of Milk and Honey Farmers. Report of an Investigative Mission to Zambia.* Heidelberg 2008.

FIAN International 2009: *Right to Food of Milk and Maize Farmers. Report of an Investigative Mission to Uganda,* Heidelberg 2009.

FIDH 2008: Position Paper. *Human Rights Impact Assessment of Trade and Investment Agreements concluded by the European Union.* Brussels 2008.

Issah M. 2007: *Right to Food of Tomato and Poultry Farmers. Report of an Investigative Mission to Ghana.* FIAN, Send Foundation, Both Ends, Germanwatch & UK Food Group (eds.): Heidelberg 2007.

Paasch, Armin (ed.), Frank Garbers and Thomas Hirsch 2007: *Trade Policies and Hunger. The impact of trade liberalisation on the Right to Food of rice farming communities in Ghana*, Honduras and Indonesia. EAA, Geneva 2007.

Paasch, A. 2008: *Devastating Floods – Man Made. European Trade Policy violates Right to Food in Ghana – Chicken and Tomatoes,* Germanwatch, FIAN, Both Ends and UK Food Group (eds.), Bonn 2008.

UN High Level Task Force on the Global Food Crisis 2008: *Comprehensive Framework of Action*

This text is based on *World agricultural trade and human rights: case studies on violations of the right to food of small farmers*, by Armin Paasch, FIAN, November 2008, available at www.fian.org.

Armin Paasch is responsible for trade and human rights at FIAN Germany. Rolf Künnemann is Human Rights Director at FIAN International Secretariat

Right to Food and Election Manifestoes of the National Parties in India:

A Bird's Eye View by Dr. Neetu Sharma

The Indian democracy was gripped in the election fever from March to May 2009 and the election season for the national legislature of the largest democracy of the world got over with the India National Congress emerging as a single largest party and forming the government in the Centre. Like any other elections in India these elections were also full of promises and pledges by invariably all the political parties, for ensuring social justice, egalitarian society and adequate standard of living for all irrespective of class, caste, gender and identity. Nevertheless, amplified significance being attached to the food security issues is a pleasantly surprising element of the election manifestoes of almost all the national level political parties. It is interesting to have a closer look at the promises made by Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP), Indian National Congress (INC) and the Communist Party of India – Marxist (CPI-M), which are recognised as national parties by the Election Commission of India, and have been in power in past and continue to be in power either in centre and/ or in different states.

The BJP said in its Manifesto that people have the right to food and to ensure its enjoyment it pledged to provide 35 kg of rice or wheat every month to Below Poverty Line families at Rs 2 per kg under an improved and expanded Antyodaya Anna Yojana Scheme[1], which will be available against 'Food Coupons' redeemable at both Public Distribution System (PDS) and private outlets. In order to prevent families from slipping below the poverty line, the party promised to allocate more funds for expanding, universalising and improving the functioning of the PDS and setting up community kitchens in extremely impoverished areas. The party pledged to ensure the security of life by, revitalizing rural development and unorganised and informal sectors, amongst other measures.

CPI-M assured measures targeted at the workers - unorganised, organised, farmers, fishermen etc. In addition to the strengthening of the employment guarantee for these groups by increasing the minimum wages, the party also promised to implement the pro-farmer recommendations of the National Commission for Farmers, waiving of the farmers' loans, increasing the minimum support prices for crops and expansion of irrigation facilities. The Manifesto, in particular, talks about the reintroduction of the universal PDS scheme, abandoning the targeted PDS, which was contentious since its introduction in 1997, and the expansion of *Antyodaya* scheme to cover urban as well as rural poor and include tribal communities as well. Some radical ideas like takeover and redistribution of all surplus land and handing over of cultivable wasteland to landless and poor peasant households, also form part of these promises.

An analysis of the manifestos points towards the concern expressed by all the political parties over the growing number of hungry people in India. However, wide variety of factors have been held responsible for the same, such as unemployment, price rise and inadequacy of the government policies. With a view to addressing the problem of widespread malnutrition, all the parties have vowed to strengthen and expand the scope of existing Mid day Meal Scheme[2], Integrated Child Development Services[3] and the Public Distribution System, creation of ample job opportunities, curb the price rise and various other measures.

What assumes prime importance in the present scenario is the election manifesto of the INC given that the party has recently formed the Union government along with the other allies of United Progressive Alliance. The manifesto, in addition to bragging on the achievements like the enactment of National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) or National Rural Health Mission, "pledges to continue work to ensure a life of security, dignity and prosperity for every citizen, social justice". However, the most striking feature of the manifesto is the National Food Security Act that the government has pledged to introduce within the 100 days of its coming into power. Going by the manifesto of the INC, India will soon see a National Food Security Law that would guarantee access to sufficient food for all people, particularly the most vulnerable sections of society by providing 25 kg of rice or wheat per month at Rs 3 per kg. It also promises "at least 100 days of work at a real wage of Rs 100 a day for everyone as an entitlement under the NREGA".

As the new government assumed office in May 2009, the countdown for introducing the National Food Security Act has begun that will provide a statutory basis for a framework which assures food security for all. All eyes are on the government as the possibilities for establishing a food security regime are abundant given that this legislation is to be used for bringing about systemic reforms in the entire public distribution system and administration of all those welfare schemes that are identified by the Apex Court[4] as the forerunners in the realisation of right to food for the vulnerable. However, the challenge as well as the opportunity for the civil society is to make the most of this momentum and strive hard to make the government enact a law that ensures everyone's right to feed oneself, taking due cognizance of socio-economic disparities, imbalances and vulnerabilities, and not allow it to be trimmed down into another mere welfare scheme.

Dr. Neetu Sharma is part of FIAN Group in Bangalore, India, and presently working as Fellow with Centre for Child and the Law (CCL), National Law School of India University (NLSIU), Bangalore

1 The "Antyodaya Anna Yojana" (AAY), launched in December 2000, contemplates identification of one crore poorest from amongst the Below Poverty Line families covered under the Targeted Public Distribution System within the Indian States and providing them foodgrains at a subsidized rate of Rs.2/ per kg. for wheat and Rs. 3/ per kg for rice.

2 Mid Day Meal Scheme is a flagship school feeding programme of the government wherein all the government and government aided primary school children are provided with cooked lunch

3 Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS) is a major national programme that addresses the health and nutrition needs of children under the age of six. It seeks to provide young children with an integrated package of services, including supplementary nutrition, health care and pre-school education.

4 For example – Mid Day Meal Scheme, ICDS, Old Age Pension, National Maternity Benefit Scheme, National Family Benefit Scheme, AAY and Annapoorna.

HIV/AIDS and Children's Right to Food *by Ida-Eline Engh*

The HIV epidemic impacts on children's right to adequate food and nutrition whether they are infected or in other ways affected by HIV. Article 27 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) points to the right of every child to a standard of living that is "adequate for his or her physical, mental, spiritual, moral and social development". More specifically, it provides that State Parties "shall take appropriate measures to assist parents and others responsible for the child to implement this right and shall in case of need provide material assistance and support programmes, particularly with regard to nutrition, clothing and housing".

The CRC reflects Article 11 of the ICESCR, which refers to food as an aspect of the right to an adequate standard of living. However, the CRC, in contrast to the ICESCR, points to the importance of *nutrition*, which goes beyond the concept of food as it also incorporates health and care. All three dimensions are crucial when considering children's right to adequate food and nutrition in the context of HIV/AIDS.

WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS OF HIV AND AIDS FOR CHILDREN'S RIGHT TO FOOD?

HIV-infected children may need a 50-100% increase in calories[1], thus the implications of the right to adequate food and nutrition of an HIV-infected child differs from that of a healthy child. As their parents fall ill or die children's right to adequate food and nutrition is jeopardised in a number of ways. To cover AIDS-related costs, affected households are often required to reduce spending on items such as food and children's education.[2]

The impact of HIV-infection is often magnified in conditions of poverty and food insecurity. For example, the financial burden associated with HIV for the poorest households in India represents 82% of annual income, while the comparable burden for wealthy families is about 20%.[3]

Children drop out of school in order to care for their ill parents or to run entire households. The death of a parent does not necessarily lead to children's direct loss of land but it may undermine security in access to land and food.[4] Many households adapt to a decreasing labour force by reducing cultivation of labour intensive crops, which may lead to limited biodiversity and lack of an adequate diet.[5]

Knowledge transfer from one generation to another about preparing food and tilling land is disrupted, as the father or mother dies and is unable to pass the knowledge on to their sons and daughters. In addition to their increasing responsibilities and physical efforts, children and young adults also risk not receiving the care and support that they need to grow and thrive. A study of 100 households in rural Ethiopia found that women spent around 100 hours per week nursing the sick, time which was largely found by spending less time caring for their children and working on their farms.[6]

Furthermore, the risk of HIV infection increases in households and communities where there are limited ways out of poverty and food insecurity and where children lack protection from sexual abuse and exploitation.

CAN REALISATION OF THE RIGHT TO FOOD PREVENT HIV AND MITIGATE IMPACTS OF AIDS AMONGST CHILDREN?

The Right to Food Guidelines explicitly recognise the potential of the right to food in fighting the epidemic. Guideline 10 stipulates that "States should address the specific food and nutritional needs of people living with HIV/AIDS or suffering from other epidemics".[7]

Nutrition is vital in counteracting the effects of AIDS. However, the disease cannot be cured by a good diet. Access to antiretroviral (ARV) therapy is crucial, to prolong the lives of those who are infected and even save the lives of their children: A study from Uganda found an 81% reduction in child mortality among *uninfected* children of adults receiving ARV therapy, as well as an estimated 93% reduction in orphanhood.[8]

General Comment No.3 by the Committee on the Rights of the Child states that "it is now widely recognised that comprehensive treatment and care includes anti-retroviral and other drugs […], good nutrition […], as well as family, community and home-based care".[9] This paragraph underscores the interdependence of the rights to food, health and care.

A human rights based approach to food, health and care addresses the particular access problems faced by children and their families. It is a useful tool to indentify the roles and obligations of states in efforts to decrease children's vulnerability to HIV and AIDS.

The right to adequate food and nutrition points to the underlying socio-economic structures that increase the vulnerability of children and their families to HIV-infection and reduce their ability to mitigate impacts of AIDS. Power relations, from household to global levels, which create marginalisation and undermine participation, are key to the understanding and elimination of poverty and food insecurity, HIV and AIDS amongst children and their families.

Ida-Eline Engh is a board member of FIAN Norway and FIAN International and works for Plan Norway. This article is partly based on her doctoral research published by Intersentia in 2008: "Developing Capacity to Realise Socio-Economic Rights. The right to food in the context of HIV/AIDS in South Africa and Uganda".

1 WHO (2003): Nutrient requirements for people living with HIV/AIDS: Report of a technical consultation. Geneva.

2 UNAIDS (2008): Report on the Global AIDS Epidemic. Geneva.

3 Asia Development Bank & UNAIDS (2004): Asia-Pacific's Opportunity: Investing to Avert an HIV/AIDS Crisis. ADB/UNADS Study Series.

4 See e.g. M. Aliber et al. (2004): The impact of HIV/AIDS on land rights: Case studies from Kenya. HSRC & FAO, Rome.

5 See e.g. FAO (2006): Mainstreaming HIV and AIDS into FAO programmes. Process, achievements, challenges. Rome.

6 A. Baryoh, cited in C. Bishop-Sambrook (2004): The Challenge of the HIV/AIDS Epidemic in Rural Ethiopia: Averting the Crisis in Low AIDS-Impacted Communities. FAO, Rome.

7 FAO (2004): The Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realisation of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security. Rome. Guideline 10.4.

8 J. Mermin et al. (2008): Mortality in HIV-infected Ugandan adults receiving antiretroviral treatment and survival of their HIV-uninfected children. The Lancet March 1, 371 (9614), pp.752-759.

9 Committee on the Rights of the Child (2003): HIV/AIDS and the rights of the child. General Comment No.3. Para. 28.

Fair Flowers – With Flowers for Human Rights *by Gertrud Falk*

FIAN Germany has been coordinating the so-called flower campaign for 18 years – a campaign not for the sake of flowers, but for the implementation of workers' rights on flower plantations. The campaign has achieved a lot, including the creation of an international code of conduct and of an association which certifies flower companies following this conduct. Therefore, working conditions for approximately 30.000 workers have strongly improved. The campaign contributes to the implementation of Human Rights through voluntary standards.

FLOWER PRODUCTION AS A MOTOR FOR DEVELOPMENT?

The World Bank discovered the export-oriented flower production as a motor for development in the countries close to the Equator in the 1980's, because countries such as Kenya or Ecuador have the appropriate climatic conditions, and the industrial production of cut flowers needs many workers that can easily be found in those countries. Between 10 and 13 workers, mainly women, per hectare are employed in the companies. The World Bank asked its borrowers to present attractive offers to the sector and allocated investment credits in the millions for the construction of flower plantations. Colombia, Ecuador and Kenya were the first countries to accept, followed by other South-American, West-African and East-African countries.

However, the World Bank did not demand from those states to ensure that the flower plantations abide by the Conventions of the International Labor Organization and take action to protect the environment. As a result, the workers of this internationally promoted industry belong to the *Working Poor* and often have to bear inhuman conditions.

THE BEGINNING OF THE FLOWER CAMPAIGN

In 1990, Colombian workers turned to NGOs from those countries where the flowers are exported to. They asked for support in the fight for internationally recognized workers' rights. Their salaries were so low that they were not able feed themselves and their families adequately. In Germany, the request was picked up mainly by *Bread for the World, terre des hommes,* and FIAN. The NGOs invited Colombian flower workers to hold a lecture tour in Germany.

Among other things, the workers reported on discrimination in trade union activities; un-paid overtime; acute and long-term health problems because of the highly poisonous pesticides sprayed in the greenhouses; low salaries, that are not sufficient to fulfill the basic needs of a family.

BOYCOTT?

As a reaction to this, the question of a boycott of imported flowers was raised quickly. However, this is not the workers' interest. "As bad as our working conditions might be, we need our job in order to obtain at least some income," they say uniformly. "Please, support us in the improvement of our working conditions and in the implementation of our rights." After the lecture tour, the three NGOs decided to start a campaign on this topic, following a strategy with four pillars: a) to inform people about the violation of working rights and environment pollution through the flower industry; b) to ask the flower importers to mind that their suppliers do not exploit the workers; c) to organize letter campaigns in severe cases of workers' rights violations; and d) to build an international network of NGOs and trade unions that promote the flower workers' rights.

THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF CONDUCT

Together with this international network, the flower campaign established in 1998 the International Code of Conduct for a socially and environmentally responsible flower production (ICC). The ICC was the first code in the branch to contain social and environmental standards. It is mainly based on the conventions of the International Labor Organization, both Human Rights Covenants and the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development. It prohibits the use of pesticides categorized as highly poisonous by the World Health Organization (WHO) and as carcinogenic by the US- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The ICC includes the following topics: freedom of association; prohibition of discrimination; salaries that ensure an adequate living; regular work hours; health and safety at the workplace; pesticides and chemicals; security of employment; environmental protection; prohibition of exploiting child labor and prohibition of forced labor.

THE FLOWER LABEL PROGRAM

After a successful pilot project for the realization of the ICC in Zimbabwe, and a failed demand towards the Fair Trade to take over the code, the Flower Label Program (FLP) was founded in 1999 (www.fairflowers.de). FLP certificates flower farms based on the ICC and, at the same time, is a consumer seal. In the last 10 years, the organization has certified approximately 80 flower plantations in Africa and Latin-America and has therefore measurably contributed to the implementation of human rights. Workers consistently report the improvement of their working conditions through the certification. Among other measures, all companies have to have a workers' representation; have to employ a minimum of 90 percent of the total workers as permanent; have to grant a three month paid maternity leave; have to protect the workers sufficiently against pesticides.

FAIR FLOWERS – FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

Since the beginning of 2009, the flower campaign has created a broader network within Europe. Together with FIAN Austria and FIAN Belgium, as well as three other partner organizations in Belgium, Germany and the Czech Republic, the campaign aims to promote a further breakthrough of the ICC in the flower production. Together, we want to inform consumers, florists and public procurement officers about the violation of human rights in the flower industry, and convince them of the existing alternatives to conventionally produced flowers. Eventually, everyone can contribute to the respect of human rights in the flower industry by purchasing fair flowers.

More information at www.flowers-for-human-rights.org

Gertrud Falk is Coordinator of the Flower Campaign at FIAN Germany

People's framework to eradicate hunger *by Sofía Monsalve Suárez*

Most of international institution's and government's plans to reduce or eliminate hunger have been developed with little or no involvement of social movements, peasants, fisherfolks, pastoralists, indigenous peoples, and people who are suffering from hunger and malnutrition. Recent example is the Comprehensive Framework for Action by the High-Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis.

The International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty IPC (www.foodsovereignty.org) has embarked upon developing a people's comprehensive framework to eradicate hunger and realize the right to food, which will be elaborated by a committee made up mostly of social movement representatives, and will be presented to governments, international and national institutions and organizations. The framework is based on the concept of food sovereignty, which since World Food Summit 1996 has been the most important political framework for many social movements and NGO's working with agriculture, fisheries, food and related issues. Actions and concrete policy proposals to end hunger and support sustainable food production have been developed, amongst others, at the CSO/NGO parallel conferences to World Food Summits in 1996, 2002 and 2008 and the Nyéléni International Forum for Food Sovereignty (www.nyeleni2007.org).

Sofía Monsalve Suárez is Coordinator of the Program Access to Land and Natural Resources at FIAN International Secretariat

Conference on Extraterritorial Obligations *by Rolf Künnemann*

There have been two main conceptual short comings since the codification of human rights in international law in the 1960s. Firstly, the split into civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural rights. Secondly, the "territorialisation" of human rights which pretends that states' obligations are limited to their own territories.

The split will only start healing once the last year adopted Optional Protocol to the ICESCR will enter in force. The territorialisation will need the mainstreaming of extraterritorial obligations (ETOs), and the establishment of a set of principles – aims pursued by the ETO-Consortium, a global network of human rights NGOs, members of academia and university institutes.

On September 9-11, 2009, the University of Lancaster, UK, hosts an International Conference on Extraterritorial Obligations in Relation to Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. In this first public international conference on the subject after two years of internal work, the ETO Consortium will present its conceptual and case work, invite feedback and suggestions from a wider audience, and eventually produce a comprehensive report on ETO related issues and policy fields such as jurisdiction and IGOs, investment and trade, regulation of TNCs, and development.

Rolf Künnemann is Coordinator of the Program on Extraterritorial State Obligations at FIAN International Secretariat

Right to access to sufficient water

by Jackie Dugard and Sandra Liebenberg

On 25 March 2009, the South African Supreme Court of Appeal (SCA) handed down judgment in the Mazibuko case. The case was an appeal against the judgment of the Johannesburg High Court of 30 April 2008, concerning the sufficiency of the City of Johannesburg's free basic water policy and the lawfulness of prepayment water meters.

Prior to 2000, the residents of Phiri, a township of Johannesburg, were supplied water as deemed consumption system in which each household was required to pay for 20 kilolitres per month regardless the actual quantity of water consumed. In 2002, the City of Johannesburg experienced a financial crisis due to the poor water infrastructure. However, on the basis of its policy and regulations the City is obliged to provide minimum quantity of potable water of 25 litres per person per day of 6 kilolitres per household per month. The City and Johannesburg Water Ltd agreed to install prepayment meters throughout Soweto; Phiri was the first pilot site to be affected. Prepayment meters have automatic disconnection and once the 6 kilolitres have been consumed, the water supply to the stand is automatically cut-off.

Upon reference to international and foreign jurisprudence as well as expert evidence, the High Court ordered the City to supply the applicants with free basic water of 50 litres per person per day and to give them choice on prepayment meters. The City appealed to the SCA which ordered the City to legalise its policy and provide the amount of 42 litres per person per day to the residents of Phiri.

Among other juridical references, the SCA applied ICESCR which impliedly recognises the right to water by imposing the right to adequate standard of living including right to food, clothing and housing (art. 11 para 1) as well as right to health (art. 12). The right to water is also related to life and human dignity in which the provisions under the ICCPR are clearly provided for (art. 6, 10). General Comment 15 details that the right to water entails quality, availability and accessibility particularly to the marginalised people given the fact that water is indispensable for dignified life.

Despite promising aspects, the judgment ultimately fails to provide normative clarity in interpreting the right of access to sufficient water and the nature of the obligations it imposes on water services providers. It also falls short of its stated intention to provide an effective remedy for the constitutional infringements caused by free basic water supply and the use of prepayment meters.

This summary is based on an article in ESR Review: http://www.communitylawcentre.org.za/Socio-Economic-Rights/esr-review/esr-previous-editions/esr-reviewn-vol-10-2-july-2009.pdf

Jackie Dugard is a senior researcher at the Centre for Applied Legal Studies, University of the Witwatersrand. She is part of the legal team that has been representing the Phiri residents since 2004. Sandra Liebenberg is a law professor and H F Oppenheimer Chair of Human Rights Law, University of Stellenbosch.

PUBLICATIONS

Right to Food and Nutrition Watch 2009

Launched in 2008, the Right to Food and Nutrition Watch is the first periodical publication that undertakes an international review and monitoring of states' actions and omissions related to the realisation of the right to food. The 2009 issue published jointly by Bread for the World, ICCO and FIAN International, focuses on the question 'Who Controls the Governance of the World Food System'. The volume discusses the reasons why the present world food system has proven unsuccessful in eradicating hunger and severe malnutrition, and presents concrete proposals by civil society, social movements and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food on how a new governance system can be shaped within the right to food framework.
To be published in September 2009, 80 pages, English, French and Spanish, download at www.fian.org

Voluntary guidelines for good governance in land and natural resource tenure

Civil Society Perspectives on the FAO initiative of adopting international guidelines on land and natural resource tenure.
FIAN /Hakijamii (Economic and Social Rights Centre), June 2009, 70 pages, English, download at www.fian.org

Monocultures and Human Rights

Guide for documenting violations of the right to adequate food and housing, to water, to land, and territory related to monocultures for industrial agriculture production.
FIAN and HIC Latin America, June 2009, 42 pages, English and Spanish. Download at www.fian.org

Shadow Report Brazil

Report of Brazil's fulfilment of the International Covenant of the Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.
May 2009, 368 pages, English and Portuguese.
Download at www.fian.org

The Right to Food of Milk and Maize Farmers in Uganda

Report on the findings of an investigative mission in April 2008 on the impact of agricultural trade policies of the EU on the right to food of small holder farmers in Uganda
FIAN International/ CONSENT (Consumer Education Trust), April 2009, 39 pages, English.
Download at www.fian.org

Report of the 2nd Conference of the Consortium on Extraterritorial States' Obligations

Report on case and conceptual work done by the Consortium since its first meeting in November 2007.
FIAN International/ Brot für die Welt/ ICCO, November 2008, 36 pages, English.
Download at www.fian.org

How to Promote the Justiciability of the Right to Food

A multidimensional strategic proposal on the justiciability and exigibility of human rights.
FIAN International, November 2008, 16 pages, English and Spanish.
Download at www.fian.org

IMPRINT

Right to Food Quarterly – Vol.4 No. 1, 2009

Editors: Wilma Strothenke
Design and Layout: Ian Davidson

Published by FIAN International, August 2009

Produced with financial assistance of the European Commission (EC) The views expressed herein are those of FIAN and not of the EC.

FIAN International
P.O. Box 102243
69012 Heidelberg
Germany
Tel: +49-6221-6530030
Fax: +49-6221-830545
www.fian.org

CONTACT

If you have any comments, queries or wish to subscribe to the Right to Food Quarterly, please contact the editor at **strothenke@fian.org**

FIAN International is the international human rights organization that advocates the realization of the right to food. We are a non-political, non-for-profit organization with sections and members in more than 50 countries. We expose violations of people's right to food and strive to secure access to the resources that people need in order to feed themselves now and in the future. We envision a world free from hunger, in which every man, woman and child can fully enjoy their human rights in dignity.