

New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition (New Alliance)

Development Committee Own-Initiative Report-Civil Society Input

March 2016

Small-scale food producers are collectively the leading investors in agriculture, estimated to produce approximately 70% of the food in Africa.¹ Addressing food and nutrition insecurity on the continent requires the full participation of those who are already producing, and who promote an agricultural system based on human rights and food sovereignty through local control over land, water, forests, seeds, knowledge and technology.

Since the New Alliance was launched in the G8 summit in 2012, civil society organisations have highlighted its negative impacts on people and the environment. The New Alliance is fundamentally flawed as it focuses on the extension of corporate-led, input-dependent industrial agriculture to the detriment of small-scale producers. This model of agricultural development is considered to be outdated in the expert report by Olivier De Schutter which was commissioned by the Committee on Development.² Last year over 100 organisations from African countries and across the world called on participating governments to stop all engagement in and support for the New Alliance.³

New Alliance progress report 2014-15

The New Alliance produced its own progress report to monitor its impact at the end of last year. However, for a project that involves USD \$6.3 billion⁴ of public money from across G7 countries, the progress report completely fails to provide adequate accountability:

- **The report is focused on corporate needs, not on food and nutrition insecurity and poverty:** The report's recommendations are focused on removing barriers to corporate investment, encouraging governments and donors to remedy problems faced by businesses. There is no concrete evaluation of the impacts of the investment projects on food security and poverty. The report overlooks the needs of farmers and people, and crucially ignores the supposed core objectives of the scheme, which are reducing hunger and poverty.
- **Lack of impact assessment on small scale producers:** The report measures the percentage of completed policy reforms. These policy reforms focus on seeds, land and tax laws. They primarily benefit corporations through the easing of export controls and tax obligations, changing seed laws in favour of multinational companies and facilitating transfers of community land to investors. The report does not assess the impacts of the New Alliance on small-scale farmers' control over land and seeds, the marginalisation

of local markets and loss of biodiversity and soil fertility. While reporting the jobs it has created, the report does not assess the quality of these jobs (job security, conditions etc) and does not record the loss of jobs as a result of New Alliance investments.

- **It is contradicted by all other reviews of the New Alliance:** The progress report contradicts the expert report by Olivier De Schutter who states that the New Alliance is hugely deficient in a number of areas⁵. Every review of the New Alliance by development NGOs⁶ has shown the negative impact of the New Alliance. These document allegations of land grabbing, unfair contract farming arrangements, the undermining of livelihoods and the promotion of corporate control of the African agricultural sector through legislative reforms.

Amendments of the draft Development Committee report on New Alliance

Due to the serious deficiencies that have been documented in several studies, we call on the EU to withdraw its support for the New Alliance.

With regards to the Development Committee's own-initiative report process, we urge MEPs to reject the following amendments to the draft report, **in order of priority:**

Amendments 113, 114, 115: [Reject](#)

Reason: The deficiencies of the New Alliance have been clearly articulated in the expert report by Olivier De Schutter and numerous other studies.

Amendment 52: [Reject](#)

Reason: There is a high risk that continuing to implement the policy reforms that countries have signed up to under the New Alliance will negatively impact small-scale producers, increasing risks of land grabs and loss of local seed systems.

Amendments 8, 59, 107: [Reject](#)

Reason: Providing support to the New Alliance contravenes the objective of supporting domestic local companies which cannot compete with multinationals that already benefit from a dominant market position. When referring to “private sector” it is essential to differentiate local private sector (small vs. medium and large) and multinationals.

Amendments 22, 23, 25, 62, 63, 70: [Reject](#)

Reason: The expert report by Olivier De Schutter criticises the exclusive focus on land titling and its impacts on women, inequality and land access. Land titling alone does not sufficiently guarantee equitable access to land nor secure land tenure. Strong governance and accountability systems need to be in place prior to any titling effort; otherwise risks are significant.

The Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests (VGGT) states the need to recognise all legitimate rights to land, including customary rights. See VGGT 3.1.1 “(States should) Recognize and respect all legitimate tenure right holders and their rights. They

should take reasonable measures to identify, record and respect legitimate tenure right holders and their rights, whether formally recorded or not.”

Amendments 96, 97: [Reject](#)

Reason: The EU has adopted a precautionary approach regarding GMOs, and should be coherent with its policies outside of Europe as well.

Amendments 74: [Reject](#)

Reason: Free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of impacted people is a crucial and necessary prerequisite for any land-related investment. In this regard, we strongly support the adoption of amendment 72.

Amendment 87: [Reject](#)

Reason: UPOV 1991 is not suitable for developing countries as it favours commercial seeds and large seed corporations. It disrupts and threatens the functioning of the existing farm-saved seed systems where farmers can keep, save and swap seeds. This is low cost, maintains biodiversity and builds resilience.

Amendment 14: [Reject](#)

Reason: Numerous studies on the New Alliance have reported the lack of participation of family farmers and small-scale food producers, as well as its deficient accountability and governance mechanisms.

Amendment 54, 102: [Reject](#)

Reason: The Co-operation Framework Agreements do not give enough information on the investment projects. Publishing the Letters of Intent (LOIs) is vital for monitoring New Alliance projects.

1 HLPE. 2013. Investing in smallholder agriculture for food security. A report by the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security, Rome. IFAD, UNEP 2013. Smallholders, food security and the environment. Rome.

2 Directorate General for External Policies Policy Department (16 Nov 2015),The New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition in Africa, p34.

3 <http://www.actionaid.org/2015/06/call-civil-society-organizations-their->

[governments-new-alliance-food-security-and-nutrition-](#)

4 New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition and Grow Africa Joint Annual Progress Report 2014-2015, p.9.

5 Directorate General for External Policies Policy Department (16 Nov 2016),The New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition in Africa, p4.

6 <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ic7MJbh-Af4mIT0avk1NN0sVJM-yb5CQ8PBcJPKF1OQ8/edit>

