

**Results of the dialogue process
in the “No one eats alone” campaign of Bread for the World**

March 06, 2008

A new agricultural policy for farmers in the North and South – The Case of Milk

1. Introduction

All in all, three-quarters of the more than 850 million people who are hungry and undernourished worldwide live in rural areas – in those regions where food is produced.

“Because of a lack of agricultural equipment and methods, many farmers in remote areas only have enough of the food staple rice to feed their families for three months of the year,” say Laurence Padillaen and Maria Cleofe Bernardino und of the Philippine farmers' organization the Palawan Center for Appropriate Rural Technology (PCART). “Their daily meal isn't ensured the rest of the year.”

The dialogue began already at the two-week International Rural Women's Conference in 2005, hosted by Bread for the World in cooperation with the smallholder farming organization *Arbeitsgemeinschaft bäuerliche Landwirtschaft (AbL)* and the rural women's association of Württemberg-Baden. There participants from many developing countries and Germany already identified mechanisms which could endanger living and economic conditions for the rural population, and devised general political proposals for action. Bread for the World and AbL are continuing this North-South Dialogue, using milk as a concrete example. The dialogue was conducted with this paper as a basis for discussion.

The way in which trade liberalization is taking place was identified as a considerable danger, and that process is continuing in negotiations within the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) between the EU and the ACP¹ countries, and other bilateral agreements among individual countries. Negotiations are dominated by the interests of the global retail sector, as well as transnational companies of the agricultural and food industries, and they threaten to endanger the lives and livelihoods of agricultural laborers and their families as well as family farms in the North and South. This undermines food sovereignty.

In this paper, we introduce our common guiding principles for new rules governing agricultural trade. They do not adhere only to international market mechanisms, but place the market in the service of societal, developmental and farming interests. Using the example of milk, the EU's agricultural and trade policies and their consequences for farmers in the North and South are outlined. Finally, farmers from Germany and representatives from farming organizations from Africa, Asia and Latin America agreed on common proposals on which politicians should take action.

The reason for this dialogue was not least the announcement by the European Commission that it had scheduled a 2008 review of its 2003 agricultural reform program. This review is referred to as a “health check.” And truly, the EU's agricultural and trade policy has health problems. We have made the EU Commission proposals, *Preparation for the CAP Health Check*, dated November 20, 2007, part of our dialogue and have included them in this paper. And we will incorporate our joint proposals for action into the public and political debate, which will help us be involved in the “health check.” After all, the EU Commission is expected to make its legislative proposals on May 20, 2008.

This “Dialogue between the North and South” is part of Bread for the World's campaign “No one eats alone.” Bread for the World is using this campaign to inform about the connection between hunger, our approach to consumption and the rules of the game in global trade. Bread for the World's

¹ The African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States, 80 countries that are usually former European colonies

campaign calls on people to take a stand on a more just economic and trade paradigm that respects the right to food worldwide.

2. Guiding principles for new agricultural trade policies

Sarath Fernando and Sandun Thudugala from the Sri Lankan farmers' organization MONLAR say, "MONLAR supports the general campaign goals as well as the guiding principles set out in this document."

"The discussion paper is comprehensive as it takes up subjects such as human rights, environmental protection as well as agricultural production and marketing in an age of globalization," says Sandra López Fernández of the farmers' organization Grupo de Promoción de la Agricultura Ecológica (GPAE).

Agriculture is more than a branch of the economy. It serves a wide range of purposes, especially for people living in rural areas and for nature. National and international agricultural policies must therefore include farming in this multi-functionality and diversity. Politicians have an obligation to design markets in such a way that all these functions are wholly supported. We have developed principles for agricultural policies, using this as a base.

The principle of...

...**social agriculture** means that agriculture produces high-quality food, preserves and creates jobs in rural areas, and offers people the opportunity to earn a living.

...**environmental protection** means that producing food and energy from renewable resources must preserve biodiversity, and that air, soil and water are used sparingly. When renewable resources are used to produce bioenergy, the production of food must remain a priority.

...**the right to a GMO-free life** means that farmers and consumers must have unlimited opportunities to make or consume their products without the use of genetic engineering.

...**a secure supply of food** means that people should have access to food that is healthy, culturally appropriate, is nutritional and of a wide variety and is thus of high quality.

...**regionalism** means that local and regional markets are a priority, because farmers can obtain fair prices for quality products mostly on the microeconomic level. That is a way to strengthen the regional creation of value and support rural economic development.

...**of international responsibility** means that national agricultural policies must be shaped in such a way that they do not harm agricultural producers from other countries, for example through dumping prices.

"Industrialized agriculture undermines the local, traditional and ecologically appropriate systems as well as the social role of agriculture," says Lucinda Quispealaya of CNA in Peru.

3. Problems with the EU's agricultural and trade policies: the case of milk

"Global agricultural trade rules that do not differentiate between developing and industrialized countries have a negative influence on those countries whose economies are overwhelmingly dominated by rural agricultural production, economies like ours," says Sandra López Fernández from Nicaragua.

"The EU subsidizes the export of dairy products that also end up on Kenya's markets. It is impossible for small-scale dairy producers to compete with these cheap imports, and they are

being crowded out of producing milk,” says Philip Ombidi of the Kenyan organization IDCCS.

So far, agricultural trade policies have disregarded the guiding principles listed above, as the European Union’s dairy policies demonstrate. The EU is one of the world’s largest exporters of dairy products – it has a one-third share of the global dairy market. Every year, it exports two to three times more dairy products than Australia does. Its export subsidies have hitherto allowed the EU to unduly influence dairy product prices worldwide, keeping them low.

“All efforts to increase dairy production here in Sri Lanka have failed abysmally, and the easiest solution for the government was to allow multi-national companies to import 80 percent of the local demand for milk ... The catastrophic consequence was that small-scale milk producers and production at the village level have disappeared. According to reports, only very few farmers still produce milk locally,” say Sandun Thudugala and Sarath Fernando about the situation in Sri Lanka.

“What can help poor farmers is an extremely important question that is becoming more and more complex and dynamic under the prevailing trade liberalization regime. The export subsidies of the EU, for example, are damaging to small-scale producers in the South as well as in the North, making them compete in the global market. But countries such as Bangladesh also benefit from these subsidies because they have to import most of their dairy products,” says Shahidul Islam of the Bangladesh organization UD.

Thanks to export subsidies, surplus milk from the EU has up to now been unloaded into markets in developing countries. There, milk powder, butter and condensed milk from the EU muscle out dairy products made by local and regional producers. For decades, these export subsidies have come in for severe criticism from development aid specialists – such subsidies are, after all, one of the most aggressive kinds of dumping. Bowing to pressure from European consumers and self-confident developing countries, the EU agreed to entirely abolish export subsidies, not just for dairy products. In the current WTO negotiations, these subsidies are scheduled to be abolished by the year 2013.

The EU has steadily reduced its dairy export subsidies in recent years. And since June 2007, all export subsidies for dairy products have been suspended – for the first time since this artificial way of lowering prices was introduced 40 years ago with the help of taxpayer money. But the EU could restart the subsidy program anytime if it deems it “necessary.” The EU Commission, for example, reinstated subsidies for unprocessed pork in November 2007 so that it could sell its surplus supplies to the global market. Germany’s Federal Minister of Agriculture, Horst Seehofer, announced in February 2008 that he even backed increasing export refunds for pork.

For those markets that have been severely disrupted by the EU’s program of export subsidies, the question must be asked how European dairies or exporters, which have been benefiting from these export subsidies, will react to the looming abolition of the subsidies. There has already been some reaction. The European dairy industry has called on the EU to cancel the existing milk quota. This

The logic of EU agricultural policy

The intended liberalization and export orientation of European agriculture strengthens the economic interests of corporations and endangers the future of small-scale farmers in this world. Milk is only one example.

- Milk surpluses in the EU are created by policy design. Thus export-oriented dairies are guaranteed surpluses so they can play a significant role in the global dairy products market and earn profits.
- EU dairy products, whose prices have been kept artificially low, usually due to export subsidies, end up in developing countries and have a destructive effect on domestic agriculture. After all, most people in developing countries are dependent on agriculture for their livelihoods.
- Milk surpluses have steadily forced down the price of milk in Europe. As a result, dairy producers here at home are in danger of going out of business.

quota sets a maximum amount of milk that each EU Member State and each individual farmer can produce without penalty.

Although the milk quota was set so high that production was 10 percent above how much the EU consumed as a whole, enabling the dairy industry to expand into the global market, continuing the quota no longer appears to be in the dairy industry's interests. Calls to abolish the quota are explained by stating that dairy producers would no longer pay in the long term to buy or lease the quota. And that would in turn make milk production in the EU more competitive internationally. This is obviously a calculated move: the European dairy industry would pay less for its commodity once the quota falls. And if limits on milk production were abolished, European dairy producers would likely increase the amount of milk they produce.

On November 20, 2007, the EU Commission put forward a proposal to increase the milk quota, "so that there will be a soft landing for the dairy sector when the quota system expires in 2014/15". About a month later, on December 12, the European Commission published a report called *Market Perspectives for the Milk Sector*. In it, it suggested that the milk quotas be raised by two percent on April 1, 2008 throughout the European Union.

A brief review of the health check:

Following on the 2003 agricultural reforms, the European Commission now plans a so-called "health check" of the Common Agricultural Policy in 2008

Timetable

November 20, 2007: The EU Commissioner for Agriculture proposes adjustments

Among them are the following:

- making direct payments more effective, more efficient and simpler through cutbacks in three areas (higher modulation, degression, raising the minimum level)
- cutting back certain market regulations, such as a confirmation that the milk quota will fall beginning in 2015, while another proposal foresees a gradual increase in the milk quota.

May 20, 2008: The EU Commission is due to put forward its proposals for legislation.

November 2008: Final decision expected by EU agriculture ministers during the French EU presidency.

Abolishing the milk quota will therefore strengthen the export strategy of the European dairy industry. EU-internal measures such as abolishing limits on milk production threaten to cancel out any positive effects that phasing out EU export subsidies would have on development. The livelihoods of local and regional farmers and dairy producers in the developing countries affected remain at risk, and the situation will be aggravated because of the changes in export strategy (increase in production). Dairy cattle owners in Europe also face significant risks due to this export strategy. After all, one of its significant elements is that the elimination of the producers' quota costs is to be used to lower the producer price of milk, and therefore the price of the dairy exporters' raw material.. This means that the average milk producer will not derive any benefits from the abolition of the milk quota and its associated costs.

Milk production worldwide increased in 2007 compared to the previous year, while in the EU milk supply dropped. Milk consumption in the EU increased more quickly than production did, since the milk quota now sets an upper limit for production. Just a small change in the available quantities in the EU can have a large-scale effect – as was shown by the market conditions in 2001. At the time, milk

supplies in the EU dropped by just 1.5 percent – but as a result, EU-subsidized exports of dairy products dropped significantly in the short term.

Current developments clearly show how a small shift in milk supplies within the EU affects the milk market. If quota rules are softened or even abolished and the EU expands its production of milk, then that would mean an end to the chance for milk prices to improve over the long term.

Those likely to benefit from the new situation are the export-oriented dairies in Europe and Germany. They are strongly interested in cheap milk. Exports make up 20 percent of the German dairy industry's total sales. And dairies are counting on profits within the global market in the future. In particular, they have turned their gaze to developing countries, where demand for milk is predicted to increase.²

4. Consequences for small-scale agriculture worldwide

Consequences in developing countries

Agricultural policies harm dairy farmers in the South...

During WTO negotiations, economic interests forced developing countries to significantly open up their markets, and further access to these markets is part of the current round of negotiations. African, Caribbean and Pacific countries are supposed to gradually dismantle their trade barriers as part of the EPA negotiations as well. This liberalization for so-called special products can be suspended in interim agreements. But for this to happen, not only do the countries within a region have to agree, but so do the different interest groups. Experience shows that that is a controversial and drawn-out process. It would be desirable if all staple foods fell into this category. But making an exception from liberalization does not mean that these products can then be adequately protected. The so-called “stand still clause” stipulates that duties and quotas cannot be increased – e.g. to protect the future development of a national dairy sector (milk collection, processing and marketing) from cheap imports. But since duties have already been lowered over the last 15 years, merely creating an exception from the general liberalization process would not be enough to guarantee comprehensive protection, especially since anti-dumping measures have already been made more difficult to introduce in the accords.

Domestic dairy sectors in developing countries are endangered even if just a small quantity of dairy products whose prices are kept artificially low by means of export subsidies is imported. The milk market in Jamaica, for example, has collapsed. Over the last 15 years, imported milk powder, largely from the EU, has replaced domestic milk production. It is cheaper for the dairies there to process milk powder from the EU and turn it into milk for sale to supermarkets, instead of selling milk produced in Jamaica. More than half of the dairy farmers have given up and sold their cows. According to a 2004 study by the Jamaica Dairy Development Board, employment has fallen by two-thirds. The amount of imported milk powder has risen from 1,200 tons in 1992 to 6,300 tons in the year 2000.³ Similar situations have occurred, for example, in Burkina Faso, Tanzania or Senegal.⁴

“The livelihoods of some 600,000 small-scale producers of milk in Kenya are threatened by dairy products imported from the EU,” says Philip Ombidi.

² Thomsen, Berit, 2007: A strategy for cheap milk – EU exports without export subsidies and their effect on farmers in North and South, Arbeitsgemeinschaft bäuerliche Landwirtschaft e.V. and MISEREOR e.V. (publishers), 2007, Hamm/Aachen.

³ Oxfam: Fact Sheet: Milk dumping, no publication date or location, www.oxfam.de/download/fact_sheet_milchdumping.pdf

⁴ FAO (2004): Impact of import surges: Country case study results, 20th session of the intergovernmental group on meat and dairy products, June 2004, Rome

Oudet, Maurice (2005): Agricultural subsidies create poverty: the example of EU milk in Burkina Faso by MISEREOR (publisher.), 2005, Aachen, Germany.

Cheap imports, be they dairy products or other agricultural products, destroy prospects for rural areas. Small-scale farmers in developing countries are seeing their livelihoods taken away. Processing and refining of agricultural raw materials, which forms the cornerstone of agricultural trade and for healthy rural development, is ground down to zero as well. One consequence is an increase in hunger and poverty. By not protecting the small-scale agricultural sector, national governments are ignoring the human right to food. So is the international community, by not taking responsibility for the world beyond their own borders. Such behavior also flies in the face of the Millennium Development Goals, which aim to halve the number of those going hungry worldwide by the year 2015.

Shahidul Islam's comments on this: "The Millennium Development Goals do not take into account the reasons behind hunger and poverty. However, the guiding principles of this discussion paper take up this challenge in a practical manner."

...but the planned beginnings of a reform will not solve their problems

If the EU dairy market is liberalized further – where the milk quotas rules are to be hollowed out and then abolished – then milk production in the EU is likely to increase. These surpluses, which cannot be sold on the European markets, will continue to be exported. This will remain a major goal for European dairies, especially if they continue to receive export subsidies to balance out the differences in price and to make themselves more competitive. But they could still be interested in these surpluses even after 2013, when export subsidies may be dropped, as the EU has offered to do in the current round of WTO negotiations – namely when the price for milk in Europe has dropped to levels equivalent to the global price and farmers are supported with direct payments. There would be no end to the destructive consequences for the dairy industry in developing countries. Instead, fluctuating prices and volumes in the global market affect them directly.

Effects in Germany

Crowding out of small-scale milk production because of the market regime ...

Overproduction in the EU is the result of administrative policy design. The milk quota is approximately 10% higher than the EU's own consumption and will even be gradually expanded by 1.5% in some EU countries, including Germany, by 2008/09. For years, the surpluses have led to a drop in producer prices for milk in the EU and also in Germany, even to 27.5 cents in spring 2007, the lowest price in more than ten years, which had not covered the dairy farms' production costs for a long time (many farms require a minimum price of 40 cents/liter of milk to cover their production costs⁵). That the price of milk in Germany (and in Europe) has risen since the summer of 2007 is a result of the supply of milk in the EU becoming tighter. In addition, the dairy farmers organized in the Bundesverband Deutscher Milchviehhalter (German Federal Dairy Farmers Association, BDM) threatened to stop delivering if the producer price for milk did not rise to a cost-covering level of at least 40 cents/liter which was to be maintained on a permanent basis. The dairy farmers exerted enormous pressure on the dairies to translate the current price increases into higher producer prices.

In the year 2007, some dairies in Germany paid far more than 40 cents/liter of milk during individual months. According to preliminary estimates, the average producer price in 2007 was 33.5 cents/liter of milk.

Market regime policy is partly responsible for rapid structural change in the dairy industry, as the following table shows. Over the last ten years, 50% of the dairy farms with less than 50 cows have gone out of business. And the current practice of supporting farms by means of direct payments will not stop this structural change. Linking support to just one criterion – the amount of land farmed or the

⁵ In Austria, for example, there was a higher minimum price because production costs and producer prices are relatively higher there.

amount of milk produced in the past (2005) – has the effect that large, streamlined farms benefit disproportionately from government support⁶.

Table: Farm size development in Germany

	Number of dairy farms with a herd size of ...			Total number of dairy farms
	... 1-49 animals 100 animals	...50-99 animals	...more than	
1996	165,400	16,600	3,900	185,900
2005	86,400	19,100	4,900	110,400

Source: ZMP Marktbilanz Milch 2006

... current reform plans are exacerbating the problems

Phasing out the milk quota, currently under discussion in the Health Check, and expanding the quotas aim to increase the amount of milk produced in the EU, which will again place pressure on the price and lower it. There is talk of future milk price scenarios between 21 and 27 cents. The continued existence in particular of small and medium-sized farms with a higher average production cost level would be at risk. But growing farms would not be able to cover their production costs, either, especially if they still need to bear high capital costs for previous phases of their growth.

The economic and ecological consequences are disastrous. Less productive regions in Germany (e.g. areas in the Black Forest and less productive grassland regions) would no longer be able to produce economically. But in these regions, there are hardly any alternatives to milk production. The people would lose their work, and the regions their added value. The effects of giving up milk production for the landscape and the environment would be that stretches of land would slowly but surely be overgrown with bushes and that biological diversity would be reduced. At the same time, milk production would shift to favorable locations. Animal husbandry would be concentrated on ever fewer farms, which would increase unbalanced nutrient input.

The political community conveys the message that it can cushion the effects of abolishing quotas, or even compensate them, by means of accompanying measures. But it fails to address the issue of financing possible government measures. Budget funds for promoting rural development have been cut back drastically for the next few years. In addition, proponents of phasing out quotas are claiming substantial funds precisely for the few farms which are to survive the structural change. For among other things, investment assistance is to promote growth. The gradation and rededication of direct payments as measures to further rural development, as proposed in the “Health Check,” is to be welcomed. But it will not be able to compensate for the effects of a concentration of milk production and processing on the most productive sites.

Milk plays a major role in Germany

- Germany produces approx. 30 million tons of milk and is the number one producer in the EU (142 million tons).
- More than 100,000 of the country's 400,000 farms are dairy farms.
- One-third of agricultural revenues are from the dairy sector alone.
- In the event that quotas are phased out, the number of dairy farms will be cut in half in the coming years, and farm size will increase.

⁶Vgl. www.wer-profitiert.de

5. Demands of farmers in the North and South

“It is the responsibility of the people of the South as well as the North to join forces to prevent negative global policies and to struggle for alternative policies,” Shahidul Islam points out.

“We believe that these proposals for action do not give a comprehensive answer to the questions of how to confront the power of the transnational and multinational corporations ...,” criticizes the Indonesian peasants' union FSPI, a member organization of La Via Campesina.

Sarath Fernando proposes the following supplemental demands: “No patents on seeds and genetic resources. Independent research must be strengthened internationally in order to improve the quality of production and food continuously.”

Agricultural policies must be readjusted so that they support a sustainable concept of rural development. Following our guiding principles (see section 2 above), this includes using natural resources sparingly and making it possible for farms to be a sustainable source of livelihoods. This also includes supporting appropriate framework conditions for creating non-agricultural employment in rural regions. In this context, processing high-quality agricultural products within the rural regions themselves plays an important role, in order to increase the value added in the region.

In the international context, the goals of agricultural policy and trade policy must be coherent, namely benefiting producers in the poorer and poorest countries of the world. We consider the following proposals for action necessary to guarantee that our guiding principles are put into practice.

Demands relating to EU trade policy:

“As long as an import tariff on milk of just 5% is in place [in our countries], local milk producers will hardly be able to compete with cheap milk imports, which are of higher quality, too,” write the Indonesian peasants' union FSPI, a member organization of La Via Campesina.

- The EU should end export dumping at once. To this end, export subsidies must be abolished immediately and effectively. Since export competition is supported indirectly as well, all exports at market prices lower than production costs must be stopped.
- The EU should support and strengthen developing countries' possibilities for protection, based on the concept of food sovereignty.

“Imports from small-scale agricultural production at fair prices must be given priority. For example, preferences for imports of sustainably-produced soy from small-scale agriculture in Brazil,” says Vincente Puhl of the organization FASE in Brazil.

- The EU should improve market access. Targeted support in the countries of the South for measures which aim to ensure compliance with quality standards (support of rural development) is to prevent isolation of the market by means of new trade barriers in form of standards. That is part of the concept of qualified market access which is to be introduced into the agricultural negotiations. Improved market access is to be ensured especially for processed products as well as for products whose production supports, rather than undermines, sustainable rural development in the South. At the same time, however, the concept also includes mutually accepting the necessary rights of every country to protect its markets, in order to support rural areas and rural development as well as employment in the agricultural sector.
- The EU should support and strengthen the proposed concepts regarding developing countries opportunities to protect their markets, for example by means of flexible and appropriate application of the classification of important staples as “special products” and effective “special protection mechanisms” in the event of import surges. Even after signing the EPAs and the interim

agreements, the EU should work towards ensuring that raising tariffs remains possible in order to protect small-scale agriculture and rural development.

Demands regarding EU agricultural policy (the case of milk):

- The EU should not abolish the milk quota system, but rather reform it. The EU should introduce a flexible steering system for the amount of milk to be produced. Its goal is to be a cost-covering producer price. When determining the permissible level of milk production, the EU should ensure that export dumping by means of direct and indirect subsidies is prevented.
- The second pillar, that is, the promotion of rural development, must not be downgraded to the venue where failed measures of the first pillar of agricultural policy (e.g. abolishment of the milk quota) are to be fixed. Rather, strengthening a small-scale and environmentally compatible means of production in the EU should be the focus of attention, and difficult site conditions such as topography or climate should be taken into consideration as well as additional quality requirements and environmental performance. These agricultural production systems require additional labor. In this way, businesses are supported which achieve special ecological performance and contribute to rural economic development.
- The EU must reduce the dumping effects of its direct payments. The EU Commission's proposal for differentiation is an important step in this direction. The differentiation should take account of the costs of agricultural labor so that larger family-owned businesses are not disadvantaged.

Demands regarding developing countries' trade policies:

- Developing country governments must withstand the pressure brought to bear by a massive national export orientation of their agricultural sectors which stems from international financial institutions such as the IMF (International Monetary Fund) and the World Bank.
- The governments must ensure in bilateral and multilateral negotiations that their domestic agricultural products which are important regarding livelihoods, rural development and poverty alleviation are protected from imports.
- To this end, room to maneuver within existing trade policies (e.g. within EPAs) is to be used and, where necessary, additionally required protection mechanisms are to be demanded.

Vincente Puhl from Brazil says, "In Southern Brazil, genetically-modified soy from Argentina found its way across the border and onto the farmers' fields illegally. The creeping contamination with genetically-modified soy has made the farmers dependent on multinationals in the genetic-engineering business, for example Monsanto. Our governments must prohibit and stop imports of illegal, genetically-modified seeds and products in order to prevent further contaminations of soy and other agricultural products."

Demands regarding developing countries' agricultural policies

"Another important conclusion is that not only the trade policies of the EU and other countries must be readjusted in such a way that they stop destroying local milk production in other countries. Likewise, the one-sided political orientation of the developing countries' governments towards privatization as well as reduction and abolition of protection mechanisms must be stopped," says Sarath Fernando.

- The governments should make support of rural areas and above all of small-scale producers the focus of attention because they are the majority of food producers worldwide. Suitable measures to support them include infrastructural measures, access to credit, agricultural extension systems and targeted government support measures.

- Support of domestic markets as well as local and regional processing are considered very important in national agricultural policy.
- Governments should end their support for privatization with simultaneous cutbacks in support for promoting and protecting small-scale producers.
- Governments are urged to implement the FAO guidelines on the “right to food,” including legal certainty regarding access to land and other productive resources.

Additional demands regarding national and international agricultural policies:

Vincente Puhl from Brazil: "The expanding production of bioethanol in Brazil is crowding out family farms from production and displacing them from their land, and is exacerbating the problems of hunger and poverty."

- Regarding the production of energy from renewables, regional food production and food supply must have priority over the production of biofuels.
- In order to improve the quality of production and food continuously, independent research regarding sustainable production must be strengthened internationally.
- No patents on seeds and genetic resources

6. Dialogue partners from the South:

Sarath Fernando and Sandun Thudugala from **Sri Lanka**, Movement for National Land and Agricultural Reform (MONLAR)

Ratih Kusuma from **Indonesia** for the Federation of Indonesian Peasant Union (FSPI), a member organization of La Via Campesina

Shahidul Islam from **Bangladesh**, Unnayan Dhara (UD)

Sandra López Fernández from **Nicaragua**, Grupo de Promoción de la Agricultura Ecológica (GPAE)

Philip Ombidi from **Kenya**, Inter Diocesan Christian Community Services Ltd. (IDCCS)

Laurence Padilla and Maria Cleofe Bernardino from the **Philippines**, Palawan Center for Appropriate Rural Technology (PCART)

Lucinda Quispealaya from **Peru**, Confederación Nacional Agraria (CNA)

Irmi Salzer from **Austria**, Österreichische Bergbauern und Bäuerinnen Vereinigung (ÖBV), La Via Campesina-Austria

Henri Njakoi from **Cameroon**, Heifer Project International-Cameroon (HPI-CMR)

The partners' comments in full:

www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/ernaehrung/agrardialog