



## Yes to a sustainable trade policy – no to the TTIP

### The EU-US free trade agreement: a threat to the Global South

Trade policy has long been a core topic in North-South dialogue. And with good reason: by flooding African markets with their exports of cheap chicken meat, European companies are putting Africa's farmers at risk. But the traffic tends to be one-way: African businesses' lack of access to markets in the northern hemisphere is obstructing development in the Global South. Since the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) was established in 1964, development organisations have therefore been monitoring and analysing the impacts of trade agreements on people's living conditions in the Global South. Bread for the World, together with many other non-governmental organisations, has long advocated for more justice in world trade. International trade should promote sustainable development in the African, Asian and Latin American countries, and should not widen the gap between rich and poor.

Since the mid 1990s, the debate about sustainable trade policy has focused particularly on the role of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Based in Geneva, the WTO exerts considerable influence on the governance of the globalised world

economy. Although the WTO's main task is to coordinate its members' economic and trade policies and lower trade barriers, its rules also intervene in policy areas that have little to do with economics. It is the only international organisation to have its own tribunal (the Appellate Body). It also has various sanction mechanisms at its disposal. Partly as a consequence of these arrangements, economic interests take precedence over politics in the WTO. The growing dominance of economic, as opposed to political, governance is currently evident in the negotiations on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) – in essence, a free trade agreement – between the EU and the US. However, this agreement is not being negotiated within the WTO but bilaterally between the EU and the US. It was partly the deadlocks in the WTO which prompted the US and the EU to work towards a bilateral free trade agreement outside the WTO framework.

This free trade agreement is currently the subject of broad public debate and is beset with controversy. Development and civil rights organisations, politicians from across the political spec-

trum, trade unionists and many private citizens are critical of the negotiating process, claiming that it is undemocratic. They also fear that the TTIP will erode consumer protection, dismantle environmental standards, and weaken social welfare systems. Bread for the World shares many of these concerns. However, in this publication, we would like to focus primarily on the potential risks to the developing countries and emerging economies, which have received too little attention in this debate.

### From the WTO to the TTIP

The EU and the US had high expectations of the World Trade Organization when it was established in 1995. Governments hoped that it would result in the comprehensive liberalisation of trade, not only in goods but also in services, intellectual property and investment. However, the round of trade negotiations launched in Doha in 2001, which was meant to be a “development round” for the benefit of the Global South, has still not reached a conclusion. This is mainly due to conflicts of interest between the industrialised countries, which are calling for liberalisation of services and investment – sectors in which they have competitive advantages – and the developing countries and emerging economies, which are keen to secure concessions, mainly in relation to agriculture. Protests from development organisations, environmental groups, trade unions and governments from the Global South have also put the brakes on the WTO’s free trade agenda.

#### European free trade policy

At the First WTO Ministerial Conference in Singapore in 1996, the European Union was already making its priorities clear: sweeping liberalisation and deregulation in sectors in which European companies are more productive and therefore more competitive. They include foreign investment, services, intellectual property and government procurement (known as the “Singapore issues”).

In order to assert its trade policy demands, Europe is lobbying at various levels:

1. multilaterally within the WTO framework,
2. bilaterally via trade, investment and partnership agreements, which it negotiates directly with individual countries or groups of countries,
3. plurilaterally through the formation of appropriate forums, as in the case of the Trade in Services Agreement (TISA).

#### The Doha Development Round

The “Development Round” was officially launched at the WTO’s Fourth Ministerial Conference in Doha, Qatar, in 2001 and aimed to achieve reciprocal tariff reductions and liberalisation of the markets for agricultural and industrial products, a reduction in agricultural subsidies, market liberalisation for services, and implementation of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement). The main reason for the failure to bring the Doha Round to a successful conclusion is that the EU and the US apply double standards. Despite pushing hard for liberalisation of investment and services, for example, they are keen to maintain subsidies on their own agricultural products and exports.

By contrast, the Ministerial Conference in Bali in 2013 ended in success. The 161 WTO members adopted the Bali Package, which includes provisions on trade facilitation and streamlining of customs procedures, and establishes limited exemptions for the developing countries’ food security programmes. Preferential rules for the least developed countries were also announced but were not established on a binding basis. However, the compromise package only relates to minor aspects of the Doha Round. The real lines of conflict still exist, and it is unclear at present whether the agreement will generate any fresh momentum in the Doha Round.

With the WTO negotiations stalled, the EU and US are now increasingly attempting to push through their liberalisation agenda via bilateral agreements. The EU has been negotiating a free trade agreement with Canada since 2011, for example, and in June 2013, Brussels and Washington began talks on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). If the talks are brought to a successful conclusion, this will create the world’s largest regional free trade area, accounting for 47 per cent of global GDP and 44 per cent of world trade flows.

#### What is the purpose of the TTIP?

The European Commission and the US Government hope that the free trade agreement will improve transatlantic trade relations – at least, according to their official statements – and hold out the promise of higher economic growth and new jobs. Studies by various economic research institutes seem to back up these expectations. Some researchers predict that the agreement could add around 0.5 per cent to the EU’s annual economic output and yield 70,000 additional

jobs in Europe (Bertelsmann and Centre for Economic Policy Research 2013). However, these forecasts relate to a period of 10-14 years. In other words, the positive effects for individual countries are, in reality, likely to be modest in the extreme.

It seems unlikely that the prospect of additional annual growth of less than 0.1 per cent is the real reason why European and US heads of government are investing so much energy in these negotiations. In early 2014, the EU's Trade Commissioner Karel De Gucht explained the real purpose of the TTIP: "The next big battle in world trade is about norms, standards and subsidies, not about tariffs. We Europeans must set global standards, to make sure that nobody can impose standards on us" (Süddeutsche Zeitung, 17.01.2014). The purpose of the transatlantic free trade area, then, is to create a new trade policy paradigm that safeguards the partners' competitive advantages in international trade.

The project is a reaction to the shifting weights and power relations in the global economy. Emerging economies such as China, India and Brazil are securing a growing share of world trade and global GDP, whereas the established industrialised nations' share is decreasing. With the TTIP, the EU and US aim, at least, to slow down this process. This long-term objective is the reason why the TTIP is attracting interest from development organisations as well.

## Impacts on the Global South

### Investment

Demands for liberalisation of investment, combined with more robust investment protection, have been right at the top of the EU's trade policy agenda for years. It also features prominently in the controversy over the TTIP.

According to the European Commission's draft of the mandate for the TTIP negotiations, the TTIP should contain investment liberalisation and protection provisions, on the basis of the highest levels of liberalisation and highest standards of protection, and should include the - highly controversial - investor-to-state dispute settlement (ISDS) mechanism. A combination of the highest standards in these areas would result in even more sweeping investment provisions than those already contained in all the existing bilateral investment treaties (BITs). An issue of real concern for the developing countries and emerg-

ing economies is that the investment provisions contained in the TTIP will serve as the model for future agreements between these countries and the northern hemisphere's two most powerful economies. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has already made it clear that it is important for the TTIP to conclude a full and ambitious investment promotion and protection chapter, "less out of concern for the current state of investment protection in either the United States or the EU, but as a symbol of our joint commitment to strong investment protections globally" (Statement of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, May 10, 2013; <http://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=USTR-2013-0019-0241>).

### Investor-to-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS)

Like many other bilateral investment and free trade agreements, the TTIP will give companies the right to bring a case directly against the country in which they have invested before an arbitration tribunal. According to drafts of the TTIP, this would mean that businesses would be able to sue governments if new environmental laws or other state measures reduced the returns on their investment. These tribunals operate outside the ordinary jurisdiction and conduct proceedings behind closed doors. There is no mechanism for appeal against the three arbitrators' decisions. Most of these cases are dealt with by the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), which is based at the World Bank in Washington - the organisation whose task is to lend funds to the world's poorest countries.

From a development perspective, this plan gives cause for serious concern. The existing bilateral investment promotion and protection agreements (BIPAs) already intervene strongly in national sovereignty by allowing foreign investors to bring an action against signatory states before a tribunal. Argentina is the most frequent respondent, with 52 cases against it, followed by Venezuela (34), Ecuador (23) and Mexico (21). The compensation payments often run into hundreds of millions - and in some cases even billions - of euros. As a consequence, there is considerable opposition and resistance from developing countries and emerging economies. Bolivia, Ecuador and Venezuela have already withdrawn from the IC-SID, and South Africa, Bolivia and Ecuador have terminated several bilateral investment treaties (BITs). The members of the Bolivarian Alliance of the Americas (Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra América - ALBA) are planning to set up a mechanism to monitor international invest-

tor-state disputes and develop joint strategies for the provision of legal assistance to Latin American countries facing legal action.

### European investors vs. South Africa

In 2006, Italian investors in South Africa mounted an international arbitration procedure against the South African Government before the ICSID. These Italian investors held large investments in South Africa's mining industry via a Luxembourg-based holding company. Their claim challenged the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA), which came into force in 2004 and established a new framework for the allocation of extraction licences. This new framework aims inter alia to implement key elements of the South African Government's Black Economic Empowerment policy and the constitutional goal of redressing historical, social and economic inequalities and therefore includes an obligation to increase the equity share of "Historically Disadvantaged" South Africans in mining companies to 26 per cent. The Italians argued that these amendments to the legislation amounted to expropriation. In early 2010, the parties reached an out-of-court settlement, with South Africa waiving its requirement for the Italians to sell 26 per cent of their shareholdings to South Africans. In order to avoid similar cases in future, South Africa terminated its bilateral investment treaties with Germany, Luxembourg, Spain and Belgium in 2013.

The TTIP negotiations are crucially important for the further development of investment protection. In 2009, the EU's Lisbon Treaty transferred the Member States' investment policy competence to the European Commission. Since then, the Commission has not only been tasked with shaping the EU's investment policy in relation to future agreements with third countries, but must also harmonise the investment policies of the EU's 28 Member States. In total, the EU Member States have concluded around 1,200 investment protection agreements, the majority with developing countries and emerging economies. The TTIP negotiations will therefore have considerable influence on the harmonisation process, as well as on future free trade agreements concluded by the EU and on treaties negotiated within the WTO framework.

### Services

The main objective of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) and almost all the EU's bi-

lateral trade agreements is to promote further liberalisation of all markets in services. The Europeans are pursuing the same goal in the services sector as with investment: they want the TTIP to formalise the highest level of liberalisation in order to achieve more open markets.

This could, for example, have an adverse effect on a plurilateral forum in which the liberalisation of services in favour of European and US interests is also being discussed, namely the Trade in Services Agreement (TISA). There is a fear that together, the EU and the US could utilise this forum in order to push through the new TTIP rules. The regulatory scope that is important, indeed vital, for developing countries would thus be significantly curtailed.

In a further step, the EU and the US could attempt to make trade preferences and other concessions depend on future treaty partners' accession to plurilateral agreements on services that operate in accordance with TTIP rules. In that case, Europe and the US would have successfully bypassed the stalled Doha Round.

### Agricultural policy

Global agricultural relations have been dominated in recent decades by conflicts, dispute settlements and harmonisation of rules between the US and the EU. Disputes have been resolved without a transatlantic free trade agreement.

In cases where this was not achieved, other countries benefited from the existence of two different legal systems, for it meant that they were free to choose which regulatory regime they wished to apply. A better option than the TTIP, therefore, is for the international community to continue to reach agreement on new food standards or on rules for pesticide use multilaterally via the Codex Alimentarius Commission - the joint body established by the UN's Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) - or within the WTO framework.

From a development policy perspective, too, the TTIP is problematical, for a reduction in customs duties between the US and the EU could take place at the expense of the developing countries, due to the de facto loss of their current preferential tariff arrangements in trade with the EU. This would divert trade flows away from the developing countries, especially if Europe were to import products such as fish,



Kenyan carrots for the world market: A smallholder cooperative in Mau Narok in Kenya's Rift Valley collects and cleans carrots for export. Destinations now include Europe and the USA, but for how long? TTIP will mainly intensify trade between those two blocs. Developing countries are likely to lose out.

cotton, tobacco, citrus fruits and beef from the US, rather than from the poor countries.

### Preserving the precautionary principle

However, it is, above all, the decisions on rules and standards, rather than customs duties per se, which will crucially influence global agricultural trade in future - and this is the real purpose of the TTIP. But for European consumers, there are more fundamental issues at stake. Until now, the EU has applied the precautionary principle, which means that industry can only use chemicals or processes once it has furnished evidence that they are not harmful. In the US, by contrast, substances are considered to give no cause for concern as long as there is no evidence that they have a harmful effect. It seems likely that once the TTIP is in place, a permanent Regulatory Cooperation Council will facilitate compromises on currently contentious issues such as, in the area of animal products, the treatment of the traded meat (chlorinated chicken) and livestock keeping (use of growth hormones and antibiotics), meat from cloned animals and approval of genetically modified crops for food and feed and livestock. This will put the regulating bodies, parliaments and governments under pres-

sure to adopt these practices as the "gold standard", which will then be imposed on the rest of the world.

A lax regulatory system based on the principle of strong private regress rather than on governmental precaution is risky not only for Europe but especially for the developing countries. From their perspective, it is incumbent on industry itself to provide evidence that its products are harmless before they are admitted to the market and to cover the associated costs, since most developing countries lack the resources necessary for maintaining well-equipped laboratories to conduct their own effective analyses. This in itself is a good enough reason why the precautionary principle should be adopted as the global standard, as applies to GMOs under the Cartagena Protocol; a watered-down version within the TTIP framework is certainly not acceptable.

### A threat to developing countries' food security

The TTIP is, in effect, a support programme for the further intensification and industrialisation of an increasingly export-oriented farm sector. Whereas major agricultural companies and large producers will profit from the new trade opportunities, family



A small shop offering pre-processed foods from Europe on the Kaneshi market in Accra. Local produce is attracting ever fewer buyers. The deregulation of farming pushed by TTIP will bring more and more cut-price foods to Africa, putting smallholder production in a difficult situation.

farms and smaller processing firms on both sides of the Atlantic will face additional downward pressure on prices and mounting competition, which could ultimately squeeze them out of the market altogether.

Furthermore, the expansion of agro-industry puts the food security of hundreds of millions of small farmers, fishermen and herders in developing countries at risk. Even more low-cost exports from the EU and the US could flood the poor countries' markets - without any quid pro quo in the form of better access to the EU-North American trading bloc's markets for the farmers in the poor countries. The growing pressure from market competition on small-scale producers threatens to undermine poverty reduction efforts in the Global South.

Brazil and India, for example, are attempting to combat rural poverty by purchasing agricultural goods from small-scale producers at preferential rates through subsidised food programmes. This produce is then sold

cheaply at a subsidised rate to the urban poor via public canteens or specific shops. The TTIP would lead to targeted action against this type of programme between the two parties, and such a hostile attitude will spill over into the WTO rules. This could well affect schemes in Europe as well, where local authorities, for example, subsidise purchases of local, organic or fair-trade products for schools or hospitals.<sup>1</sup>

## Towards a sustainable and equitable trade policy: what is needed?

### Trade policy must be more democratic

A lack of transparency is one of the hallmarks of European trade policy - not only since the advent of the TTIP. Decisions are generally taken behind closed doors, with access reserved solely for specific

<sup>1</sup> — Hansen-Kuhn, Karen (2014): Trading away localization in TTIP, IATP, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 2014. Available online at: <http://www.iatp.org/documents/trading-away-localization-in-ttip>, 20.10.2014

interest groups - mainly business associations and representatives of major companies. Civil society organisations (CSOs), by contrast, are usually excluded from the negotiations. On the rare occasions when they are admitted to the proceedings, they are obliged to maintain strict confidentiality. In Germany, the lead Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy ensures that even institutions such as the Federal Environment Ministry and the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development are kept at arm's length.

This lack of transparency is one of the main reasons why civil society proposals on development and environmental policy and human rights aspects of the TTIP play such a negligible role. For that reason, it is essential for the EU to make public the full set of documents that form the basis of the negotiations. There should also be a broad consultation process to ensure that all the various tiers of government - federal, state (Land) and municipal - and ordinary citizens are able to contribute to the framing of a trade agreement.

### **The quality of trade policy must be enhanced**

The yardstick currently used to assess international trade performance is its monetary value, not its social and environmental quality. Under WTO rules, countries are not generally permitted to make trade in goods and services conditional on product manufacturing criteria. As a result, a foodstuff produced using pesticides, or a genetically modified food, enjoys the same right of access to overseas markets as a product from an organic farm.

The TTIP follows this logic in that the two fundamental principles of European environmental law - namely the precautionary principle and the polluter-pays principle - are defined as barriers to trade. Accordingly, US lobby groups criticise what they see as Europe's excessively slow licensing procedures and the requirement for labelling of GM foods. They also object to the further development of the EU Regulation on Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), the Euro standard on road vehicle emissions, and plans for a European Strategy on Plastic Waste in the Environment.

For trade to become a driver of social justice and sustainability, we need higher, not lower, social and environmental standards. Prohibitions, taxes and tariffs must be imposed on harmful manufacturing processes, and there must be scope to give targeted support to sustainable production methods.

### **The human rights dimension of trade policy must be strengthened**

In the Treaty on European Union, the EU states its commitment to respect and promote universally applicable and indivisible human rights in its external policies as well. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights reaffirm the state duty to protect against human rights abuse by business enterprises and the corporate responsibility to respect human rights. For European trade policy, this means that the EU must subject all its trade and investment agreements to independent human rights impact assessments on a regular basis. In light of the TTIP's potentially adverse impacts on developing countries and emerging economies, the EU has an obligation to include third countries in these human rights impact assessments as well.

All future international trade agreements should contain a human rights clause allowing the suspension or amendment of any treaty provisions that put human rights at risk. These agreements should also provide for the establishment of an independent and transparent complaint mechanism to deal with cases of investment-related human rights abuse in third countries.

### **Governments' scope for action must be expanded**

Equitable and sustainable trade policies which promote universal welfare and prosperity need a political governance framework. This is essential in order, firstly, to ensure that companies comply with existing environmental and social standards, and secondly, to facilitate the adoption of new rules on resource efficiency, environmental protection, social justice and human rights.

If the negotiators get their way, however, the TTIP will strengthen the rights of foreign investors on a unilateral basis. Special tribunals would then have the power to hand down legally binding decisions on whether legislation is adversely affecting private profits. These special rights - reserved for investors alone - to bring legal action will unduly restrict governments' scope for action, allowing companies' expectations of profit to take precedence over public welfare. And because the special tribunals lack transparency and are not subject to any control by the national courts, they undermine the rule of law. Dispute settlement mechanisms for companies should therefore be excluded from the scope of the TTIP and all bilateral investment and trade agreements.

## Respecting food sovereignty - promoting agroecology

Sustainable agriculture based firmly around rural farming communities needs a fair and equitable system of trade which takes account of farmers' interests all over the world, respects countries' rights to pursue policies geared towards food sovereignty, and protects the climate, the environment and biodiversity. Every country must be involved in the process of negotiating standards and rules. Reducing customs duties purely for the benefit of agro-industry cannot be the only approach to economic progress.

We advocate for the precautionary principle, which should be strengthened everywhere in the world. Organic farming must be promoted and progressed. And we firmly reject new high-risk technologies, the use of artificial treatments and additives, and any expansion of the area used to cultivate genetically modified crops.

The burgeoning global trade in foodstuffs and growing speculation in farm products are incompatible with a sustainable and secure world food supply. Instead, priority must be given to local, organic and fair-trade products, with an emphasis on supporting and facilitating this process. Preferential access for farm produce to markets in the Northern hemisphere must be expanded, especially if the value chains include small-scale producers and share a fair part of their profit with them. The TTIP, by contrast, is likely to curtail this access.

Non-intensive animal husbandry, restrictions on monocultures and the conservation of diverse landscape structures are appropriate steps in promoting a transatlantic farming revolution, with no need for a free trade agreement. This would also be a more effective way of reducing global poverty. The TTIP makes no contribution to the attainment of these goals.

## Implications for the TTIP negotiations

The planned US-EU free trade agreement conflicts with the fundamental requirements of a fair and sustainable trade policy. The negotiations are undemocratic and take place behind closed doors. Key elements of the agreement, such as the investor-to-state dispute settlement mechanism, threaten to undermine rule-of-law principles. The agreement primarily strengthens the rights of foreign investors. For the majority of developing countries and emerging economies, it is very likely to restrict their policy-making scope and curtail their opportunities for social and economic development.

The EU and the US should therefore suspend the current negotiations on a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership and, instead, should henceforth focus their trade policy ambitions on ensuring that multilateral trade relations at all levels are sustainable and equitable.

### Published by

Bread for the World - Protestant Development Service  
Protestant Agency for Diakonie and Development  
Caroline-Michaelis-Straße 1  
10115 Berlin, Germany  
Phone: +49 30 65211 0  
E-Mail: [info@brot-fuer-die-welt.de](mailto:info@brot-fuer-die-welt.de)  
[www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de](http://www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de)

**Author** Sven Hilbig, Francisco J. Marí

**Reviewer** Cornelia Geidel, Maike Lukow

**Translation** Christopher Hay

**Responsible according to press law** Thomas Sandner

**Photos** Rudolf Buntzel, Francisco J. Marí,

Sergej Seemann / fotolia.com

**Layout** János Theil

**Print** RetschDruck, Nagold

Printed on recycled paper

**Art. Nr.** 129 501 660

Berlin, November 2014