



Corporate Conquest

Why the UK and its EU partners must stop forcing Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) upon developing countries

The European Union is currently negotiating unfair trade deals with 76 developing countries from the Africa, Caribbean and Pacific region (ACP) behind closed doors. If these Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) are ratified, they will have a devastating impact on poor communities and their natural resources. By forcing poor countries' farmers and industries into unfair competition with rich countries, infant industries are set to be destroyed and small farmers driven off their land.

In addition, the EU is attempting to include new investment rules that would give European corporations greater rights over poor countries, despite the fact that developing countries have already rejected this at world trade talks. This would pave the way for corporations to exploit natural resources with minimal regulation. The UK and its EU partners have until the end of 2007 to push these deals through.

Friends of the Earth inspires solutions to environmental problems, which make life better for people.

Friends of the Earth is:

- the UK's most influential national environmental campaigning organisation**
- the most extensive environmental network in the world, with almost one million supporters across five continents and over 60 national organisations worldwide**
- a unique network of campaigning local groups, working in over 200 communities throughout England, Wales and Northern Ireland**
- dependent on individuals for over 90 per cent of its income.**

To join or make a donation call us on 0800 581 051

Friends of the Earth, 26-28 Underwood Street, London N1 7JQ

Tel: 020 7490 1555 Fax: 020 7490 0881 Email: info@foe.co.uk Website: www.foe.co.uk

Friends of the Earth Limited company number 1012357

♻️ Printed on paper made from 100 per cent post-consumer waste

EPA zones in the Africa, Caribbean and Pacific region

Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA)

Burundi, Comoros, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritius, Madagascar, Rwanda, Seychelles, Sudan, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe

West Africa (ECOWAS)

Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo

Central Africa (CEMAC)

Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Republic of), Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, São Tome and Principe

Southern African Development Community (SADC)

Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, Tanzania

Caribbean Community (CARICOM)

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Montserrat, Saint Lucia, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Dominican Republic

Pacific Islands

Cook Islands, Fiji Islands, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu

EPAs spell disaster for the poor and their environment

Not only have the UK government and its EU partners been aggressively pushing unfair trade rules onto developing countries through the World Trade Organisation (WTO), but now they are forcing even more harmful European regional trade deals upon them. Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) are Europe's first attempt to carve out free trade areas with mostly former colonies in the Africa, Caribbean and Pacific region (ACP).

More than 90 per cent of the population of ACP countries lives in sub-Saharan Africa.¹ The ACP countries are split into six regions: four in Africa; one in the Pacific and another in the Caribbean (see box above). The negotiations with these six blocs that are being led by the European Commission (EC) are not transparent and are taking place away from public scrutiny.

If these agreements are signed, they will plunge vulnerable communities deeper into poverty and cause lasting damage to their environment. Yet for European corporations this agenda represents a potential bonanza by allowing them to flood Southern markets with heavily subsidised goods whilst opening up precious natural resources for them to exploit with minimal regulation.

The UK and its EU partners are pressing for the ACP to open up to 90 per cent of their markets to European corporations which could result in a massive loss of revenue for developing countries.² However, the EU is not granting any concessions in return – only allowing ACP countries continued preferential access to EU markets. This is grossly unfair and inequitable. The United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan has expressed concern over the impact of EPAs on developing countries and their ability to tackle poverty.³

Since 1976, the EU's political and economic relations with ACP countries have been governed through Lomé conventions. These conventions allowed developing countries preferential access to EU markets whilst giving them policy space to protect their own domestic agriculture and industry. In 2000, the Cotonou Agreement that replaced these conventions continued to allow ACP countries to make their own economic and development decisions. This more development-friendly approach changed dramatically in 2002 when five-year long negotiations on EPAs began.

EPAs were designed to be WTO-compatible. The European Commission (EC) which is responsible for negotiating with ACP countries on behalf of EU member states is attempting to force open ACP markets by bringing EPAs in line with WTO rules.

The most relevant of these rules is Article 24⁴ of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), a founding document of the WTO. The EC interprets the clauses within this article to mean that 90 per cent of trade in goods between Europe and ACP countries must

¹ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, The Secretariat of the Africa, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States, "The Agricultural Dimension of the ACP-EU Economic Partnership Agreements", p.4, 2006 <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/009/ag303e/ag303e00.pdf>

² The UK's Institute for Development Studies (IDS) has estimated that, from the base scenario of 80 percent liberalisation, three quarters of ACP countries could lose 40 percent of their EU tariff revenue, while over a third may lose as much as 60 percent or more. See Christopher Stevens and Jane Kennan, "EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreements: The Effects of Reciprocity". Institute of Development Studies, 2005 www.odi.org.uk/jedg/Projects/chris_stevens/CSEPARCEBP2.pdf

³ Kofi Annan, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's message to the Fourth Summit

⁴ www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/region_e/regatt_e.htm#gatt

be liberalised. Europe's position on EPAs is shaped by the concept of reciprocity- that poor countries should compete equally with rich nations without taking into account the huge economic asymmetries that exist between them.

This essentially means that developing countries are being given an ultimatum – to open up their markets to face direct competition from powerful European business and farmers or have their current preferential access to EU markets repealed. These policies are difficult for poor countries to reject as they are major recipients of EU aid and fear losing this important financial support if they reject EPAs.

EPAs are based on WTO rules which are already rigged in favour of its powerful members, but EPAs are potentially more damaging as they re-introduce harmful economic policies that were stopped by developing countries at world trade talks in Cancún in 2003. Poor countries expressed most concern over the issue of investment which would give corporations greater rights over their economies.⁵ The EU failed to push investment through at the WTO and is now trying to force it through the backdoor with EPAs.

The investment deals being proposed by the EU within the EPAs framework are designed to reduce restrictions on foreign direct investment. What this means in practice is the handing over of more rights to foreign corporations to exploit natural resources with minimal government regulation.

If these deals are ratified (different countries have different ratification processes) before the end of 2007, they will come into force in 2008. Cheap European exports are set to flood developing countries' markets and destroy local businesses and farmers that would be unable to compete with these heavily subsidised goods.

The European Commission's own impact assessment has predicted that this could lead to the collapse of the manufacturing sector in West Africa.⁶ In September 2006, another EU impact assessment stated that EPAs could lead to a "strong decrease in public revenues" in Central Africa.⁷ The ensuing poverty and unemployment would dramatically increase the pressure on natural resources.

The negotiations are veiled in secrecy and it is unclear which sectors would be slated for liberalisation. Yet the economies of ACP countries are driven by exploitation of natural resources such as oil, gas, minerals, fish and forest sectors. By forcing open these markets to corporate interests, it is most likely that local communities and their environment will come under threat. Even the EU's own impact assessment states that Central African countries should consider the environmental costs of trade liberalisation such as increased deforestation resulting from timber exports and environmental degradation linked to oil exploration.⁸

⁵ Investment is part of the Singapore Issues or 'new issues', including public procurement and competition policy, that powerful nations have attempted to include in the Doha.

⁶ PricewaterhouseCoopers, "Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) of the EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreements," 1 October 2003, pp 125-127 www.sia-gcc.org/acp/download/summarized_mid-term_report_final_doc_light.pdf

⁷ PricewaterhouseCoopers, "Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) of the EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreements: Financial Services in Central Africa," 11 September 2006 www.sia-gcc.org/acp/download/sia_fs_cemac_finalreport_11sept2006.pdf

⁸ *ibid* p.34

Investment: a Trojan horse for European corporations

An investment deal could inflict lasting damage on poor communities and their environment because sectors that have been protected by ACP countries such as oil, gas, forests, fisheries and agriculture may be deregulated and pried open to foreign corporations, severing poor communities from their precious natural resources.

Evidence shows how poorly regulated foreign direct investment (FDI) can impact negatively on communities and the environment. For example, in Nigeria where the main economic activity is oil and gas, foreign companies such as Shell have caused long-term damage to the environment through gas flaring and pollution in the Niger Delta.⁹

Mining has been a major recipient of foreign direct investment in Africa. During the 1990s when Zambia opened up its copper mines, investment resulted in huge environmental damage. Air pollution, including dust from waste dumps, has led to an increase in bronchial disease for nearby communities and rivers have been polluted.¹⁰ New investment rules would close down ACP government policy space to regulate such corporate abuses and would also increase the likelihood of such abuses taking place.

The EU pushed for investment rules that were rejected at world trade talks in 2003. It would have minimised developing countries' abilities to regulate foreign corporations, opening up sensitive sectors to foreign investors. There has been a trend towards the liberalisation of foreign investment in the last 15 years, yet many developing countries have strengthened their protection of certain sectors. All developing countries have an application or approval process for FDI and there is no unlimited access to all sectors for foreign corporations.¹¹

Botswana has regulated investment in diamond mining through a joint venture between the Botswana Government and the South African based company DeBeers. The Government has successfully channelled revenue generated into health and education. In other sectors where foreign corporations operate, conditions have been implemented to transfer technology and to ensure the employment nationals in management.¹² Under an EPA investment agreement, these new demands would not be possible.

This case highlights how foreign direct investment could bring benefits to developing countries when managed properly. However, when sensitive sectors are opened up and controls on investment are removed, communities are unable to maximise positive benefits to the local population and environment. ACP countries are also unable to minimise negative impacts such as environmental damage from oil, gas and mineral extraction.

Regulations are currently in place in African countries to protect sensitive sectors. For example, Ethiopia reserves certain sectors for domestic firms including saw milling and timber making products. Ghana has restrictions on foreign investment for mining, petroleum

⁹ Friends of the Earth, "Behind the Shine: the other Shell report" 2004

www.foe.co.uk/resource/reports/behind_shine.pdf

Friends of the Earth, "Broken Promises: How Shell's non-compliance with the OECD guidelines harms people and the environment", June 2006

www.foe.co.uk/resource/briefings/broken_promises.pdf

¹⁰ Colin Nov Boocock, "Environmental Impacts of Foreign Direct Investment in the Mining Sector in sub-Saharan Africa", 2002 www.natural-resources.org

¹¹ United Nations Conference on Trade and development (UNCTAD), "The determinants of liberalization of FDI policy in developing countries: a cross-sectional analysis, 1992-2001", 2005

¹² UNCTAD, "Investment Policy Review Botswana", 2003 www.unctad.org/en/docs/iteipcmisc10_en.pdf

and tuna fishing. It also has regulations to ensure that foreign companies provide transfer of technology.

In Mozambique, there is a government review process for large agricultural projects and forestry projects – allowing policy space to assess potential environmental impacts. Uganda and Tanzania require secondary licenses for foreign investment in mining, fishing, and forestry sectors. Tanzania also prohibits FDI in armaments and hazardous chemicals.¹³

If an investment deal came into force in these countries such restrictions would be removed as they would be ruled as discriminatory towards European corporations. This would reduce these governments' ability to regulate corporate abuses. Such investment agreements give corporations increased rights to repatriate profits abroad whilst stripping away developing countries' ability to regulate foreign investors. In addition, once a sector is opened up, developing countries would be locked into liberalisation commitments for the future-removing flexibility to repeal the decision.

This is particularly concerning for ACP countries as foreign corporations already take advantage of the relative openness of their investment regimes, particularly throughout Africa. Twenty Western corporations, including four UK companies, have brought cases against African, Caribbean and Pacific states.¹⁴ While European corporations are being given more rights to sue poor countries, these countries are having their rights to regulate these companies taken away. ACP countries can expect to have an increasing number of cases brought against them if an investment deal is passed in any of the six regional blocs.

Case study 1

The UK water company Biwater¹⁵ is currently suing Tanzania, one of the poorest countries in the world, in response to the Government cancelling a contract with its subsidiary City Water. Two years into a ten-year \$102 million water privatisation contract, the company allegedly failed to make even half the required investment or improve services in Dar es Salaam. Campaigners and journalists are requesting that the oral proceedings of this case are open to the public.¹⁶

Case study 2

Another UK corporation Booker¹⁷ sought to hold the poverty-stricken southern American state of Guyana liable over alleged incurred debt. Heavily indebted poor countries expressed concern that foreign creditors have resorted to suing them over debt repayment.¹⁸ After pressure from campaigners the case was dropped in 2003.

¹³ OECD, "NEPAD/ OECD Investment Initiative. Investment for African Development: Making it Happen", 25 May 2005 www.oecd.org/dataoecd/25/6/34783838.pdf

¹⁴ www.worldbank.org/icsid/cases/cases.htm

¹⁵ www.biwater.com

¹⁶ www.wdm.org.uk

¹⁷ www.booker.co.uk

¹⁸ www.jubileeresearch.org/hipc/hipc_news/guyana071002.htm

Case study 3

A UK company, CDC that is wholly owned by the UK Government's Department for International Development¹⁹ sued the Seychelles over a dispute about loans to upgrade two power stations.²⁰

Other Western companies include mining, oil and gas corporations have brought cases against some of the poorest states in the world such as the Democratic Republic of Congo and Niger over disputed exploration and exploitation concessions.²¹

Agriculture

Millions of farmers in ACP countries depend upon agriculture for their livelihoods. Yet the welfare of these farmers and their families is critically threatened by EPAs. Trade liberalisation through EPAs would not only open developing countries to cheap imports, but it would also reduce their ability to support their own farmers. In addition, an investment deal could open up agriculture sectors to EU agri-businesses which would force communities off their land to make way for foreign companies.

Friends of the Earth Ghana has warned that EPAs are likely to undermine agricultural sectors. Rice and poultry farmers have already suffered from trade liberalisation and unfair competition from subsidised imports. An increase in cheap EU imports of frozen chicken and cheap rice from the EU would force rice farmers out of work and could lead to the collapse of the poultry industry.²²

Rice is essential for many African countries' food security. Studies by the United Nations Environmental Programme highlight that further trade liberalisation threatens small-scale rice farmers and the environment in countries such as Senegal and Nigeria.²³ Such impacts range from soil erosion, the increasing use of pesticides, water pollution and the loss of biodiversity to the destruction of forests as demand for new agricultural land intensifies.

Cheap European imports from milk powder and wheat to canned tomatoes and second hand clothes have already flooded African countries at the expense of livelihoods of small farmers and factory workers. In West Africa, EU imports of cereals such as wheat and valued-added farm products such as canned tomatoes depress agro-industries in countries such as

¹⁹ CDC aims to fulfil its role as a pioneer for the private sector in developing countries through direct investment and the mobilisation of third party capital from other sources of finance. In this respect CDC is the UK equivalent of the World Bank's private sector arm, the International Finance Corporation, which has been widely criticised for extending the reach of the private sector into public services in developing countries. www.cdcgroup.com

²⁰ www.worldbank.org/icsid/cases/conclude.htm

²¹ www.worldbank.org/icsid/cases/cases.htm; see also the case of Ridgepoint Overseas Development vs. Democratic Republic of Congo at www.raid-uk.org/docs/Complaints/UK_NCP_Complaints.pdf#search=%22ridgepoint%20raid%22

²² Correspondence for Friends of the Earth Ghana

²³ United Nations Environmental Programme, "Integrated Assessment of the Impact of Trade Liberalization on the Rice Sector. UNEP Country Projects Round III, A Synthesis Report", 2005, pp.22, 72-73

www.unep.ch/etb/publications/intAssessment/RapSynRice.pdf

United Nations Environmental Programme, "Integrated Assessment of the Impact of Trade Liberalization on the Rice Sector: A Country Study on the Nigerian Rice Sector", 2005

www.unep.ch/etb/publications/intAssessment/Nigeria.pdf

UNEP, "Evaluation intégrée de l'impact de la libéralisation du commerce: Une étude de cas sur la filière du riz au Sénégal", 2005 www.unep.ch/etb/publications/intAssessment/Senegal.pdf

Senegal and Ghana.²⁴

In addition, second-hand clothing from Europe is already depressing West Africa's textile industry using locally grown cotton lint.²⁵ The most likely scenario under EPAs is that West Africa would be flooded with even more worn clothes – destroying the vulnerable textile industry and the livelihoods of poor West African cotton farmers.

Past experience shows us that these agricultural sectors need to be protected if they are to survive. The UK and its EU partners are trying to force through the opposite of what is needed for successful economic development.

Opening up ACP countries' markets would also impact negatively on agriculture indirectly. Cheap EU manufactured imports are set to flood their markets, destroying infant industry and setting in motion a process of deindustrialisation. This would lead to an even greater reliance on primary agricultural products for export, the prices of which have been declining for years. The focus on agriculture for export rather than for domestic consumption may well lead to less sustainable, large-scale farms. These policies would also directly impact upon poor countries' ability to generate revenues that could be spent on health (including HIV/Aids treatment), education and tackling environmental problems.

Fisheries

Fish is one of the main exports of ACP countries and is essential for poorer countries' food security. The fishing industry provides livelihoods for millions of people across the globe. Furthermore, developing countries provide 70 per cent of all of the fish consumed by people worldwide, although most of it is channeled to wealthy nations.

Ninety per cent of fisherfolk worldwide – nearly 40 million people – are employed in small-scale artisanal fishing and are responsible for 45 per cent of global fish production.²⁶ However, these small-scale fishermen and women are overwhelmingly poor. EPAs could force these sectors open further to European fleets that would destroy livelihoods and damage marine life.

United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) reports have highlighted the devastating impact European fleets have already had on fishing stocks, marine life and the livelihoods of African fisherfolk. In Senegal trade liberalisation exposed its waters to heavily subsidised fleets.²⁷ Ecologists claim that some 11,000 tonnes of fish caught in Senegalese waters are discarded annually by EU trawlers.²⁸

UNEP studies show that in Mauritania fishing stocks have been devastated largely as a result of trade liberalisation with certain species such as sawfish disappearing altogether.

²⁴ PriceWaterHouseCoopers, "Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) of the EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreements, Phase Two", 27 July 2005

²⁵ PriceWaterHouseCoopers, "Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) of the EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreements, Regional SIA: Caribbean ACP countries, Phase Two", 27 July 2005

²⁶ Friends of the Earth, *The tyranny of free trade: wasted natural wealth and lost livelihoods*, 2005
www.foei.org/publications/pdfs/tyranny.pdf

²⁷ United Nations Environmental Programme, "Economic Reforms, Trade Liberalization and the Environment: a Synthesis of UNEP Country Projects", 2001
www.unep.ch/etu/doha/pdfs/papers/synthesisround2.pdf#search=%22unep%20fish%20senegal%20trade%20liberalisation%20%22

²⁸ Oceana, "European Trawlers are Destroying the Ocean", 2005
www.oceana.org/fileadmin/oceana/uploads/europe/reports/european_trawlers_destroying_oceans.pdf

This over-exploitation of fish stocks destroys the livelihoods of fishing communities and undermines their food security.²⁹

In the Pacific region, fish and especially tuna is the most important resource. Over half of the world's tuna comes from the Pacific region. A fishing agreement between the EU and the Pacific countries will be negotiated within the EPAs framework and could allow EU vessels to extend their reach further into the region. This could pose environmental risks as many tuna species are already fully or over-exploited.³⁰ The by-catch of other endangered species can lead to lasting damage of the marine environment.

Seventy per cent of wild fish stocks are exploited, over-exploited or depleted. Any additional fishing – which could be triggered by these trade liberalisation agreements – may cause extinction and hinder regeneration of depleted fish stocks.³¹

Forests

In ACP countries millions of indigenous people are reliant on forest resources for their livelihoods – for food and fuel, medicines and materials. The loss of forest resources is believed directly to affect 90 per cent of the 1.2 billion people who live in extreme poverty.³²

The European Commission's own impact assessment ahead of world trade talks in December 2005 states that: "Trade liberalization can accentuate negative sustainability trends unless appropriate forest governance systems are in place and enforced". Such systems are clearly not operating in many countries and further liberalisation should therefore not take place.

The report also points out that in ACP countries such as the Congo Basin countries and Papua New Guinea, possible negative impacts on biodiversity can be irreversible.³³ A UNEP study reinforces this study by highlighting how trade liberalisation in another ACP country, Tanzania led to a rapid increase in deforestation as exports for forest-based products rose dramatically.³⁴

With world trade talks currently in abeyance, EPAs which are based on WTO rules, pose a serious threat to forests. The EU's impact assessment from September 2006 states that trade liberalisation induced by EPAs could include negative externalities including deforestation associated with wood exports.

Other than increased exports of timber products, trade liberalisation under EPAs can threaten forests indirectly. Trade liberalisation encourages an economic model whereby agricultural production is oriented towards export rather than local consumption. This policy can impact negatively on precious forest resources as land is cleared to make way for

²⁹ United Nations Environmental Programme, "UNEP briefs on economics, trade and sustainable development", May 2002 www.unep.ch/etu/publications/UNEP_Fisheries.pdf

³⁰ PriceWaterHouseCoopers, "Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) of the EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreements, Phase Two", 27 July 2005 pp28-33 www.sia-ACP.org

³¹ ibid

³² Friends of the Earth, "Can't see the forest for the trees", 2005

³³ The Institute for Development Policies and Management University of Manchester, Savcor Indufor Oy "Sustainability Impact Assessment of Proposed WTO Negotiations: Final Report for the Forest Sector Study", 2005 www.sia-trade.org/wto/Phase3B/Reports/ForestFR19June05.pdf

³⁴ United Nations Environmental Program, "Economic Reforms, Trade Liberalization and the Environment: A Synthesis of UNEP Country Projects", November 2001 www.unep.ch/etu/doha/pdfs/papers/synthesisround2.pdf

further agricultural exports.

Examples of this are given in the EU's own impact assessments. Forests have been cleared in West Africa when the economies were re-oriented to export cash crops such as coffee, cotton and sugar.³⁵ The United Nations Environmental Programme has highlighted how trade liberalisation has led to the expansion of rice farming that has destroyed forests in developing countries. EPAs would result in a dramatic acceleration of trade liberalisation that would predictably increase this pressure on forest resources.

Conclusion

The European Commissioner for Trade, Peter Mandelson claims: "EPAs have been designed to create the conditions that foster sustainable development."³⁶ In reality, EPAs were primarily designed by the EU to create markets for its corporations and its agenda is clearly not conducive to sustainable development.

While the Commission has generally been unresponsive to campaigners concerns over EPAs, the UK Government promised not to force trade liberalisation onto developing countries through EPAs.³⁷ It also stated that investment should be removed from the negotiations if not requested by ACP countries' negotiators. Furthermore, the European Commission was called upon to provide an alternative to EPAs at the request of ACP countries.

These preliminary statements are welcome, but the UK Government must go beyond rhetoric and use its influence within the EU to speak out much more strongly against EPAs. This would create the environment for other EU states to follow suit and change the EU mandate.

The UK Government has set itself up as being a champion of sustainable development as part of its commitment to uphold the Millennium Development Goals.³⁸ Yet by pushing these unfair trade deals that are set to cause lasting environmental damage, it is dramatically undermining these commitments.

Many ACP countries rely on the EU for aid- putting them in a weak negotiating position and with no alternatives on offer they do not have much choice. Yet despite this, resistance to these agreements is increasing in ACP countries that fear the damage EPAs would cause to their economies and environment.

³⁵ PriceWaterHouseCoopers, "Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) of trade negotiations of the EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreements", 1 October 2003

www.sia-gcc.org/acp/download/summarized_mid-term_report_final_doc_light.pdf

PriceWaterHouseCoopers, "Qualified Preliminary EU-ACP SIA of the EPAs: Phase One", 2 February 2004
Speech by Tony Blair to the General Assembly of the United Nations, 15 September 2005

³⁶ Peter Mandelson, "For real trade justice, barriers must come down gradually", *The Guardian*, 3 October 2005
www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,,1583381,00.html

³⁷ Department for Trade and Industry and Department for International Development, "Economic Partnership Agreements: Making EPAs Deliver for Development", March 2005

www.dti.gov.uk/files/file9845.pdf#search=%22dti%20economic%20partnership%20agreements%20making%20epas%20deliver%22

³⁸ Speech by Tony Blair to the General Assembly of the United Nations, 15 September 2005

Speech by Gordon Brown at the Labour Party Conference, 25 September 2006

Speech by Gordon Brown MP at the Energy and Environment Ministerial Roundtable, 15 March 2005
The eighth Millennium Development Goal aims to "ensure environmental sustainability".

www.un.org/millenniumgoals

Civil society organisations in ACP countries are voicing their opinion against EPAs³⁹ and ACP Governments have begun responding to this public opposition. In July 2006, Dame Billie Miller, trade minister of Barbados highlighted the disjuncture between the EU's purported commitment to development and their actions at the negotiating table.⁴⁰ President Mogae of Botswana has expressed his concern at the impact of EPAs on African economic development.⁴¹ The Kenyan trade minister, Hon Dr Mukhisa Kituyi has also spoken out against EPAs stating that: "To make poverty history, we have to also make EPAs history".⁴²

Recommendations

We call on the UK Government to use its influence over the European Commission to:

- Stop these unfair trade deals.
- Explore alternative approaches to these deals that do not harm poor communities and their environment.
- Publicly disclose all relevant information surrounding the negotiation process and end the lack of transparency.

³⁹ This Day (Lagos), "National Association of Nigerian Traders mobilises for 5 million signatures against EPAs",

1 August 2005 www.thisdayonline.com

⁴⁰ www.caricom.org/jsp/regional_news/rnm_update_12july_06.jsp

⁴¹ www.cafod.org.uk

⁴² www.traidcraft.co.uk/template2.asp?pageID=1846&fromID=1608