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1. Introduction

Since the World Food Summit +5 in Rome in 2002 the German Commission for Justice and Peace has a long term commitment on the implementation of the Right to Food. Especially the negotiations of the Doha- Round of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the role European Union (EU)- Agricultural Policies in the world market focussed the discussion on uniqueness of the agricultural market in regard to human rights issues.¹

For the last 10 years Justice and Peace engaged in a dialogue on aspects as rights- based approach, world market mechanisms and small holder suitable sustainable production. The objective was and is to bridge gaps between farmers’ organisations and development actors and provide dialogue platforms for stakeholders in agricultural production, processing and trading. Guiding principles for this dialogue are the right to food and the right to decent work. The dialogue includes agricultural producers, processor, retailers and addresses decision makers in politics and economics. It is directed towards advocating for regulatory frameworks in national contexts which will improve the situation of small holders, family farmers and the agricultural labourers.

In order to qualify this dialogue it is advisable and necessary to strengthen the networking of civil society of North and South and to raise awareness of the possibilities given by the political and programatic approaches of the EU to countries with low food security and high informal work.

Hence from 12. to 14th November 2014 a four person delegation from Republic of South Africa, Uganda, Zambia and Germany visited Brussels and engaged in a dialogue with the European Commission, DG AGRI (General Directorate Agriculture) and DEVCO (General Directorate Development) and other Brussels based organisations.

1.1 Concrete Background

Several steps led to the program in Brussels. Starting from dialogue with partners on principles of rights based, participatory development cooperation in 2005 the concerns on food security and energy supply as contribution to the right to food were identified with Exposure programs and conferences in Uganda and Zambia in 2009.² In 2011 the entrepreneurial Potential of small scale farming led to debate on the relevance of social standards and the right to decent work in rural areas.

In particular the conference ‘Sweet Fruits-good for everyone?’ in Berlin, January 16th, 2014 was an entry point into an expert dialogue on the nexus of the Right to Food and the Right to Decent Work.³ Long- standing partners of the German Commission for Justice and Peace

and its members focussed their exchange on the potential of agriculture and agricultural value chains for rural development and poverty reduction.

This conference elaborated the importance of the EU and its institutions for coherent agricultural and development politics. It also helped to identify the fields of involvement needed of Southern Non Government organisations (NGO) and think tanks in order to improve ownership and awareness of development politicians and actors.

In Dr. Leonard Mizzi, Head of Unit African, Caribean, Pacific Countries (ACP), G7/8, African Union (AU) in DG AGRI, who took part in the conference, the idea of mutual capacity building by dialogue was taken up and implemented. The German Commission for Justice and Peace with Dr Hildegard Hagemann was able to co-organise and finance the program for the participating partners.

Participants of the Program were Mrs Angela Mwape Mulenga, Right to Food Network, Zambia, Mrs Lali Naidoo, East Cape Agricultural Research Project (ECARP), Republic South Africa (RSA) and Mr Denis Kabiito, Caritas Kasanaensis, Uganda. The program in Brussels was combined with several activities in regard to the Right to Food, e.g. an expert conference on the occasion of the 10 year existence of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food (VGRtF) of the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). These guidelines were adapted in 2004 and a result of the World Food Summit +5 in Rome 2002.

1.2 Expectations

The program stated with the formulation of expectations on the dialogue. Those cover the field of

- Coherence in EU Politics
  - in regard to the implementation of the European Common Agricultural policy (CAP)
  - in regard to state of play of Policy for Coherence for Development (PCD)
  - in regard to response to peoples needs.

- How to bridge the gap between agrobusiness and small scale farmers
  - private sector involvement
  - enhancing social standards (Corporate Social Responsibility)
  - power balance (who sets the trends for policies/programmes?)

EU agricultural policy and programs methodolgy evidence based, empowerment aspects, European Development Fund (EDF) - accessibility for grassroots organisations small scale enterprises/Farms and civil society.

- Human rights approach embedded in program/policies of EU, Fair trade, ethical agriculture
2. Exchange with African Experts on EU Development Politics, Human Rights Based Approach and Informal Labour Issues

2.1 Europe’s Agriculture Policy – Past, Present and Future

Presentation by Mr John Mc Clintock, Planning and Programming Officer, DG AGRI

The first session of the day was about the European Common Agriculture Policy (CAP). It came in handy to address the participants questions that were raised in the participants expectation session. The questions of concern here were:

- Are EU policies/ programmes responding to the peoples needs?
- Is there a coherence between the EU policies? How CAP is implemented?

Mr John Mc Clintock, (we should say a very didacti c man), gave a good background of the origin of CAP. He pointed out the following points:

- There is a universal problem of agriculture if there is a free market (volatility of prices). It originates from biblical times in Genesis, when there were seven years of plenty and seven years of want.
- Mother nature generates that universal problem and therefore, “it should be noted that good harvests dont necessarily reciprocate into good revenues/ incomes”, staed Mr Mc Clintock.
- A free market, not controlled by government, is determined by the auspices of supply and demand.

It was as a result of bankruptcy, destitution and want for both producers mainly and consumers that the common agric policy was established (1930s) to salvage the situation. The treaty, signed by the ministries of Agriculture of EU, was written to meet the farmers needs (not to be bankrupt) and also cater for consumers by ensuring that food is affordable and available.

Mr Mc Clintock stressed that :” the task of the EU comission is to ensure that the market prices does not go below the floor price but can be allowed to fluctuate accordingly”. Therefore the role of EU is to have a managed market. In a managed market, both the farmer's and the consumer's needs are met. Farmers concern is that of low prices, thereby EU purchases produce from them and hence increase demand. this caters for the farmers. If the demand is high, and prices are exhorbitant, then EU puts the produce back on market but at a floor price to cater for demand therby addressing the consumer's needs.

This explanation therefore revealed to the delegation, why there was a revolution in the farming system in Europe and one area our African governments can pick a leaf in addressing the food insecurity status in most of our countries and also take the opportunity that is there for them of having over 42% of global arable land in Africa. This can be an impetus for finding food for the 9 billion people by 2050. Policies like the Maputo declaration
and the CAADP (Common African Agricultural Development Program), can utilise some aspects of CAP is necessary to revolutionalise agriculture in Africa.

Mr Mc Clintock further said that, much as there was a revolution in European farming systems especially because of the managed market in the 1960’s where farming became profitable and there was vast investment on farms to be more productive, it was not a bed of roses even till now. ‘There are bottlenecks in the CAP that the EU has to often address as they come with re-adjustments and reviews in order to suit the consumers needs and farmers needs too’ says John. Issues like surplus production were met by lowering the floor price but came with the pinch of compensating farmers by establishing direct payment schemes for sustainability reasons. This direct payment is conditional in that the aspects of environmental protection, consumer safety are incorporated in the rules to be signed by the beneficiary.

Therefore, in the 1960’s an increasingly complex system of quotas and support prices was set up. This system led to the infamous bumper harvest/surplus production in the 1980s, with farmers being paid to produce crops for which there was no market and which were then bought up for intervention storage and later sale at (lower) global market prices.

Prior to 1980’s, the 1970s was characterized by a revolution in farming from manual to mechanical as farmers saw the profitability of farming hence the need to produce more and reduce on farm labour costs.

The presentation then highlighted that, despite originally a system of direct production subsidies and export subsidies, the EU could not cope with over production/surplus hence the introduction of the CAP which has been transformed since the early 1990s into one where farmers are given direct payments not tied to production. Furthermore environmental conditions are also attached to farmers for them to receive direct payment such as Food hygiene, environmental issues and biodiversity. Other includes rural fund development which is not so important to farmers. The objectives of the CAP as discussed in the presentation are as follows;

- To stabilize markets.
- To secure availability of supplies.
- To provide consumers with food at reasonable prices.
- To increase productivity, by promoting technical progress and ensuring the optimum use of the factors of production, in particular labour.
- To ensure a fair standard of living for the agricultural Community

Conclusively, the session provided the delegation with an insight of how the CAP is implemented, who sets the trend for policy change (power balance) and majorly how the policy responds to the needs of people.
2.2 Outcomes of the Presentation and Discussion

- CAP has no developmental concerns towards African farmers as they cannot compete with EU subsided products. CAP reform reflect its impact globally and on development objectives. Hence the request by African Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) calls for the CAP to wider have a wider Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) agenda, to take development objectives into consideration in wider EU policy.
- The need for a monitoring mechanism for the effects of the CAP on developing countries, with objectives for process and results enshrined in the legal text of the CAP. This should also have some human rights based considerations.
- Labour and social standards are not considered in EU agriculture policy
- EU committed to ensuring development of Agriculture in African through its development support towards Agriculture development, however, trickle down effects are not monitored.

2.3 CAP External Dimensions: ACP and Development Issues,

*Presentation by Dr Leonard Mizzi, Head of Unit ACP, G8, AU, DG AGRI*

Dr Mizzi provided a comprehensive overview of the revised Common Agriculture Programme (See attachment for details). Certain measures have been put in place to protect commodities and goods produced by countries from unfair appropriation and patenting. This is referred to “geographical identification”.

Questions were raised about the overall benefits for small-scale farmers and producers and for workers employed on commercial farms and on plantations. This observation gains significance against the implementation of the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) which are set to come into effect in 2016. While Dr Mizzi stressed the role of civil society in assessing the impact, monitoring the trends of its impact on small-scale farmers and the need to identify concerns and constrains, the delegation remained unconvinced that there would be wide spread benefit for rural social groupings at the bottom end of the value chain. Specific vulnerable groups such as small-scale-farmers and farm workers and dwellers will be further marginalised by the EPAs. This is largely due to the fact that well-resourced and large-scale farmers and commercial ventures connected to the global food production system will continue to dominate farming and will entrench their power further. A good example is the case of South African farmers taking over land and agricultural production on the African Continent. By doing so, these farmers are not only embedding themselves firmly in South Africa but also in other African states. Hence local small-scale farmers face a real danger and threat to continue with farming at any level.

One potential area where issues of impact and trends with EPAs is the Horizon 2000 a research agenda that encourages civil society participation jointly with farmers on the ground. However, this will be effected through calls for proposal form the European Union
and will favour research that is pitched at regional level and that which is undertaken with collaboration in academic institutions.

The overall impressions of this revised programme are its highly technical thrust where the focus is on trade and "geographical identification". The EPAs and the external dimension of CAP will be implemented in contexts where power relations have not shifted in favour of the small-scale farmers and for agricultural workers. In this sense, important considerations such as fair labour standards, living wages, rights to organise and democratic value chains that enable inclusive participation of small producers are absent both in content and in implementation. This raises questions about how a human rights approach will be implemented and institutionalised with the EPAs. Moreover, it raises questions about the indicators used to measure and assess progress towards strengthening human rights and the associated monitoring mechanisms.

Civil society in Africa and in the North will have to engage in earnest with the EPAs to determine how best to support and strengthen the most vulnerable in the agrarian political economy. Dr Msisi offered to hold seminars, workshops and discussions on the details of the EPAs in respective countries with civil society and trade officials. However, the delegation noted that in many instances governments are unresponsive to civil society and power dynamics often act against transparent discussions enacted in good faith.

The limitations with the isolated way in which the DG AGRI operates in that it does not integrate critical issues of social standards and power relations was stressed by the delegation. This isolated methodology could potentially result in an even more unsustainable and unequal global agricultural system.

### 2.4 International Year of Family Farming and Policy Framework for Investment in Agriculture

*Presentation by Mr Jules Seitz, International Relations Officer, DG AGRI*

2014 International Year of Family Farming (IYFF) aims to raise the profile of family farming and small holder farmings by focusing world attention on its significant role in the fight for eradication of hunger and poverty, providing food security and nutrition, improving livelihoods, managing natural resources, protecting the environment, and achieving sustainable development, in particular for the rural areas.*,, www.fao.org/family-farming-2014.*

Mr Jules Seitz, briefed the delegation about the IYFF and what has been done in the context of the EU. He pointed out that this year existed because of civil society efforts or advocacy work in FAO and UN as a whole. As The DG AGRI, they participated in several events especially:

- In the coordination committee for IYFF
- International dialogues marking the IYFF
He informed the delegation that the major initiatives seen from all this was that it provided a knowledge platform for family farmers and also to work on the definition of family farming (FF). The definition of family farms was a contentious issue since it was not universally approved and many questioned the essence of spending money on a special committee to come up with a proper policy paper on it.

The current definitions of a family farm is that: a family farm is any agriculture unit (be it forestry, fisheries, pastoralism, etc) owned and managed by a family.

Family farms have labour mainly dominated by the household members. They are often small holder farming units and have the family at the centre in aspects of; planning, decision making and implementation. Family farms have networks predominately at community level.

The discussion from the delegation revealed that the question should not be about the size but on how best farmers can be supported to be profitable and dignified professionals. It was further noted that the IYFF had little awareness in the South since many events to mark it were just ceremonial or mentioned through other national / institutional events.

2.5 The Post 2015 Agenda at the EU

Presentation by Martin Woolhead, DG AGRI

Special attention is given to the issue for financing for development in the context of MDG and now also the Post 2015 agenda. Efforts of the EC are taken to make the SDG Agenda more communicable and suggest bold and concrete steps for implementation. The Council works on a discussion paper and conclusion. The EP reports on their priorities. As predictable the priorities are heterogeneous. EUROSTAT works on a more precise data base to come up with strong and valuable indicators.

3. Learning from our Practice: How to Engage with Agricultural Private Sector in ACP Countries, DG DEVCO

Presentation by Mr Guy Stinglhamber, Délégué Général, COLEACP, Mr Regis Meritan, Head of Sector Europaid Mr Jeremy Knops, Director of Operations, PIP

3.1 Lessons from COLEACP

COLEACP was an association of European and ACP businesses that promotes sustainable agriculture. It was created in 1973 by key players in the international fruit and vegetable trade, the Europe-Africa-Caribbean-Pacific Liaison Committee (COLEACP) supports the agricultural sectors of developing countries.
The organization is membership driven with its activities aimed at capacity building of ACP farmers and entrepreneurs (Small and Medium Enterprises - SMEs) in the fruit and vegetable sub-sector. The activities of COLEACP aimed at empowering ACP SMEs in the fruit and vegetable sector include among others the following; market intelligence, business development support, quality and standards assistance, training i.e skills capacity building, research and development, information and communication and advocacy to defend the interest of the food chains suppliers in the ACP countries.

A case example was made of COLEACP work in Africa where empowering farmers to be recognized as competitive suppliers in sustainable value chains is a priority and contributing to setting up of business models in order to safeguard the position and living standards of thousands of small scale farmers in Africa and throughout the entire horticulture industry. For example COLEACP has assisted a women SME in Kenya to set up quality control and traceability system to enable her to export to the EU. Similar assistance has been provided for the implementation of the global GAP in Madagascar for increased market access to the EU market.

3.2 Outcomes of the Presentation and Discussion

- The work being implemented by COLEACP is commendable but lacked a focus to assist small scale farmers but on commercial farmers. COLEACP operates mostly through national farmers' unions which are most dominated by commercial farmers in most African countries.
- Popularization of COLEACP work in Africa needed to be feasible among small scale farmer organizations who are so much in need of competitive capacity building.
- It also became evident that the EU believes that the private sector is a critical facilitator of economic growth through higher productivity and knowledge transfer. Private firms and entrepreneurs invest in new ideas and new production facilities. Higher private investment is associated with faster-growing economies. what is being misunderstood is that millions and millions of farmers in Africa are small scale based.

4. Exchange with European Agricultural Institutions

The second day was meant to meet with representatives of EU programs, agricultural organisations and institutions working along with DG AGRI and DG DEVCO engaging with partners in African countries.
4.1 Support to Farmers’ Organizations in Africa Programme (SFOAP)

*Presentation by Ms Danila Chiaro, Europaid Officer, ACP Regional programme*

With the first presentation the delegation was introduced to the specific programs of SFOAP. The present program runs from 2013 to 2017. The former Food Security Program does not exist anymore. In the regions with Forum of Agricultural Research in Africa. They focus on advisory services, extension services linking farmers to agricultural special organisations in regard to crops. Farmers’ organisations are represented in the research organisations. The principles of the work are flexibility, economic solidarity and subsidiarity reaching out to grass-root level. However, according to Ms Chiaro, it is too early to have an overview on its impact.

4.2 COPA COGECA Communication Activities in the International Year of Family Farming and Relation with African Partners

*Presentation by Ms Amanda Cheesley, Press Officer*

In the second presentation of the day, the press officer for COPA (Association for European farmers organisations) and COGECA (association for European Cooperatives) informed the delegation about some of the key activities COPA COGECA participated in to mark IYFF.

In her background, she informed members that there are 13 million family farmers and 38,000 cooperatives in Europe and that COPA-COGECA is there to defend the interest of farmers in EU. IYFF, she stated, was to raise profile of family farms and cooperatives, highlight their roles in food security and environmental resilience. Therefore as COPA-COGECA they had numerous press events, dialogues and exhibitions like in Budapest, Brussels and France to mark it and also to present their policy position on the aspect of Family farms. African farmer organisations participated in some of these events to bring to the world the plight of family farms from the south.

4.3 Fighting Farmers’ Poverty Programme

*Presentation by Ms Laura Jalasjoki, AGRICORD*

Here the work is supported by farmers’ organisations in Europe. The German DBV is an associated member, without membership fee but participating in general assemblies. Funds from Germany would be highly welcome and are asked for. The Fighting Farmers’ Poverty is a sister program to the SFOAP.
4.4 Sustainable Agriculture Development Approach in the European Commission

Presentation by Mr Roberto Aparicio, Europaid Officer

Per definition the sustainability concept brings together food, fuel and fibre. Guiding document for the EU approach to sustainable agricultural development approach is according to Roberto Aparicio the EU Agenda for Change. In Sub Sahara Africa (SSA) food production should be doubled in the next 30 years. However, due to climate change less production is expected. The EU is aware of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food, the Voluntary Guidelines on responsible land tenure (VGGT), Principles for responsible agricultural Investment (RAI-Principles). Due to time constrains discussion could not engage enough on the issue of social security, social dialogue, labor rights and their relevance to sustainable agricultural systems.

5. Social Dinner at COMECE

The delegation had a social dinner at the Commission of the Bishop’s Conference of the European Community (COMECE). The team was welcomed by Fr Patrick Daly; General Secretary and Anna Echterhoff, desk officer of COMECE, Prof. Dr. Ingeborg Gabriel, Vice-President and Stefan Lunte, General Secretary of the European Conference of Justice and Peace Commissions, and Jorge Nunyo Meyer Of Caritas Europe. The dinner was meant for further networking with other Brussels based church organisations like CIDSE, FIMARC represented by Rony Joseph and George Dixon and JOCI, represented by Andy Predicala.

The delegation came to know more about the positioning of this office at the heart of the EU, in Brussels. The Catholic Bishops of Europe are benevolently involved / affected by the EU policy framework. "Therefore there is desire to work together and have a positive relationship” said Fr Patrick.

The Catholic Bishops have a particular interest in European projects since:

- They participate in Democratic ownership of EU policies
- Come up with press release/ analysis of Eu policies

This keen interest emanates from the fact that COMECE has a big constituency to serve and to look out for their interest, that is the Catholic church. Its therefore prudent to take the whole EU policy framework and have it in the context of the compassionate heart of the church/social teaching of the church.
6. International Labour Organisation (ILO)

Discussion with Claire Courteille the Director of the ILO

The representative from the International Trade Union (ITU) cancelled her participation at the meeting due to another engagement. The delegation met with Claire Courteille who is the Director of the ILO in Brussels. Ms Courteille presented a summary of development in Brussels with specific reference to the European Union. She related the tensions with the EU and the general state of flux with respect to the common vision within EU politics. The economic recessions and austerity measures are fuelling tensions and raising questions about members’ sovereignty. In this context critical issues around migrant workers, small-scale farmers and farm workers become even more urgent to address. The ILO is committed to engaging the European Union on the right to food for all sections of society and especially the most marginalised and vulnerable such as farm workers and small-scale farmers.

The rise and expansion of poor working conditions for migrant workers in Europe and especially Germany was discussed. Similarities with workers’ poor working conditions in the food productive systems between Germany and Global South countries were identified. It will be important and useful for the ILO in Brussels to have access to research and case-studies on these developments and trends. The ILO often has platforms where they reach a wide audience in the European Union and will use research from the ‘Global South’ and ‘Global North’ to raise awareness of and attention to the plight of low waged workers in their varied contexts and situations.

7. Evaluation and Conclusions

The final evaluation stressed the value of such an intensive exchange though considering the time constraint which arises in such tight programmes. Especially the introduction of the CAP, the issues on coherence and the developments of the Economic Partnership Agreements were important. Unfortunately deeper discussions were not always possible. However with this enough issues for further debate were identified and with this possible communication and cooperation envisaged.

Additionally it was interesting to hear about the different programmes with which farmers organisations and the EU try to promote agricultural activities and rural development. Contacts were build and follow up was made possible.

The dialogue showed that social issues are not as much pushed as needed from the side of DG AGRI and DEVCO. Incorporating and implementing a strong framework for advancing social issues is a challenge. Due to the division of labour aspects in the EC. An exchange with DG Employment would have been helpful to identify the common problems in global agriculture and the existing gaps and traps for coherence. Therefore the visit at the ILO Brussels office was helpful. In this dialogue the similarities of the agricultural sector worldwide and its challenges for human and labour rights were expressed.
This dialogue was a new experience for the EC as much as the small delegation. The EC never had a group of grassroot and small Civil Society Organisations from the South as dialogue partners over two days and the partners had never had the possibility to talk with EC on so many different issues. The openness of the EU delegation in their countries varies tremendously. In this regard the openness of Dr Mizzi and his department to receive the delegation, to share information and co-ordinate the variety of inputs is appreciated.

The members of the visiting delegation were grateful for this interesting and open exchange and consider to take up the EPA issue in detail.

Major points in regard to follow up:

1. Learnt how operations are in the EU with the interesting fact of the silonisation of departments hence making coherence difficult.
2. Social standards are not tackled by DG AGRI, but by DG Employment. The team advised that much as DG AGRI is technical, they should be mindful of human aspects.
3. Advice from Dr Mizzi, on social standards was to engage more the EU parliament rather than beaurocrats. That is the Economic and Social Committee of Parliament.
4. Potential areas for dialogue are EPAs; especially aspect of social sustainability and social standards in agriculture value chains.
APPENDIX

A. More Information

1. Policy Coherence for development
https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/policies/policy-coherence-development_en

2. External dimension CAP, EPA
http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/countries-and-regions/
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/developing-countries/acp/index_en.htm

3. SDG and sustainable development
http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgsproposal.html

B. Members of Delegation

DENIS KABIITO, Uganda

Denis Kabiito is biologist, a farmer, fisheries scientist and aqua culturist, extensionist with 8 years work experience in rural extension development work plus advocacy, training and lobbying. He is experienced in program development and management, monitoring and evaluation and a public health specialist (Msc.). He has worked with farming households as an extensionist, a farmer association facilitator and also facilitated the formation of several associations and primary co-operatives in the central region of Uganda. Currently, he is the head of programming (programmes officer) in Caritas Kasanaensis, the social services and development arm of Kasana-Luweero Diocese, running e.g. a community savings methodology for the rural poor called Village savings and Loaning (VSAL) in Kasana-Luweero diocese. He is regional coordinator for the Central Archdiocesan Province Caritas association Project, concerned with association formation and cooperatives for marketing of coffee and household produce.
**Caritas Kasanaensis www.caritaskasanaensis.org**

Over the past 16 years, Caritas Kasanaensis has implemented several programs to change the status of the community including: (1) The programmes for social rehabilitation of vulnerable groups such as women, the poor, People with Disabilities (PWD) and OVCs. (2) The programmes that focus on Agriculture and other Income Generating Activities and imparting of skills. (3) Poverty reduction through a combination of skills training in Sustainable Agriculture and provision of a variety of agricultural inputs. (4) The health programmes that target the reduction of malaria especially among pregnant mothers and children below the age of five. (5) HIV/AIDS Projects.

Caritas Kasanaensis is a member to several organization networks including the following: Affiliated to Caritas Internationale through Amecea Regional Caritas (Caritas Africa), National Caritas (Caritas Uganda). Down to the clients/roots through Community Based Organisations (CBOs) to the family.

**ANGELA MWAPE MULENGA, Zambia**

Angela Mwape Mulenga has been working in the last three years with the Common Market of Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) as regional agro food expert. She was responsible for the coordinating all COMESA regional Agro-foods strategies and policies targeted at regional integration, focus on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) Cluster Development programme. She coordinated the EU-AAACP All Agricultural programme in ESA Region and developed the Agriculture sub-Sector strategy and value chains development. Her responsibility was the alignment of COMESA agro-food sector with various processes such as CAADP, EIF process and SACD and EAC initiatives and the administrative and financial management of EU-AAACP programme at COMESA. Before this appointment she worked with the Consumer Unity and Trust Society- Africa Resource Center (CUTS-ARC), Civil Society Trade Network in Zambia, the Third World Network in Ghana, also as coordinator of trade related issues. For the jobs for Africa program of the International Labour organisation she worked from 2000-2002 as assistant coordinator. Presently Ms Mulenga is the national coordinator of the African Network of the Right to Food in Zambia.

**African Network on the Right to Food (ANoRF) www.rtnf-watch.org**

Founded in 2008 in Cotonou, the African Network on the Right to Food (ANoRF) is a Pan-African network devoted to the promotion of the right to adequate food in Africa. The network established its permanent secretariat in Benin. The network’s members are the ANoRF national coalitions present in more than twenty African countries including Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Ivory Coast, Gambia, Kenya, Mali, Niger, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Togo, Uganda, and Zambia. These coalitions bring together several civil society organizations working to promote and defend the right to adequate food.
LALI NAIDOO, Republic of South Africa

For the last 18 years Lali Naidoo is the director of the East Cape Agricultural Research Project (ECARP). Her primary areas of focus are research, social mobilisation and advancing socio-economic and political rights in the agrarian political economy. Lali has published widely on these areas. She holds a Masters Degree in Industrial Sociology and is currently pursuing a PhD at Rhodes University. Her research topic is on the impact of minimum wage on the farming sector and the implications for mobilising for a living wage for farm workers. The farm committee and social mobilisation programme at ECARP was initiated by Lali and is gaining momentum in other parts of South Africa as appropriate alternative forms of organisations for farm workers and dwellers.

East Cape Agricultural Research Project (ECARP) www.ecarp.org.za

The East Cape Agricultural Research Project (ECARP) was established in 1993 as a non-profit organisation to support and empower rural communities. Our primary partners are farm workers, farm dwellers and small-scale farmers across five municipal areas. ECARP conceptualises its work within a broader understanding of the structure of the agrarian political economy, power relations in the countryside, the control and ownership of resources, the relations of production and the relations of expanded social reproduction. In this regard ECARP is in partnership with research institutions and civil society organisations to track the trends in organising and implementing core labour standards through grass roots structures such as farm and area committees. The grass roots structures in the Eastern Cape have an impressive record of making socio-economic rights self-enforcing filling the gaps posed by the Labour and Land ministries’ lack of capacity to enforce such rights on commercial farms. Engaging growers and labour standards auditors ensures that these processes are inclusive of workers and that commercial farmers, pack-houses and growers are moving towards decent work, living wages, food security and dignified housing for workers and their families.

Accompanied by: HILDEGARD HAGEMANN, Germany

Hildegard Hagemann did her Doctorate in Agriculture on dairy cattle breeding in West-Malaysia, attached to the Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur and the Justus- Liebig- University in Giessen, Germany. Afterwards she turned to the field of development co-operation at the Association of Development Co-operation in Cologne (AGEH e.V.), the Catholic personnel agency as Desk officer for East- Africa. From there she and her family left for Papua New-Guinea, Catholic Diocese of Aitape, working in the field of rural development. Since 1997 she works for the Catholic Church in Germany in various responsibilities. For 12 years she is in charge of the ‘development desk’ at the German Commission for Justice and Peace in Bonn. Hildegard Hagemann’s main fields of work are the Millennium Development Goals and post 2015- Agenda, NePAD, JAES, CPA, Informal Economy and Decent Work, the Right to Food, agricultural trade and social standards participation in development.
German Commission for Justice and Peace www.justitia-et-pax.de

The German Commission for Justice and Peace assembles the Catholic institutions and organisations which work on an international level on behalf of the German Church. Justice and Peace is their joint voice in society and politics and wants to draw the German public's attention to the world-wide issues of justice and peace. Justice and Peace prepares Church statements contributing to the elaboration of German development, peace and human rights policies. It is involved in continuous dialogues with parliament, government, political parties and forces in society on these issues. It elaborates concepts for the Church's work on an international level.

C. Programm


9. November
Arrival of Lali Naidoo in Berlin

10. November
Arrival in Berlin, (Angela, Hildegard)
17.30h prep talk for Conference at Hotel Grenzfall, (Lali, Angela, Hildegard)
19.00h Dinner with Guests of conference
   (Restaurant Neumond, Borsigstr 28, 10115 Berlin)

11. November
Conference 10 years Voluntary Guidelines Right to Food

12. November
Departure to Brussels (Angela, Lali, Hildegard): on train debriefing of conference
Arrival of Denis Kabiito in Brussels
19.30h Social dinner with DBV, Willi Kampmann

13. November
10.00h prep talks for EU- Dialogue at the hotel
11.30h - 17.00h EU Dialogue at DG AGRI (s. EC program)
13.00h Lunch with AG AGRI
18.00h Social dinner meeting with COMECE-team, CIDSE, FIAMRC, JOCI
   (19 Square de Meeus, 1050 Brussels)

14. November
9.00h EU-Dialogue at DG AGRI (as EC program)
   Meetings with DG DEV, DEVCO, EEAS, Employment/Social
13.30h Meeting with Claire Courteille, director ILO Brussels  
*(Rue Aimé Smekens 40, 1030 Brussels)*  
15.45h Debriefing in DG AGR  
18.30h Departure from Brussels Midi *(Lali, Hildegard)*

15. November  
Departure to Brussels airport and Amsterdam *(Angela/Denis)*

2. Agricultural Dialogue Agenda, European Commission and German Commission for Justice and Peace

13. November 2014  
*(Rue de la Loi 130, 1049 Brussel, Meeting Room 06/77)*

11:30h Introduction:  
**Ms Hildegard Hagemann**, German Commission for Justice and Peace  
**Mr Jules Seitz**, International Relations Officer, DG AGRI  
11:40h Participant’s expectations of the dialogue  
12:00h “Europe’s agricultural policy: past, present and future”  
**Mr John Mc Clintock**, Planning and Programming Officer, DG AGRI  
14:00h “The CAP: an external dimension”  
**Mr Leonard Mizzi**, Head of Unit: ACP and Development Issues, DG AGRI  
15:00h “International Year of Family Farming and Policy Framework for Investment in Agriculture”  
**Mr Jules Seitz**, International Relations Officer, DG AGRI  
16:00h Learning from our practice: How to engage with agricultural private sector in ACP countries?  
**Mr Regis Meritan**, Head of Sector Europaid  
**Mr Guy Stinglhamber**, Délégué Général, COLEACP  
**Mr Jeremy Knops**, Director of Operations, PIP  
PIP2 is an Intra-ACP Programme financed under 10th European Development Fund (EDF) which addresses food safety and sustainability of the ACP fruits and vegetable sector.

*(Rue de la Loi 102, 1049 Brussel, Meeting Room 08/ARCA)*

09:00h Welcome coffee/tea  
09:30h "Support to Farmers’ Organizations in Africa Programme (SFOAP)"  
**Ms Daniia Chiaro**, Europaid Officer, ACP Regional programme  
10:00h “COPA COGECA communication activities in the International Year of Family Farming and relation with African partners”  
**Ms Amanda Cheesley**, AGRICORD  
"Fighting Farmers Poverty programme"  
**Ms Laura Jalasjoki**, AGRICORD  
11:00h "Sustainable agriculture development approach in the European Commission"  
**Mr Roberto Aparicio**, Europaid Officer  
11:30h Wrap up session
D. Policy Coherence for Development Actors Chart
Shaping of National and International Agri- Markets
According to Principles of Justice
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1. Defining the Focus

1.1 Introduction

The workshop commenced on the evening of the 7th March 2016 with a welcome from Ms. Lali Naidoo from the hosting organisation, the East Cape Agricultural Research Project (ECARP). Subsequent to this, a round of introductions from the participants began. In the introductions, Ms Lali Naidoo noted that Ms Ntom Daweti and Ms Robertha Botha from ECARP would provide administrative support to the workshop. Following the introductions, each organisation was given an opportunity to define their programme of work in their respective geographical locations in terms of farm workers, farm dwellers and small-scale farmers that link to Justice and Peace’s 2017 initiative. This process continued on the morning of the 8th March 2016. Common issues coming out of the programme of work of the respective organisations these were isolated as follows:

- Fair labour standards
- Decent work
- Land grabbing
- Solidarity
- Right to food – extension services
  - Organising/ mobilising – for example, Justice and Peace volunteer committees
  - Uplifting the plight of peasant farmers
  - Advocacy based on the bottom - up approach

1.2 Background to the Meeting and Reasons behind the Collaboration in the Past

Dr. Hildegard Hagemann, German Commission for Justice and Peace

Following the identification of issues based on the programme of work in the respective organisations, Dr. Hildegard Hagemann gave an input on the background to the meeting. In this regard, she explained that since 2009, the German Commission of Justice and Peace’s line of work has been in relation to two human rights issues, the right to food and decent work.

- Right to Food – What Does This Mean for Rural Politics and Agricultural Policies?

In 2009, there was an exposure dialogue programme to look into the issues of food security, energy supply, and their link to the right to food. The focus was on whether there is some form of tension between food security and energy supply in relation to competition for land and other resources. After this exposure dialogue, there was a conference in Zambia where food security and energy supply, in the human rights and global justice context, were the key areas of discussion. In this context, some of the focus was on where the right to food is anchored in the legal framework and how it can be strengthened in this framework. The
discussion in this conference also extended to social standards and labour rights. It also geared towards the entrepreneurial potential of small-scale farmers, and how this is linked to food security, food sovereignty and the right to food. This led to an exposure programme and dialogue-workshop which was held in Uganda with local stakeholders, where these issues were discussed and elaborated on. Simultaneously, Justice and Peace initiated in Uganda focusing on what decent work in the informal economy is about.

- **Decent Work**

In relation to the decent work issue in Uganda the aim was to organise a tripartite between workers’ organisations, employers’ organisations and government. In 2011/2012, a joint action committee on decent work was formed in Uganda. This committee was tasked to assess what is happening in relation to decent work in Uganda and how this fits into the International Labour Organisation (ILO) programme. This means that the farm situation was only one area of a range of other issues. The idea was for this joint action committee to look into the different regions in Uganda to uncover the other burning issues there. For this purpose there were four regional conferences in 2014, to isolate the burning issues, where are the labour issues, etc. Findings from these were wide ranged from child labour up to oil issues. At the time, the issues were not so much related to migrants in the labour market. Rural employment was seen as a major issue in all four regions. Caritas documented their findings on these.

- **Trade and Rights**

An accumulation of the efforts to think the two rights together was the exercise to discuss the relevance of voluntary food standards dominating the international agricultural trade in regard to developmental potential, and protection of workers’ rights. The international conference ‘Sweet fruits- good for all’ in January 2014 highlighted the interconnectivity of agricultural development with the link to labour rights and building of solidarity between the stakeholders- the small scale farmers and the workers. The possibility of having a close dialogue with European Commission and European organisations brought another aspect to the floor- the influence of the trade politics and the CAP on the agricultural markets and rural development, protection of human rights in countries with weaker economy. This dialogue in November 2014 led to idea to strengthen the CS networks on right to food and raise the decent work issues.

- **Actual Developments and Discussions**

Dr Hildegard noted that people involved in development issues are joining those that are fed up with agricultural policies in Europe to do demonstrations against the issue of commercialised or industrial agriculture. As a consequence of these heavy discussions in the society farmers feel that they are being accused of being the bad people (causing hunger in the world, etc.) on the one hand. On the other hand, the progressives say that ‘we cannot go on like this, with agricultural politics, we cannot go on like this with ecological
programmes, climate change, the end of natural resources’. Hence, they highlight and stress that there is a need to transform our societies and our politics. Therefore, there are clashes within societies between those that are feeling wrongly accused (conventional farmers) and those who fight for developmental issues and transformation and human rights’ issues. These clashes got through the membership of Catholic organisations and associations themselves—like the Rural Movement, the Womens’ Association, the Kolping families etc etc. The German Commission of Justice and Peace sees itself as having the responsibility to provide dialogue forums, to bring people together to try to bridge these gaps so as to find a common understanding in agricultural policies—nationally, European and internationally. There is a planned dialogue platform taking place in November, bringing together members of Catholic Associations, representing the different perspectives.

- Value Chains and Decent Work

In the government, there are about two promoters (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development) of decent work in the global chains. When Germany had the G7-presidency, they strongly voiced out decent work conditions in global value chains. This is continued in the G20 process, where Germany will preside in 2017. There are food value chains, starting in the rural areas and ending in highly technologized production processes. This also provides a platform of the human rights’ approach of the right to food and decent work. Dr Hildegard noted that these are the different themes that Justice and Peace has been working on, leading us to this workshop because we want to strengthen the link between the right to food and decent work. We also want to discuss possibilities of strengthening our regional networks and qualify our work with the government, but also in the international stage. The Conference planned for 2017 by Justice and Peace is to enhance international unity on the demand for just markets, agricultural markets as much as Labour markets-issues we are working on.

Discussion and Questions Based on the Input

Ms Lali Naidoo, from ECARP, contributed to the discussion by referring to some of the work on the way global markets are operating, and what we’re seeing now in BRICS (in the South African experience). In so doing she noted that in South Africa we are seeing a downplay approach to strengthening labour rights. She stated that this may largely be as a result of our functioning in BRICS and our ties with the Chinese who are infamous for a disregard for labour rights, similarly with Russia in terms of freedom of association. Those core first generation rights are largely missing in those two countries. Brazil has a strong social movement in the name of MST; India has a very strong civil society. Based on this analysis, she posed a question of how Europe positions itself, and how we locate ourselves in the polarisation within global trading market and global value chains. In accentuating her point she noted that when looking at South African agricultural produce, there are stringent audits from the sanitary of the actual product to the labour standards that apply to Europe. When looking at Russia, China and Japan there is not much like that in terms of the social audits,
whereas with the EU, that features very much. She explained this as a schizophrenic division involving a part of the world that adheres to these rights, while in the other part of the world these are not qualified.

Ms Lali Naidoo further noted that we cannot dialogue and think that this animal does not exist. To explain her argument she stated that on the one hand, South Africa has a very big trading partnership with the EU. Therefore, it is held accountable in terms of the ILO conventions (the minimum wage, fair labour standards, etc.) but our leaders in the African continent are not committed enough to this integrated social justice perspective but are more committed to economics for a small elite. They will therefore go with those countries such as the Chinese and Russians and Japanese in terms of trading agreements. She therefore inquired about what this means for the right to food and decent work? She then responded by saying it’s a question that we, as Africans, have to put to engage in and how Europe is dealing with this has to be confronted. She elaborated by maintaining that we need to build strong social movements and solidarity networks in the region and in Europe, to tell the leaders to stop and shift paradigm.

1.3 Focus of the Workshop

Based on the input by Dr Hildegard on the background to the workshop and discussion thereafter, the participants agreed that our work would be based on the right to food and decent work in the global value chains. In this regard, the participants defined the issues along the value chains in relation to the right to food and decent work. These issues were defined so as to shape our lobbying and advocacy.

Paradigm: Right to food and right to decent work: Challenging global value chains – Small-scale farmers and low-waged workers

1. Living wages
2. Social and labour standards
3. Social value accorded to labour (dignity)
4. Mobilising/organisation
5. Investment/Accumulation though dispossession

In the afternoon session the program of the workshop for the 9th March was drafted, the tasks distributed and the contents of inputs prepared.
2. Exchange with Academics Involved in Agrarian Change

2.1 Introduction

At exactly 9:00hrs, the conference/workshop started. This workshop was an exchange of ideas between academics, the working group members and international development partners like International Rural Development Service and Rhodes University. The session started with the introduction of members present, with our host, Ms. Lali Naidoo as the chair for the session.

With the round of introductions, Ms. Lali Naidoo, welcomed members present to Grahamstown and to the Rhodes University conference room where the workshop was held.

2.2 Background and Context of Gathering

To provide a mutual understanding to all the participants present, our convener, Dr Hildegard Hagemann from the German Commission of Justice and Peace (GCJP) had the following remarks;

- GCJP is involved in bringing together different stakeholders through Dialogue and Exposure in respect to the Right to Food and Decent Work.

- From 2002, GCJP started line projects to strengthening rights of those in the informal economy, in the respects of the right to food, Decent Work and meeting the MDGs.

- GCJP has used several Exposure and Dialogue programmes to act as platforms for bringing various stakeholders together to discuss on key issues in direction of rights to food and Decent Work.

- Notably is the March/April 2009 Exposure and dialogue programme on food security and energy supply between self-interest and global justice held in Uganda and Zambia. It was the initial platform where interaction of ECARP (Lali), Caritas Kasanaensis (Fr. Hilary and Denis) FIAN Zambia (Angela) and GCJP (Dr. Hagemann) together.

- Another important Exposure and Dialogue programme in respect to Right to Food, was held in Uganda in July 2011 with special interest on ‘the Entrepreneurial potential of small scale farmers for food security ‘

- In Jan 2014, the team was involved in an international Conference called ‘Sweet fruits good for all ‛, held in Berlin. It was focused on Social Standards and the right to food for especially small-scale/peasant farmers and also farm workers and dwellers.
• Further still, the team was involved in a dialogue with EU based organizations like DG AGRI, ILO, COMECE in Nov 2014 and also attended the ceremony to mark the 10 years of right to food conference in Berlin.

2.3 Paradigm of Human Dignity and Human Rights to Shape Global Value Chains for Low Wage Workers and Small Scale Farmers

Fr. Hilary Muheezangango, Caritas Kasanaensis

In his introduction, Fr Hilary briefed members about human dignity being a fundamental asset for all. It conceptualizes the experience of respect, recognition and acceptance for all human beings, thereby making it a “universal principle’ from which all rights are derived. He continued to describe human dignity as one with no history, natural, God-given, and it has no limits in time and space. This universal principle therefore has a Cosmo-centric account, Christo-centric, logo Centric, and polis centric accounts.

In the aspect of shaping Global value chains for low waged workers and small-scale farmers, it is important to focus on social justice. Social justice demands for equal sharing and use of resources and opportunities. The scramble for resources and opportunities has seen the world brood several global injustices in the areas of food, shelter, health, education, environment (climate change), and Decent Work.

Fr. Hilary continued to say that, mother church put for us principles to guard us against forfeiting others of their rights and also inhibiting the brooding of social injustices in society. These are called the principles of the Catholic Social Teaching. They include:

• Respect for life and human person (human dignity)
• Promote the family (appreciate the community aspect)
• Work for the common good (look for what is authentically good)
• Care for God’s creation (Environment& Natural resources)
• Principle of subsidiarity
• Fundamental option for the poor (those in want)
• Protection of Property rights.
As he concluded he urged participants present to challenge the Global Value Chains for the involvement of low waged workers and small-scale farmers as we seek to democratize them in the areas of:

- Living wage as opposed to minimum wage
- Social and labour standards
- Social value (dignity)
- Investment
- Mobilisation and organization in search for cohesion.

These five issues that are crosscutting in both low-waged workers and small-scale farmers were to provide the basis of our discussion as we dissect the injustices in the global value chains (GVC). He urged international organisations such as the UN, AU and EU to think about how they should help the disadvantaged like the low-waged workers, small-scale farmers, those who have been plundered in the past, and those whose resources have been taken away. He continued to say that this quote from Mother Teresa: “those rich in poverty”, urges us to help these people in society to at least die with dignity by providing them that respect and helping them to live a life of dignity. This quote was inspirational for all: “Be the change you want to see in the world” - Mahatma Ghandhi.

**Discussion and Questions**

Hermann Schuten thanked Fr. Hilary for the presentation and posed the following question to all of us: Having heard all the above principles (social teachings of the church) are they known to all families? In his response Fr. Hilary said that, there is no interface that happens at eye to eye within the church to explain these principles apart from evangelization. Theological cases in Africa are in vocation schools only (seminaries). Therefore there is need to sensitize these families about the teachings because it is shallow in our families.

The second was from Lali: she said that Mother Teresa’s Notion of ‘rich in poverty’ according to her would make the people complacent and fail to strive to change from that condition, so we should not condone poverty but rather have people change. In his response he said that he concurs with the thinking of Lali that those endowed with no disability and fail to work, it is sinful, so they should find work and also take any initiative to be better. But in the context of Mother Teresa, she meant that there are those people in society like the lame, blind or even those that have hard traumas in life or even catastrophes, we who are able-bodied ought to help them and also try to show to them that God is with them and they are humans, too.
2.4 The Right to Decent Work and Right to Food for Farm Dwellers and Workers

Group of Dr Hildegard, Khanyiso, Lali and Asanda - Presentation by Khanyiso Ntikinca

As he begun, he stressed that the issue about the low-waged workers is to: Endeavour to decommodify labour in capitalistic Systems. It should be noted that labour should not be a commodity. Many take it as a fictitious commodity in Economics yet people should have their social value and dignity rather than being a set of production. Happy beings have a social aspect hence the need to decommodify labour.

- **Living Wage**

Here the group looked at dispelling the minimum wage standard that many GVC call for but rather take up a living wage for the low-waged workers at various levels. This living wage should cater for all the fundamental needs of this worker in contrast to the minimum wage. This is aimed at ensuring that workers can meet the full ambit of the social reproduction of labour, health, education, recreation, housing and other social services. Therefore there is need to have the commercial farmers understand that the social aspects of human can only be fulfilled by putting in place a living wage rather than a minimum wage.

- **Social and Labour Standards**

Currently, labour standards are narrow and apply to the workplace. In most cases, most of these focus on the formal sector. They often cater for white collar jobs. The problem found in Global Value Chains (GVCs) is that low- waged workers are often left out of the brackets of these standards. It is therefore important to recognize the inclusion of all people in social and labour standards conventions where even the low-waged workers are part of these standards – since labour rights are human rights and they apply for all – in the formal and informal sectors.

- **Social Value**

Presently in the labour market, labour is a devalued. The social aspect of labour in agriculture is stigmatized, tasks are monotonous, and people are easily replaced and often exploited. The problem seen in GVCs is that low-waged workers depict the social devaluation of labour. Therefore the need for decent work, the only way for decisions to change is to mobilize the affected and organize structures globally.
• **Mobilisation and Organisation**

The mobilisation and the right to organise is key to transforming and democratising value chains. Therefore the implementation of the ILO- Core Labour standards is crucial in every national context. However, this is challenging for governance but also for civil society participation and social dialogue. Advocacy work on national and international level is needed as much as bottom-up approaches for unions and collectives which workers own, control and direct.

• **Accumulation of Dispossession**

Globally in a capitalistic world, the workers are often dispossessed; the structures in the value chains encourage and cement dispossessions. Often capitalists want to cut cost and often labour costs are the most affected, hence low-waged workers are most affected.

Therefore, a key to transforming and democratizing value chains is by mobilizing and organizing low-waged workers to form social cohesion structures that can enforce change.

**Discussion and Questions**

Hermann Schuten (ILD) thanked Khanyiso for the wonderful presentation. He informed the team that what has been talked about is depicted in the South African Sugar Industry where the low- waged workers face that plight on a daily basis. Angela asked the South African colleagues about the situation in South Africa currently on minimum wage since she did not easily understand whether the minimum wage is adequate or low. The group reiterated by informing members that currently in South Africa there is a minimum wage but it cannot meet the basic needs of the family. What we should advocate for is a wage that can cater for the basic needs of the family. Hermann later informed the participants that, having seen that the minimum wage is inadequate; there is a campaign now in South Africa to uplift the living conditions and nutrition of the low-waged workers by advocating for the people;

a) One acre of land to grow food (food security)

b) 10% savings for pension

Prof. Klerck (Rhodes University), further informed the team that there is perpetual ability to deny who is responsible for the plight of the low wage workers in the various value chains. Superimposed on the agricultural value chain is the global division of power and wealth. This therefore brings about the perpetual denial of responsibilities hence there are many possibilities but few capacities to change the irregularities in the value chains.

Lastly, Lali (ECARP) said that there lacks a strong clear framework based on UN Rights that can cater for proper land distributions and labour.
2.5 The Right to Decent Work and the Right to Food for Small Scale Farmers – "In the Aspect of How to Democratize the Value Chains for Small Scale Farmers"

Group of Fr Hillary, Denis, and Angela Presentation by Denis Kabiito

In his presentation, Mr Kabiito started with describing to the group who these small scale farmers are and therefore described them as follows. Small scale farmers;

- Form the majority of the rural population in sub-Saharan Africa
- Provide food and labour to the rural settings
- Play a vital but an unrecognized role in all agricultural value chains most especially as the primary producers.

He further informed the team that the plight of the small scale farmers in respect to the Global value chains was analyzed in the following thematic areas shown in the table below and therefore the group tried to come up with some remedies for each area as we try to democratize the value chains.

a) Living Wage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Impact to small scale farmers</th>
<th>Way Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No wage</td>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
<td>States should introduce minimum wage in small scale farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t take farming as a business</td>
<td>Joblessness</td>
<td>Encourage and facilitate Farming as a business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use family and friends as labour</td>
<td>Not recognized in the global value chains</td>
<td>States should comply to the economic, social and cultural rights on UN charter on decent work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small acreages and often produce with no value addition</td>
<td>Agriculture not valued especially by society and young generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States are not fulfilling the right to food by providing supportive</td>
<td>Confined to subsistence life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies and programmes like extension, subsidies etc</td>
<td>Rural-urban migration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not easily recognized in the global value chain (less participation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### b) Social and Labour Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Way Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority are not aware about the standards</td>
<td>Non compliance to international labour and social standards</td>
<td>Encourage / setup awareness raising platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few players in society advocating for standards</td>
<td>Have or remain with the same status quo.</td>
<td>Operationalise the national legal frameworks (voluntary guidelines, strategies or protocols)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National frameworks very silent on matter in regards to small scale farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c) Social Value (Dignity): How Small Scale Farmers can be Valued by Society as Important Players in Value Chains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Way Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small scale production taken as a private risky venture with little or no margins = devalued</td>
<td>Low productivity</td>
<td>Establish policy to integrate the social values of peasant farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No policy on peasantry</td>
<td>Low self-esteem</td>
<td>Awareness creation (essence/ value of small scale farmers to society esp to young generation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation, abuse esp. of women and children works even at domestic level</td>
<td>Not taken as priority in national policies, strategies and budgets</td>
<td>Greater decision/ participation in global value chains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### d) Investment (in relation to resources)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Way Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Land evictions</td>
<td>• Food insecurity</td>
<td>• Have strong state policies on investment that take into consideration social and economic values of their citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Un-fair contracts and partnerships</td>
<td>• Victimisation imperialistic bullying</td>
<td>• Responsible use of voluntary guidelines to sustainable land tenure systems/ investments = the will of state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low-wages (on large scale farms/firms)</td>
<td>• Investments policies are weak: do not take into consideration the marginalized groups (women, children, youth)</td>
<td>• Multinational companies involving small scale farmers in their value chains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Little or no penetration into the global retail stores (shoprite, pick’n’pay, Nakummat)</td>
<td>• Conflict, wrangles, criminality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• markets</td>
<td>• Unemployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Abuse of social and labour standards</td>
<td>• Rural-urban migration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Infiltration of GMOs, chemicals</td>
<td>• No penetration into the global chain stores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### e) Mobilising and Organization (Social Cohesion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Way Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Fragmented (not organized)</td>
<td>• No cohesion</td>
<td>• Social mobilization structures important to enhance social cohesion (groups, associations, cooperatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of knowledge and skills to mobilise, organize and plan</td>
<td>• Not able to lobby ad advocate (voiceless)</td>
<td>• Create awareness and empowerment to create necessary changes in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are no strong social movements to mobilise, organise and offer advocacy skills to the small scale farmers</td>
<td>• High poverty levels</td>
<td>• Social, strategic and development networks are crucial for small scale farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited research and advocacy.</td>
<td>• Individualism</td>
<td>• Establish advocacy fora at all levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited research and advocacy.</td>
<td>• Difficult to have social services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions and Recommendations

- Low-wage workers and small-scale farmers are getting a raw deal from GVC
- Strengthening discourse on living wage.
- Strengthening solidarity networks and linkages that bring about social cohesion.
- Facilitate small scale farmers to tap into this global community that wants fair and equitable share of proceeds
- Business as usual is not an option

3. Field Visits

3.1 About Groentuin Farm

Groentuin Farm was donated by Mr. Landman (owner of the farm) - when he evicted the now small-scale farmers from the other side of his farm. Some of the challenges faced by these small-scale include firstly; insecure land tenure rights. The land has yet to be transferred to the farmers despite numerous engagements with Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) Port Elizabeth office and the intervention of the Office of the Premier of the Eastern Cape. Secondly; lack of access to water for farming purposes. They were only able to access water for domestic use and for their livestock in 2012 through assistance from ECARP through the Sustainable Rural Development in the Eastern Cape (SURUDEC) Call 2 Programme. Thirdly; there is lack of post-settlement support to assist them with farming. However, despite this, the farmers make use of all the arable land available to them for cultivation. They have Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP) houses built on the farm, but no sanitation facilities and no access to electricity.
3.2 About Langbos

Langbos is an informal settlement in the Sunday’s River Valley municipality. Langbos farm workers and dwellers, largely work on a seasonal basis at neighbouring citrus farms and pack-houses. Labour legislation is often not adhered to and there are numerous cases of unfair dismissals and non-adherence to the requirements of the sectoral determination for sub-sector, including acceptable living standards as well infringements pertaining to worker health and safety. Within the citrus sub-sector violations still continue despite local labour policies and national and international ethical trade guidelines. Employers in packhouses and in orchards still find ways to circumvent paying the minimum wage rates. This includes paying workers piece rates (i.e. for number of boxes of oranges picked, trees pruned or crates packed), workers being required to come to work at 7am but only starting work at 10am because orchards are wet, but only being paid for the hours they work.

We met with Lindelwa who is a single mother of a 19 year old daughter, who is a mother herself. Lindelwa works as a seasonal worker for six months and is unemployed for the other half of the year. At the commercial farm where she works, she has no social insurance, has sick leave up to four days and audits are announced. Workers are put under pressure to say the right things to auditors. Lindelwa has a vegetable garden where she produces vegetables for consumption and selling of surplus.

3.3 About Yarrow Farm

After Yarrow Farm was bought by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR), the farm workers and dwellers were given permission by the government to utilise the land for production purposes such as subsistence farming or commercial farming. Presently, the small-scale farmers have a family business where they sell vegetables produced by themselves through using oxen for ploughing. The land still belongs to the state.

3.4 About Valencia

Stock owners in this area who are using a farm of approximately 353 hectares to graze their cattle have been living in fear of being evicted from the land by the big and powerful business people in the area. The land originally belonged to a commercial farmer who rented out the land to ten stock owners for a yearly amount of R400 for each herd of cattle in 1997.
After some time, the land was supposedly sold to a company which took down the fencing that divided the grazing camps but not the boundaries. Even so, the company still permitted the stockowners to graze their cattle on the land. However, after some time the original owner came back and told the stock owners that the people owning the company that purchased the farm from him had been arrested and the sale of the farm had not gone through. He promised the stock owners that he would facilitate the process of getting them to own the land. However, he has since disappeared. Since then the ownership of the land has been in dispute despite promises from the government to purchase the land for the stock owners. The stock owners are now facing the threat of opportunistic business people farming on a nearby farm who have bought the farm. The business people consistently come onto the farm to patrol it and dig a quarry on the land without consulting the stock owners. Without any assistance from the government, the stockowners are holding on to the land for dear life because it is their main source of livelihood.

3.5 About Bersheba

Land was given to the Bersheba community by the Moravian Church. The Minister of Land Affairs was then appointed as the custodian of the land because the people were not organised into a legal entity at the time. The community was promised that the land would be formally transferred to them when such an entity was established. After the community organised themselves into a Communal Property Association (CPA), this still did not happen. Instead, the DRDLR is currently continuously bringing to the community proposals from the different agencies in the areas that are well established in large-scale farming in game farming, citrus and vegetables to use the land for agricultural The community is not consensual in regard to what the land should be used for and how.

3.6 General Impressions on the Field Visits

Rapporteurs: Denis Kabiito, UNYFA, Asanda Sandi, ECARP, Hildegard Hagemann, GCJP

- Majority of the low wage workers, farm dwellers and settlers are native South Africans with no Land at all.

- The land situation (tenure system) in South Africa is on a time bomb. Serious repercussions are to happen soon if there are no serious land reforms.
Many of the small scale holdings are too small to make any meaningful contribution in terms of food and livelihoods for the families.

The low wage Workers (LWW) and small scale farmers (SCF) are only dependent on public or government services for handouts and counsel.

There is too much to do by different partners to mobilise communities and citizenry to fight for the right to food and decent work in South African villages.

In the South African context, commercial farms are not only places of work but also places of residence for farm workers and their families. Therefore the importance of commercial farms as well as the broader agricultural sector does not only lie in production purposes but they are also vital for the expanded social reproduction of labour.

Fair and ethical trade agreements pertaining to labour and living standards are often transgressed by commercial farmers and agri-businesses. Interactions with workers in the citrus sub-sector, where such protocols exist on paper, bring to the fore the level and extent of transgressions and violations of their provisions. The citrus sub-sector therefore constitutes one of the most vulnerable work forces.

Positive land rights for landless and poor people are circumvented by a technical and market driven land reform strategy. In all such cases, the DRDLR is consistently blocking and dismissing people’s efforts to secure sufficient food for household consumption and for sale on local markets. There is also very little or no regard for agro-ecological farming and the development of local micro-agri-businesses.

Many farmers acquiring land through land reform do not have title deeds to the land, even in cases where land was acquired through policies that provided for land transfers to legal entities based in communities and in cases where land was donated to communities.

The landlessness and out of it stemming insecurity is the most pressing burden on the farm workers and small scale farmers. Perspectives to stay on are embedded in laws, but not well and timely applied. The uprootedness of farm population is not reversible. Dependency is developing on hand outs and government. The extension service is erratic in quality and intensity, does not consider the wishes of farmers in kind of agriculture in line with production methods It jeopardizes economic and ecological and by that social sustainability. Governance problems occur - lack of participation of population. It seems that redistribution of wealth is a problem.
4. **Way Forward**

From Grahamstown, the team needs to develop a common road map of action to follow in preparation for the forum of 2017 and onwards. This is a precondition for the formulation of a common position for advocacy for decent work and the right to food. Additionally the objectives of such exercise are to make use of possibilities for international networking, for exchange and deepening insight in challenges for LWW and SSF.

1. **Which are the common things that we can tackle together under Right based approaches. / (Uganda, Zambia and South Africa)**
   - There is generalized lack of information on rights by both the citizens and states
   - Questionable governance structures (Bureaucratic and corrupted government)
   - Many people in the region are living in poverty
   - Lack of a participatory approach on how to do agriculture and labour policies
   - There is a continued less involvement of youth

2. **Therefore, in aspects of right to decent work and right to food, these commonalities in GVCs mean that there is:**
   - A dependency syndrome in society
   - Food insecurity
   - Exploitation and devaluation
   - Violation of right to food and right to decent work
   - Unhappy communities full of conflict and wrangles

3. **What is needed?**
   - Research on particular value chains (with defined characteristics)
   - Sensitization of communities on their rights (social mobilization)
   - Reflection and dialogue with other stakeholders
   - Review by each participant, on the legal frameworks and instruments on trade, food security and standards in place.

4. **How should we go about it?**
   - Research; there is need to develop the criteria/ guidelines on what value chains to research on/ or have a fact finding mission on key value chains.
   - We need to share case studies on how others have gone about it and their results.
   - Need to carry out dialogues and meetings.
5. Further suggestions

- Exposure Feb 2017 India, Gujarat, precarious labour in the cotton Value chains from migrant work to homework
- GFMD in Bangladesh and Germany 2016/2017
- Linking to JACODeWU, Uganda, Workshop, Dialogue platform in Uganda
- Taking up links with JCTR in Zambia again
- JP Congress October 2017 on labour markets

6. The result of our activities should culminate into a report
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B. Programm

Monday, March 7th, 2016

17.00h Arrival

Tuesday, March 8th, 2016

9.00h continuation from March 7th report from participants on activities since November 2014 linking to the topic
11.00 identification of issues and concretisation
14.00 Preparation of workshop March 9th, 2016
16.00h working groups for preparation according to target groups low wage workers and small scale farmers
20.00h individual preparation

In the afternoon session the program of the workshop was drafted, the tasks distributed and the contents of inputs prepared with the help of flipchart and PPP.
Wednesday, March 9th, 2016

Workshop
The Right to Food and the Right to Decent Work: challenging the Global Value Chains-
Exchange with Science and Rural Movement

9.00h Welcome and Introduction of participants, Lali Naidoo, ECARP
9.30h Background and context of this gathering. Hildegard Hagemann, GCJP
10.00h Paradigm Human Dignity and Human Rights to shape global Value Chains for Low Wage Workers and Small Scale Farmers, Fr Hilary Muheezangango, Caritas Kasanaensis

10.30h Coffee/Teak Break

11.00h Low Wage Workers and issues of concern (living wage, social and labour standards, Social value of work/dignity of worker, organising and mobilising, investment/dispossession)
Input, Feedback from ressource persons, general discussion
Prepared by: Asanda, Hildegard, Kanyiso, Lali, presented by Kanyiso Ntikinca

12.30h Lunch break

14.00h Small Scale Farmers and issues of concern (living wage, social and labour standards, Social value of work/dignity of worker, organising and mobilising, investment/dispossession)
Input, feedback from ressource persons, general discussion
Prepared by Angela, Denis, Fr Hilary, Denis, presented by Denis Kabiito

15.30h Coffee/Tea Break

16.00h conclusions, recommendations, way forward
17.00h end of workshop/ information on field visits

Chair: Hildegard, Minutes: morning: Denis, afternoon: Angela

Thursday, March 10th, 2016
7.30h Field Visits
To Groentuin Farm, Langbos and Yarrow Farm

Friday, March 11th, 2016
7.30h Field Visits
To Valenia and Bersheba

17.00h Way Forward and Evaluation