



Genotype  
Wednesday, June 5, 2002

The Stockholm Syndrome -Part II

# Food Sovereignty II

## *Food Sovereignty and the World Food Summit – 27 Modest Proposals*

The theme for the NGO/CSO Forum during the World Food Conference in Rome in early June is Food Sovereignty – the rights of small producers to provide and of poor consumers to eat. For the fifth time since it was founded in 1945, FAO is trying to get governments to wake up to their national and global obligation to end food insecurity. Past conferences have bred platitudes without progress. This time, civil society must present a real and measurable agenda – and governments should either put up or shut up.

### *Jamboree Year*

UN Summit on Development, March 18-22,  
Monterrey, Mexico

Convention on Biological Diversity – Conference of the Parties, 6<sup>th</sup> COP and ICOP3 – April 8-26, 2002, The Hague, Netherlands.

World Food Summit, Review – June 5 – 13, 2002, Rome.

World Summit on Sustainable Development:

- ❑ 2<sup>nd</sup> WSSD PrepCom – New York, January 23-February 8, 2002.
- ❑ 3<sup>rd</sup> WSSD PrepCom – New York, March 25-April 5, 2002
- ❑ 4<sup>th</sup> WSSD PrepCom - (Ministerial) Bali, May 27 – June 7, 2002
- ❑ WSSD – Aug. 26 - Sept 4 Johannesburg, South Africa.

### **From Stockholm to Rome:**

Since the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment of 1972, civil society has been trapped in a pageant of United Nations' jamborees – theme and mega-theme - conferences that have promised everything and delivered only “frequent flier” points to global biocrats. Chief among these jamborees is the environmental parade that began in Stockholm thirty years ago, trod onto Rio's Earth Summit in 1992, and will march funeral-like to somber drummers in Johannesburg in 2002. As much as Heads of State and

government diplos would like the world to think of “Rio+10”, it is actually “Stockholm+30”. Thirty years of pomp and circumspection. In 1972, we were told “not to trust anyone over 30”. It is time to stop the Stockholm Syndrome.

Although the environmental pageantry has dominated the media, the painful procession of gala food fests have a still longer history. Since the founding of FAO in 1945, there have been four major attempts to have governments accept their national and international obligation to feed the hungry and ensure food security. As with the environmental parties, the food venues have devolved into a succession of pious statements and hollow commitments. The World Food Summit – Five Years (*and getting*) Later, is FAO's fifth brave effort to make governments and society accountable for the Right to Food. It is another example of the Stockholm Syndrome at play.

## ***Food Froth***

*"We have the means; we have the capacity, to wipe hunger and poverty from the face of the earth in our lifetime. We need only the will."*

- John F. Kennedy, US President,  
World Food Congress, Washington,  
D.C. USA, October, 1963.

*"We have the means; we have the capacity to wipe hunger and poverty from the face of the earth in our lifetime. We need only the will."*

- U Thant, Queen Juliana, Lester  
Pearson *et. al.* (and *ad nauseum*)  
2<sup>nd</sup> World Food Congress, The Hague,  
Netherlands, June, 1970.

*"...today we must proclaim a bold objective – that within a decade no child will go to bed hungry that no family will fear for its next day's bread, that no human being's future and capacities will be stunted by malnutrition ... Let the nations gathered here resolve to confront the challenge."*

- Henry Kissinger, US Secretary of  
State, UN World Food  
Conference, Rome, Italy.  
November, 1974.

*"This is a shameful document." "What bandages are we to apply so that, within 20 years, there are 400 million rather than 800 million starving people?"*

- Fidel Castro, Cuban President,  
World Food Summit, Rome, Italy,  
November, 1996.

## **The Stockholm Syndrome**

Short months after the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment, bank robbers were trapped by the Stockholm police and took local bank employees hostage in order to bargain for their escape. When the hostages were eventually released, many of them came to the defense of their captors and two actually became engaged. Psychiatrists described the phenomena as "the Stockholm Syndrome" – the survival tactic used by captive or otherwise subjugated people to build bonds of loyalty between themselves and their oppressors – literally to fall in love with their oppressors in the hopes of winning some security in return.

For thirty years, civil society and South governments have been victims of the Stockholm Syndrome – development and environment "groupies" going from conference to conference wanting to believe that progress is possible and that, this time, the rich governments and richer corporations will listen to reason and reduce their oppression. For further information, see ETC genotype, "Stop the Stockholm Syndrome" at [www.etcgroup.org](http://www.etcgroup.org).)

## **Stopping the Syndrome in Rome:**

Stopping the Stockholm Syndrome in Rome *does not* mean stopping the Food Summit. It does mean holding governments and the FAO Secretariat accountable for their 1996 commitments and for establishing measurable signposts for progress in the immediate years ahead. No more platitudes. It is time for specific actions with specific timelines and monitoring mechanisms. Peoples' Organizations and other civil society organizations coming to the Summit should be prepared to follow through from Rome with their national governments and regional organizations. The programming, financing and governance of FAO should be discussed and debated at the national level and CSOs should bring these issues before national media and legislative committees and ministries. Government leaders should not get away with grandstanding in Rome without repercussions at home.

To this end, CSOs should hammer out a specific agenda for both governments and the FAO Secretariat for the year ahead. We must also consider our own specific contributions to this agenda. At the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre, Brazil next January, the social movements present should come together to assess the progress made and to consider further steps.

***Unless real progress is made, this should be the last food jamboree. There should be no "Food Summit+10"!***

## Food Sovereignty

### *An Agenda for the Post Stockholm World*

Both the intellectual and the spiritual leadership for CSO involvement in the Food Summit has been coming from La Via Campesina – the global movement of small farmers' organizations. La Via Campesina has adopted a strategy for Food Sovereignty which we consider to be the overarching approach which must be embraced by the Food Summit and by agricultural and rural CSOs who may go to Johannesburg in August for the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Under the umbrella of Food Sovereignty there are three broad areas for action ...

1. Food Rights;
2. Resource Justice;
3. Environmental Amnesty.

**A Note on Context:** The 27 proposals below are *not* intended to replace either the Forum's Declaration nor its analysis of the state of progress since the 1996 Summit. The recommendations are a very far cry from any statement of principles or of collective action. In fact, the suggestions here are extraordinarily (perhaps, too) modest and *only* pose those initiatives that can reasonably be adopted and initiated by governments and/or by the FAO Secretariat in the immediate future.

- ❑ The proposals do not require new financial commitments that would be impossible in the months ahead.
- ❑ The proposals do not require a chain of intergovernmental meetings for approval.
- ❑ Inevitably, these criteria limit what can be achieved by the end of 2002 to nothing more than studies, meetings, and structural changes.

Nevertheless, if these steps were taken (for example, by FAO) they could bring about a significant transformation in the way in which intergovernmental organizations operate and, specifically, in their future relations with Essential Producers and civil society. On the other hand, if intergovernmental bodies fail to adopt most of these proposals, we will know - in a very few months - that there is no basis for further cooperation or dialogue with that organization.

The following is one (preliminary and limited) attempt to describe an agenda that could be debated and changed during the NGO/CSO Forum...

## 1. Food Rights:

The dominant theme arising from the CSO preparatory process is that the right to food – producing it and consuming it – has primacy over global economic rules governing trade, finance or even commercial regulation. The message can be summarized as follows ...

- ❑ Essential Producer-led Food Security
- ❑ Food before Trade

**Essential Producer-led Food Security:** This is an essential first-step toward food sovereignty. The *only* effective starting point for sustainable food security is with small-scale producers, their families and organizations. These are the people – including farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolk and forest guardians – who are feeding the world's 830 million

## *Food Fifth?*

- 1963** World Food Congress, Washington, D.C.
- 1970** 2<sup>nd</sup> World Food Congress, The Hague,
- 1974** UN World Food Conference, Rome.
- 1996** World Food Summit, Rome.
- 2002** World Food Summit – Five Years Later

hungry. Environmental, economic and technology policies that Essential Producers' Organizations believe will meet their needs have the only hope of leading the world to improved food security, livelihoods and landscapes.

### ***“Essential Producers”?***

All food producers play a vital role and have rights – including the right to be heard. Essential Producers are farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolk and forest guardians - characterized by their family-based production systems and small size. They are represented by their own organizations or indigenous communities. Essential Producers' Organizations must have a special status in food and agricultural fora because they represent the producers closest to the rural poor – most of the earth's malnourished peoples. Essential Producers' organizations also represent many of the people who are, themselves, malnourished. Because they live with and deal with all aspects of production and ecosystem conservation, Essential Producers also play a unique and creative cultural and environmental role. As both producers and consumers they cannot be represented by other organizations that also represent the interests of large commercial producers.

There should be no board, committee, panel or programme related to food security issues that does not have on it – be it at the local, national or global level – strong, facilitated (financial support for travel and participation as necessary), representation from Essential Producers' organizations. If policies, projects and programmes cannot be shown to have the practical support of Essential Producers, they should not be implemented. Essential Producers should be supported so that they can undertake an initiating role in proposing and preparing policy and programme opportunities.

#### ***Immediate Steps:***

1. *The Principle of Inclusiveness* should be adopted either by agreement at the World Food Summit or at the FAO Council session in November, 2002. In practise, the FAO Secretariat and governments should cooperate to ensure the facilitated representation of small producers' organizations (farmers, forest guardians, fisherfolk or pastoralists as appropriate) in all conferences and fora.
2. *The Principle of Dialogue* should also be adopted at all levels of governance to ensure that issues of concern to Essential Producers' Organizations receive attention in all food and agricultural policy fora. With the concurrence of one or more member governments, the Chair of any intergovernmental meeting in FAO should be able to allow for three hours of interpreted plenary time to debate issues proposed and presented by Essential Producers' Organizations. The issues for discussion would have to be identified at least six weeks in advance of the meeting.
3. *Gender Justice* – The issue of gender injustice is one shared both by civil society and by governments and intergovernmental organizations. Together with the FAO gender PAIA (Priority Area for Inter-disciplinary Action) and the relevant secretariat, Peoples' Organizations and other CSOs should develop a broad data-gathering and policy/practise review process on gender justice in food production and access and in the operations and management of national and international organizations, such as FAO, concerned with food, agriculture and rural development. The product of this shared activity should include multi-lingual popular-access booklets and audio-visual materials. Agreement to pursue these goals should be confirmed by the FAO Council in November.

4. *Broadening the Expertise* - Background documents, studies and expert advice concerning any and all aspects of food security and rural livelihoods must include a specific section discussing the potential implications for small producers and identifying the process of consultation with small producers that has led to these conclusions. Essential Producers' Organizations will, as they are able, provide lists of resource persons and groups that could be available to prepare such papers and to participate on study panels both nationally and internationally.
5. *Securing Sovereignty* - The Summit and/or the FAO Council should adopt the concept of Essential Producer-led Food Security and should invite sister agencies such as IFAD and WFP as well as CGIAR, GFAR and other relevant international bodies to do likewise. In order to operationalize this approach, each of the major commissions and committees of FAO should undertake a specific study – to be presented on the agenda of their next meeting – of the means by which this concept could be realized within the context of the work of the commission/committee. A progress report on the realization of this strategy in practical terms should be on the permanent agenda of each regular meeting of the commissions/committees.

**Food before Trade:** Governments in the United Nations cannot, on the one hand, commit as they did through the UN Declaration on Human Rights, that food is a basic human right and then make that right conditional to the WTO agricultural or TRIPS chapters. Food has primacy. No one should be allowed to die malnourished because of lesser treaties concerning trade or monetary management.

Civil Society's vision is to drastically restructure and subordinate the WTO's agricultural chapter to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and resolutions adopted by governments at FAO and elsewhere affirming The Right to Food. CSOs also want to guillotine the WTO's TRIPS (intellectual property) chapter.

***Immediate Steps:***

6. *Rights Facts* - The FAO Secretariat should consider preparing a popular overview publication describing the various legal instruments, protocols, covenants and conventions that support The Right to Food at national, regional, and international levels. This booklet should be translated into each of the world's major languages and distributed both through governments and through small producers' and other civil society organizations.
7. *Food Talks* - FAO should include representatives of small producers and poor consumers' organizations as advisors to its delegation to relevant meetings of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights where The Right to Food is likely to be discussed.
8. *Trade Talks* - Similarly, Essential Producer representatives should also be invited as advisors on FAO delegations to, among others, WTO, WIPO, UPOV, and UNCTAD conferences.
9. *Right to Food* - Recognizing that some work in this field has already been undertaken, FAO should prepare additional studies, as necessary, to determine the economic, social, and legal impact of – and a possible process for - establishing the precedence of The Right to Food over other international trade and monetary agreements. Progress toward this study should be reported at the FAO Council in November, 2002.

**2. Resource Justice:**

The second essential plank in CSO positions at the FAO Summit involves the issues surrounding natural resources – especially land rights, water, and genetic resources for food and agriculture (GRFA - including crop/forest and land and marine life and technologies). There are also specific concerns regarding the ownership and control of life and its processes. The rights of the landless must also be affixed in law. The right of poor producers not to be alienated from their territorial resources must also be entrenched. The two major issue groups might be summarized as follows...

- ❑ Access Rights
- ❑ Technology Assessment

**Access Rights:** In order to produce food and contribute to food security, small producers must have assured legal rights to territory (fields, forests, range, fishing grounds), genetic resources (seed or breeding stock), appropriate water and soil, and an equitable market infrastructure (from finance to transport).

The issue of gene justice arises here and with respect to technology assessment. Small producers and other civil society groups share a common view that there should be “no patents on life” – especially no monopolies over seeds and breeding stock vital to food sovereignty. In addition, many CSOs, including ETC group, also take an affirmative position calling for a Treaty Initiative to Share the Genetic Commons. (Some elements of this Treaty are still under intense discussion among CSOs and will be debated during the NGO/CSO Forum in Rome). Among the specific points that can be addressed at the Summit or in the months following...

***Immediate Steps:***

10. *Territorial Tenure* - At the next meeting of the Council – or as part of the regular reviews arising from the 1979 FAO Conference on Agrarian Reform, the FAO Secretariat should provide a report on the basis for - and processes required for - the formation of a Commission on Territorial Tenure and Food Security. This Commission should meet in rotation in conjunction with the Committees on Agriculture, on Forestry, and on Fisheries so as to ensure a full discussion of the constraints facing forest guardians, artisanal fisherfolk, pastoralists and farmers.
11. *New Enclosures* - The Economic and Social Department of FAO should undertake a study of recent developments in contract law, material and technology transfer agreements and licenses, intellectual property, and in remote sensing and monitoring technologies that could constrain the access of Essential Producers to appropriate technologies and materials vital to food security. The report should be made publicly available and be placed on the agenda of the Committee on Food Security within 18 months.
12. *Market Access* - The Economic and Social Department should prepare a report for an appropriate committee regarding constraints facing Essential Producers in marketing biodiversity products locally, nationally, and internationally – and steps that could be taken to encourage consumer support for diversity.
13. *Water Torts* - At its next meeting, the FAO Committee on Agriculture should consider a report from the Secretariat regarding a possible major research initiative on water resources for agriculture and human consumption. In particular, this initiative should consider trends in public and private systems of water management and review the possible need for additional or supplementary

international agreements related to the use of water for food and agriculture in the light of climate change research.

**Technology Assessment:** Civil society organizations have a strong general concern about the socio-environmental introduction of new agricultural technologies. We are equally concerned about the ownership and control of these technologies. The most common CSO vision is of a world free of genetically modified organisms. In the medium-term, this remains an entirely plausible goal. In the next 12 months, given recent GM contamination scandals in the USA, Canada, Europe, and Mexico (the latter encompassing the center of origin for maize where farmers' maize varieties in at least two states have been contaminated with DNA from genetically modified maize), the Precautionary Principle should require that a global GM moratorium on both grain and seed be put in place at least until governments and scientists have an effective capacity to regulate GM materials.

Within the context of GM seed issues, industry expects to commercialize Terminator ("suicide seed") technology within 18 months. The primary commercial market for the technology – according to both the US Department of Agriculture and Delta and Pine Land Co. – is the Third World. In total, more than 400 million hectares of land (an area the size of South Asia) and 1.4 billion people who depend for their survival on farm-saved seed could be at risk not long after the Johannesburg Summit rings to a close.

***Immediate Steps:***

14. *Right to Land and Food* - The Summit (or possibly the Director-General of FAO) should request the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights to begin debating the Right to Land and Farmers' Rights within the context of the Right to Food. Right to Food negotiations will take place in the summer of 2002 and their progress can be reviewed by the end of the year.
15. *Centre of Origin Moratorium* - The FAO Council in November - or the Summit itself in June - should adopt a resolution calling for a moratorium to the movement of GM grain or seed into their centres of origin until studies can be completed and evaluated by FAO and by governments on the possible implications of GM contamination within centers of origin. Additionally, FAO should announce that it will work with CGIAR and other concerned parties to undertake the necessary studies immediately with a view to reporting on their progress to governments within one year.
16. *Terminate Terminator* - The FAO Council or the Summit itself should adopt a resolution condemning Terminator technology. All patents associated with the technology should be surrendered to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization to prevent their use by any party.
17. *Ethical Encounters* - The FAO Panel of Eminent Experts on Ethics in Food and Agriculture should invite representatives of Essential Producers' Organizations and other CSOs to meet with the Panel for a full day to discuss ethical issues and perspectives of special concern to small-scale producers and poor consumers.
18. *Moral Moratorium* - Food aid CSOs should formally announce that they will not distribute GM grains in centres of diversity and, in addition, offer to work with the World Food Programme and bilateral providers to find alternative domestic or neighbouring grain replacements.
19. *ICENT* - At its next opportunity, the Food Security Committee should request that the FAO Legal Department undertake a study of the appropriateness of – and

elements of – a legally-binding International Convention on the Evaluation of New Technologies (ICENT) for the possible consideration of the Commission on Sustainable Development.

20. *Biotech Code* - Governments, at the October meeting of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA) should give full support for the work of the Commission in developing the Code of Conduct on Biotechnology that was deferred during the negotiating process for the new International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. CSOs, in fact, believe that a well-reasoned code should become legally-binding.

### **3. Environmental Amnesty:**

The third core element on the food agenda includes constraints to economic biowarfare (“agro-terrorism”) and the unevaluated introduction of new technologies, and support for ecological and organic production systems. Two initiatives could be supported in the upcoming FAO processes.

- Ecological Production
- Eco-system Protection

**Ecological Production:** The vision is that Essential Producer-oriented research and producer/food policy should be re-organized to promote ecological models. In the immediate future, research currently directed to the genetic modification of crops and livestock (including marine life) should be redirected to explicit support for organic production research under the principle of Essential Producer-led Food Security. (Non-GM biotech research is not affected by this proposition.)

#### ***Immediate Steps:***

21. *Feedback* - FAO, CGIAR, IFAD, the World Bank, and UNDP should provide interim reports clearly defining their current spending in all areas of Essential Producers and rural development and indicating the steps they are taking to shift their resources toward sustainable organic farming. Each agency should also propose mechanisms by which Essential Producers’ Organizations and other CSOs can participate in monitoring and evaluation processes with respect to this work. Each of these bodies has a governance meeting in the final months of 2002 wherein progress can be evaluated.
22. *Eco-echoes* - Issues related to ecological production systems should be placed on the agenda of each of the major FAO Committees (agriculture, fisheries, forestry) and the Committee on Food Security. Consultants from Essential Producers’ Organizations and other relevant CSOs should be invited to prepare background papers for intergovernmental discussions.
23. *MultiPester Effects* - Groundbreaking work related to integrated pest management should be the basis for developing a model for similar work more directly associated with fisheries and forests as well as to the management of livestock.
24. *ITAGRFA* - The FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture should be asked to adapt its existing International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture to create a new Treaty on Livestock (including aquatic) Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and a third Treaty for Forest-associated Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. In



each case, the general and unique rights of Essential Producers should be considered as a matter of national and international rights.

**Eco-System Protection:** In light of tainted blood, GM crop debacles, Mad Cow and Foot & Mouth disease scandals, governments should agree to adopt a treaty that will allow the UN System and CSOs to work together to monitor the evolution of new science and technologies and to establish mechanisms for their evaluation prior to their release into the environment and the marketplace.

This monitoring must also include agro-terrorism. The Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention being negotiated in Geneva should explicitly include provisions against agro-terrorism for economic or military purposes (including Terminator technology) and other instruments related to food and agricultural embargoes.

***Immediate steps:***

25. *Biosecurity*, including the food security and economic aspects of agro-terrorism should be added to the programme of work for the next COAG (Committee on Agriculture) meeting. Governments should agree that Terminator is a form of agro-terrorism as are food and seed embargoes.
26. *Innovative Ecoregional Strategies* – Some Essential Producers and other CSOs are prepared to work with FAO and other relevant national and international bodies to develop new initiatives to address the needs of small producers in specific eco-regional zones. A mechanism for dialogue toward the establishment of such shared initiatives should be set during the Summit with a view to achieving an initial assessment of the possibilities by the end of 2002. The initiative could, for example, involve the BIOD, ECOM, ORGA and CLIM PAIA's.

Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships: Most CSOs believe that the recent upsurge in enthusiasm by the UN and its member agencies for “Major Group” and “Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships” is either wrongly-placed or intentionally diversionary. Although CSOs are open to collaboration with committed governments and intergovernmental organizations and are eager to form effective alliances with local governments, and with other social movements, the vast majority *will not* enter into partnership with multinational corporations.

Nevertheless, there is serious need to strengthen the multi-stakeholder partnership among intergovernmental actors concerned with food and agriculture. Since the formation of CGIAR in 1972 and the World Food Conference of 1974, the capacity of the international community to work together for food security has been institutionally fragmented. This must change if the modest goals of the 1996 World Food Summit are to be realized.

27. *A New Roman Forum* - The World Food Summit and/or individual actors, should declare support for the formation of a biennial meeting of the major international institutional actors concerned with food security and rural development. Among those that must be involved are: FAO, IFAD, WFP, CGIAR, UNDP and World Bank. The meetings could be initiated by the Director-General of FAO and then be hosted by rotation by the heads of each of the participating agencies and organizations. The meetings should be public and civil society and governments should be welcome. Essential Producers should have facilitated access to the full preparatory and meeting process. The agenda of each meeting should include a report from each of the institutions as well as a major discussion on a programme area identified at the previous session. The major programme discussion in the first meeting should be Food Sovereignty. As part of the first meeting,

participating bodies should consider the future of the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) with a view to retiring its operations. The regional manifestations of the GFAR initiative should also be reviewed with the intent of strengthening their role and regional participation and building closer links to the institutions committed to the New Roman Forum.

## Next Steps

The points described here are simply indicative of the range of specific issues and steps that civil society will discuss during the NGO/CSO Forum on Food Sovereignty and at the Food Summit. In examining the Medium-Term Programme of Work in FAO and the specific tasks set before the FAO Priority Areas for Inter-Disciplinary Action (PAIAs), civil society will be prepared to make much more detailed proposals involving specific meetings, activities, and PAIAs during the Summit.

Attached is a table describing the potential links between CSO proposals and PAIAs.

<b>Operational Linkages Between Food Sovereignty and FAO Priority Areas for Inter-Disciplinary Action</b>			
<i>Food Sovereignty</i>	<i>FAO PAIA</i>	<i>US\$Million FY'2002-03</i>	<i>PAIA Description</i>
<b><i>Food Rights</i></b>			
Essential Producers	Gender	?	Gender equity initiatives within FAO
Essential Producer-led Food Security	GLOP	\$3.3	Global Perspective Studies
Essential Producer-led Food Security	ETHI	\$1.0	Ethics in Food and Agriculture
Food before Trade	QINF	\$4.4	Definitions, Norms, Methodologies and Quality of Information
Food before Trade	FCIT	\$2.6	Food for the Cities
Food before Trade	AWTO	\$3.0	WTO Multilateral Trade Negotiations on Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
<b><i>Resource Justice</i></b>			
Access Rights	LHOO	\$14.1	Local Institution Building to Improve Capacity for Achieving Sustainable Rural Livelihoods
Access Rights	PROD	\$10.1	Integrated Production Systems (SARD/SPFS)
Access Rights	SPAT	\$5.0	Spatial Information Management and Decision Support Tools
Access Rights	REHA	\$4.3	Disaster Prevention, Mitigation and Preparedness and Post-Emergency Relief & Rehabilitation
Technology Assessment	BTEC	\$4.5	Biotechnology Applications in Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Technology Assessment	BIOS	\$10.8	Biosecurity for Agriculture and Food Production
<b><i>Environmental Amnesty</i></b>			
Ecological Production	BIOD	\$4.2	Integrated Management of Biological Diversity for Food and Agriculture
Ecological Production	ECOM	\$2.6	Strengthening Capacity for Integrated Ecosystem Management
Ecological Production	ORGA	\$1.0	Organic Agriculture
Eco-system Protection	CLIM	\$1.3	Climate Change Issues in Agriculture

The Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration, formerly RAFI, is an international civil society organization headquartered in Canada. The ETC group is dedicated to the advancement of cultural and ecological diversity and human rights. [www.etcgroup.org](http://www.etcgroup.org). The ETC group is also a member of the Community Biodiversity Development and Conservation Programme (CBDC). The CBDC is a collaborative experimental initiative involving civil society organizations and public research institutions in 14 countries. The CBDC is dedicated to the exploration of community-directed programmes to strengthen the conservation and enhancement of agricultural biodiversity. The CBDC website is [www.cbdcprogram.org](http://www.cbdcprogram.org).