

Multifunctional Agriculture in the International Context: A Review

Brad DeVries, The Land Stewardship Project

October, 2000

SUMMARY

The term “Multifunctional Agriculture” has rapidly emerged from obscurity into common use in environmental, agricultural and international trade circles, often at the center of heated discussion. But what does it really mean? Proponents of multifunctionality in agriculture generally are pointing to the benefits other than food or fiber that can come from agriculture - benefits that often go unrewarded in the marketplace and that can vary tremendously depending on farming practices. These benefits typically include contribution to the vitality of rural communities (through maintenance of family farming, rural employment and cultural heritage), biological diversity, recreation and tourism, soil and water health, bioenergy, landscape, food quality and safety, and animal welfare.

Like any rapidly developing idea, multifunctionality in agriculture can take on notably different meanings from the mouths of different speakers, and in the ears of different listeners. The foundations for multifunctional agriculture originated in the context of international trade, a situation which does limit somewhat its applicability to U.S. domestic policy, but also presents some real opportunities for ties to sustainable development advocates around the world and to U.S. policy makers who are tuned in to trade discussions. Because the term first gained popularity with countries which are under tremendous pressure to reduce subsidies and trade protections for their domestic farmers, it was greeted with extreme skepticism by major food exporting countries, known collectively as the Cairns Group, and by the United States. Developing countries expressed concern that multifunctionality was just a fancy term for Europe and others to shut their markets to agricultural imports, and to continue dumping excess production overseas.

This review will discuss the generally accepted concepts that are at the core of the term, as well as the origins and development of agricultural multifunctionality in international trade negotiations. It will include details on individual countries or regions that have been particularly active in developing laws or programs to support multiple benefits from agriculture, as well as those that have been particularly vehement in opposing such efforts and the equivocal response by the developing world. The paper will conclude with listings of important resources - including various reports, websites, experts, and other key sources of information - on multifunctional agriculture and upcoming events that will shape the idea. Finally, because the coining of acronyms, abbreviations, and references to obscure negotiations is a booming cottage industry among trade bureaucrats and the non-governmental groups that work on these issues, an appendix will make good faith attempt at a relatively complete glossary of common terms.

Defining Multifunctional Agriculture

The term “multifunctional agriculture” emerged on the international stage as early as 1992, at the Rio Earth Summit, which concluded:

“ . . . multifunctional aspect of agriculture, particularly with regard to food security and sustainable development.” (Agenda 21, Chapter 14)

Multifunctionality is intended to call attention to the positive “goods” that agriculture can produce beyond the food and fiber that farmers sell in the marketplace. These goods can be defined quite broadly, but generally include rural community values such as a large number of independent, family farms, strong local economies that both rely on the economic output local farms and supply them with agricultural goods and services, rural employment, and the continued health of rural culture. Environmental goods usually mentioned include contributions to biological diversity, clean water and air, bioenergy, and improved soils. Other multifunctional products include regional or national food security, landscape values, food quality/food safety, and improvements in farm animal welfare. These will be discussed in greater detail below.

It is important to note that the concept of multifunctionality does not imply that these goods accrue automatically, as inevitable outcomes of any and all approaches to farming. These outcomes vary widely based on farming practices, farm size, farm location (by country, eco-region, and local environment) and interaction of these variables. Despite the net public good that can accrue, production of these benefits is seldom rewarded in the marketplace and often requires support through subsidy or other policy mechanisms in order to become widespread.

Specific Aspects of Multifunctional Agriculture

As noted above, the benefits agriculture can provide cover a very broad spectrum, but in common usage generally include:

- **Viable Rural Communities.** Several European nations, Japan, and other countries have gone to notable lengths to support agriculture based on small family farms, local economies, and local food traditions. These policies support farms that are closely integrated into their local economies, both as producers of economic value within a given area, and as consumers of goods and services from local suppliers. These nations deem this type of farming, as opposed to larger, absentee-owned farms that primarily interact with urban (and not necessarily local) economies, important to the preservation of rural economies and cultural heritage. Many countries support the development of local marketing, or of approaches that add value to agricultural products on the farm or in the local community.

In France, for example, the 1998 Agricultural Orientation Law (*Loi d'Orientation Agricole*) explicitly targeted public aid to farms that create jobs, are of a reasonable size, and for which an individual farmer (or farmer and collaborating spouse) is personally responsible. The law also seeks to maximize entry opportunities for young farmers, promotes on-farm value-added approaches, and takes other steps to maximize the number of people active in farming.

- **Environmental Benefits.** Different farming practices can have radically different impacts on the environment, and the government policies of many nations recognize that supporting farming that is environmentally beneficial can represent a net gain to the public. Farmers are variously rewarded for direct positive contributions to biological diversity (particularly wildlife habitat), improvements (or avoided negative impacts) to water quality and increased soil health. Many countries also support bioenergy programs, at least in part with the stated intent to promote the production of cleaner-burning fuels than those derived from petroleum. The increasing interest around the world in the carbon-sequestering effects of many types of agriculture points to a growing number of programs in the near future that will support certain farming practices as a way of improving overall air quality.
- **Food Security.** In the context of increasing globalization of agriculture markets, many nations are concerned that they retain a sufficient agricultural base - both in farms and farmers - to avoid excessive dependence on the caprice of international agricultural trade. For nations like Japan, for example, self-sufficiency in rice production or other staples remains a core cultural and political value. For developing nations, the concept of food security is even more immediate, as tight supplies and price increases on the world market - or significant decreases in the price or supply of primary export crops - can often be felt as dangerous food shortages at home.
- **Landscape Values.** Many countries recognize the importance of viable agriculture, particularly small farms, to the beauty of rural landscapes. This value is recognized in a variety of approaches to zoning, and to preserving farmland from development.
- **Food Quality and Safety.** A number of countries recognize the importance of specific production methods in maximizing the ultimate quality and safety of food products. In particular, Austria and several Scandinavian countries have taken steps to promote organic agriculture, through labeling programs, direct promotion, and/or programs that subsidize farm transition to organic production.
- **Animal Welfare.** While most government actions that promote the welfare of farm animals are proscriptive, some countries support labeling or other measures to encourage farmers to go above and beyond the standards required in regulation for the treatment of livestock.

History of Multifunctional Agriculture

As noted above, an early recognition of the multifunctional character of agriculture appeared in the documents of the Rio Earth Summit in 1992. The countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, the primary mechanism for economic cooperation among economically developed nations) expanded upon this idea in 1998, noting:

“Beyond its primary function of producing food and fibre, agricultural activity can also shape the landscape, provide environmental benefits such as land conservation, the sustainable management of renewable natural resources and the preservation of biodiversity, and contribute to the socio-economic viability of many rural areas. Agriculture is multifunctional when it has one or several functions in addition to its primary role of producing food and fibre.” (OECD Declaration of Agricultural Ministers Committee)

In the same year, this term rose to prominence, and no little controversy, when the EU, Japan, and South Korea argued for the inclusion of biodiversity, food security, regional landscape, cultural heritage, and rural development considerations - using the rubric of multifunctional agriculture - in the review of the GATT Agreement on Agriculture (AoA) mandated for 1999. Food exporting countries organized in the Cairns Group joined with the United States in expressing the view that this plea for the maintenance of domestic support for agricultural multifunctionality was simply the same old protectionism dressed up in a fancy new frock.

In the U.S., the American Farm Bureau Federation and commodity groups that have hung their hat on farm exports at any cost were particularly strenuous in pushing US negotiators to reject use of the word “multifunctionality” in the agricultural negotiations leading up to and at the December 1999 trade talks in Seattle. Before the Seattle WTO ministerial meeting adjourned in disarray (and without completing work on an agricultural agreement), European negotiators had dropped their demand that the final document include the word “multifunctionality,” though Japan apparently did not yield on the issue. The U.S. position on the issue seemed to soften somewhat just before the negotiations, which will be described in more detail in the country-by-country descriptions below.

Prior to the Seattle meeting, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) held a conference on “The Multifunctional Character of Agriculture and Land” in November 1999 in Maastricht, The Netherlands. This conference brought together representatives from more than 100 countries, as well as international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector. <<http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/X3577e.htm>>

A subsequent conference on Non-Trade Concerns (NTCs) in Agriculture held in Ullensvang, Norway, in July 2000 expanded considerably the argument for consideration of multifunctional agriculture policies in trade discussions. <<http://www.prosi.net/press8.htm>>

Multifunctional Agriculture and World Trade

While it may not have originated as one, the concept of multifunctional agriculture has risen to prominence as a term of art in trade negotiations. The concept originated - at least in part - as an attempt to buttress up national efforts to preserve policies that support farmers and rural communities against attacks under international trade agreements. This situation has progressed to the point that certain non-commodity benefits of agriculture are acknowledged in trade bodies, but there remains considerable friction over these policies.

Food and agriculture issues are among the thorniest topics of present-day trade negotiations. Because of the failure of the agriculture talks at the Seattle WTO meeting, the current trade regime still is governed under the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA) from the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), about which a Friends of the Earth primer on food and trade says:

“The theoretical aim of the AoA is to reduce agricultural support and protection so as to correct and prevent distortions in world agricultural markets. However, what actually emerged was an Agreement that largely liberalised agricultural trade in developing countries and maintained a regulated trade system in developed countries. Key outcomes are increased market access for companies exporting to the South; dumping of food products in developing countries; and higher prices for net food importing developing countries. The overall result is an agreement that benefits large transnational corporations and large farms, at the expense of small and subsistence farmers.”

<http://www.foe.co.uk/campaigns/sustainable_development/publications/trade/wto_briefings/food.htm>

The AoA required reduction of production and export subsidies that have a distorting effect on trade; these supports are commonly referred to as “Amber Box” subsidies. Negotiators refer to other production subsidies as “Blue Box” policies that involve direct payments based on a fixed area of tillage or number of livestock; this classification generally refers to policies under the EU’s Common Agricultural Policy [CAP], which will run through 2006. Negotiations also defined “Green Box” supports that cover research, environmental and other programs that have little or no impact on trade and do not constitute price supports.

Multifunctional agriculture is a prominent member in the family of Non-Trade Concerns such as rural viability, environmental sustainability, and food security, as defined by countries that wish to preserve these policies. Of course, opponents argue that such policies in fact do impact trade, and are therefore open to scrutiny by the WTO.

The most active proponents of domestic laws that recognize and promote multifunctional characteristics of agriculture are the European Union (both jointly and as individual countries), Norway, Denmark, Japan, and South Korea. These countries have long argued for the importance of farming - particularly by moderate-size, independent farms - in the economic and social health of rural areas, as well as the cultural heritage of the nation. Japan has also been particularly adamant about the importance of domestic food security. Following World War II, Japan promoted total self-sufficiency in rice production, directly and indirectly blocking rice

imports from other countries. The Japanese rice market has opened only somewhat in recent years. Traditional farming practices and traditional foods are highly valued in these countries, and are often backed by government support. Because market forces alone are not sufficient to induce farmers to produce these other, non-food benefits, these countries argue that they must be able to promote these beneficial outcomes without interference from international trade bodies.

Given the nature of multifunctional agriculture's proponents policies on food trade, perhaps it is not surprising that the concept has met with such opposition and derision from major food exporting countries. Countries of the Cairns Group (Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Fiji, Guatemala, Indonesia, Malaysia, New Zealand, Paraguay, the Philippines, South Africa, Thailand, and Uruguay) have vehemently opposed inclusion of the word "multifunctional" in trade documents, and pass up few opportunities to speak disparagingly of the idea.

Developing nations have also been skeptical of multifunctionality, at least as the term has entered into the debate on trade. Given the results for them of lavish agricultural subsidies by the EU and U.S.¹ - namely depressed world market prices and commodity surpluses that often wind up dumped on their markets at still lower prices - it is not surprising that these countries do not particularly trust the latest twist on developed world farm support. There is somewhat more acceptance by these countries of food security arguments, though there is little sympathy for steps by wealthy nations to protect their food supplies, when the term has much more immediate import in places where basic nutritional needs go widely and routinely unmet. The rhetoric of food security also is used by developed nations to close their markets to food imports from LDCs.

A substantial portion of the effort on multifunctional agriculture by Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) around the world has been an attempt to reconcile the objective of supporting multifunctionality on a domestic level with efforts to enhance food security, economic opportunity, and environmental protection in developing countries. Outside of trade discussions, it should be noted, traditional agriculture in the developing world often show a high degree of complexity, environmental sustainability, community interchange, and other "goods" that are supposed to result from support of a multifunctional agriculture.

Country Positions on Multifunctional Agriculture

Multifunctional Agriculture has taken a number of forms - and garnered a wide variety of responses - from countries around the world. Though not intended as an exhaustive list, the countries or groupings of countries listed below have adopted policies that have direct bearing on the concept.

¹ OECD countries, most notably the U.S. and EU, spent an estimated \$362 billion in agricultural subsidies in 1998, roughly two and a half times the total Gross Domestic Product of all Least Developed Countries (LDC) **combined**. *World Trade Organization Negotiations on Agriculture: A Consultation Document*, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food (Great Britain), 1999.

United States

In general, the United States has long sided with the Carins Group of agricultural exporters in strong support of knocking down any and all national barriers to global trade in farm products. These would include both export subsidies and subsidies that are tied to production of specific commodities (of which the U.S. is both a vocal opponent and profligate user). The U.S. has supported “green box” supports, while arguing for elimination of “amber box” and “blue box” measures.

The U.S. position on the specific term “multifunctional agriculture” has varied somewhat in tone, if not necessarily in substance, over the past two years. Up to the eve of the Seattle WTO meeting in December 1999, U.S. negotiators had generally shared the Carins Group’s wariness of the concept. On the eve of the Seattle negotiations, however, Secretary Glickman softened the rhetoric to a degree in a speech before the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (an international family-farm group), Glickman said U.S. policy is “to support the right of any nation to give the farmers the tools they need to prosper.” He went so far as to note that, if this position marked him as a supporter of multifunctional agriculture, “Call me Mr. Multifunctional.”

While in Seattle, the U.S. worked with the Carins Group countries to fight the EU, Japan and South Korea’s insistence on inclusion of the word “multifunctional” in the final communiqué on agriculture, though this document was never completed. However, Glickman has continued to advocate policies that large U.S. agriculture exporters often find too close for comfort to European multifunctional approaches.

The European Union

As one of the most vocal proponents of a trading system that takes into account the non-food benefits that agriculture can provide, the European Union has played a significant role in the development of multifunctionality as an idea. For better or worse, that idea is shaped in large part by the history of agriculture policy in the EU.

Europe’s Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) has changed significantly since the early 1990s. Until that time, the CAP had emphasized government intervention to buy up and store surpluses of certain commodities from the market, tariffs on foods imported from outside the EU, and direct export subsidies. In 1992, changes to the CAP established limits on production subsidies, and shifted in part to direct subsidies intended to support smaller farming units. As a part of the GATT agreement, Europe has also reduced its export subsidies. The EU is now proceeding under its Agenda 2000 framework, which is intended to chart the development of joint agricultural policy over the years 2000-2007. Principles of the Agenda 2000 are:

- **The multifunctionality of agriculture**, i.e. its varied role over and above the production of foodstuffs. This implies the recognition and encouragement of the range of services provided by farmers.
- **A multisectoral and integrated approach** to the rural economy in order to diversify activities, create new sources of income and employment and protect the rural heritage.

- **Flexible** aids for rural development, based on subsidiarity and promoting decentralisation, consultation at regional, local and partnership level.
- **Transparency** in drawing up and managing programmes, based on simplified and more accessible legislation.
(from <http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg06/rur/index_en.htm>, European Commission website)

The priorities of the EU have shaped the discussion of multifunctional agriculture to a very large degree; it is hardly surprising that long-time critics of the CAP and the agricultural policies of its individual member countries have tended to see multifunctionality as little more than another verse to the same song. The specific policies of several individual EU member nations are described in more detail below.

France

With the adoption of its Agricultural Orientation Law (*Loi d'Orientation Agricole*), France codified a system of agricultural support that shows quite a bit of attention to the promotion of multiple benefits from farming. The main tool of the policy is a new “Rural Farming Contract” (RFC, or *Contrats Territoriaux d'Exploitation*) entered into by the State and individual farmers. In order to initiate a contract, a farmer would offer a proposal that would: a) create added value (including quality improvement of products, farming diversification and incentive to create and maintain jobs), and b) promote improved land management (which would include questions concerning water, grasslands, bio-diversity, landscapes and protection from natural catastrophes).

The law indicates that RFCs are to be accompanied by structural policies that maintain farms “of a reasonable size,” and are independently operated. The policy includes support for assisting beginning farmers and other measures to keep a large number of persons active in farming. In this section, the law goes into detail on the roles of women, young people, and wage earners in farming. Make of it what you will, the law goes into great detail defining the role and importance of the “collaborating spouse,” and is particularly adamant that such a role must be “chosen, not imposed” and then goes on to assume that the “collaborating spouse” is by definition a woman.

The Netherlands

Farming in the Netherlands presents a number of specific challenges, in large part due to the dense development of the country. The livestock sector in particular is subject to tight regulations due to the large number of animals in a very small land base. In order to boost the environmental performance of farms beyond the base level mandated by regulation, the Dutch have begun to examine a system of tax credits for farms that significantly exceed these levels.

The Dutch Ministry of Agriculture has financed a project to develop a plan for a comprehensive system of tax incentives and other credits for farms. Certain farming practices like organic production could be eligible for direct reward, along with measures that promote habitat conservation, energy savings, and the provision of other “green services.” The proposal envisions

a point system for actions and investments beyond the mandated level that render clear environmental benefits. Once a farm reaches a specified level of points, it would receive a financial or other reward. Developed over the past two years, this proposal is currently under consideration by the Dutch government.

Austria

Austria regards promotion of agricultural multifunctionality as a top priority of the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment, and Water Management. In particular, the Austrian government has taken steps to support sustainable forestry, food security through grain production, and small-scale livestock farms (Austrian livestock operations average 21 cattle, primarily for dairying). The Austrian government also promotes organic agriculture, claiming the largest share of organic farms in the EU, with 10% of farmland under organic management. Austria's system of environmental subsidies covers approximately 85% of the arable land in that country, and went to 62% of farms and forestry operations in 1998. It has also used a sliding scale of support for "handicap zones," primarily to support continued farming in mountainous areas.

The Ministry is also promoting measures that would hasten the development of biomass energy projects, and regards an "ecological orientation of the tax system" as a cornerstone of future agro-environmental development. Information on Austrian Agriculture (with many articles available in English, and others in German) is available at: <<http://www.bmlf.gv.at/en/>>.

Norway

Norway, which was offered EU membership in 1994 but rejected it by referendum, offers considerable support to its farmers due to the harsh conditions faced by agriculture in that country. The Norwegian Royal Ministry of Agriculture places particular emphasis on national food security, with strong secondary emphasis on environmental protection and rural viability. A paper prepared by the Ministry in 1998, offered the following description of Norway's support for agricultural activity:

The multifunctionality of Norwegian agriculture is ensured through a combination of economic, legislative and administrative measures, as well as through training and extension. In 1997, total transfers associated with agricultural policies amounted to US \$3 billion. Net budgetary outlays amounted to US \$1.7 billion and, thus, accounted for 57% of the transfers, while transfers from consumers through border protection accounted for 43%. Blue Box measures (primarily acreage and livestock support) represent approximately 60% of budgetary outlays, while Green Box measures amount to around one third. AMS policies, basically, account for the remaining budgetary support.

Important parts of the agricultural policy is laid down in the *Agricultural Agreement*, negotiated between the farmers' organizations and the Government and approved by the Parliament. Support and protection measures in the agricultural sector are not primarily based on income considerations, but aim first and foremost at ensuring a sufficient level of public goods, such as

food security, viability of rural areas and environmental protection, demanded by the Norwegian society.²

Norway hosted or supported several international conferences on the subject of multifunctional agriculture and trade, and remains one of the most active and outspoken national governments in support of protecting farms and multifunctionality from external trade pressures.

Japan

Like Norway, Japan places a very high value on domestic food security, particularly in the production of rice. Small farms in Japan also enjoy very substantial political clout, as well as popular support that stems from their central role in traditional Japanese culture and the high regard for traditional foods.

The 1999 “Basic Law on Food Agriculture and Rural Areas” promotes several multifunctional goals, including national food security, rural economies, and environmental protection. Article Three of the law offers a definition of multifunctional agriculture,

In consideration of the importance of maintaining the stability of the people’s lives and the national economy, the multiple roles that agriculture plays through stable production in rural areas, from the conservation of national land, water resources, and the natural environment to the formation of a good landscape and maintenance of cultural tradition, in addition to its conventional role as a primary food supplier (hereinafter referred to as ‘multifunctional roles’), shall be fulfilled sufficiently for the future.³

The Law arms the Japanese government with several strong policy tools to ensure food security in the form of primacy of domestic agricultural production over imports. These include the setting of a national “food self-sufficiency ratio,” an explicit definition of imports as needed when domestic production cannot meet demand (there is no reference in the law to lower price or relative production efficiency), and the authority to use tariffs to protect domestic production from harm.

The Law also provides for support of both beginning farmers and elderly farmers. An interesting innovation is the establishment of a system of direct payments to terraced rice paddy agriculture in mountainous areas. These terraces provide flood control and water quality benefits to downstream populations (which the law specifically refers to as “multifunctional roles”), but are being abandoned due to high production costs.

² Royal Ministry of Agriculture, *Non-Trade Concerns in a Multifunctional Agriculture B Implications for Agricultural Policy and the Multilateral Trading System*. June 1998.

< <http://www.odin.dep.no/archive/ldbilder/01/05/NTCpa009.rtf>>

³ Japan, *Basic Law on Food, Agriculture and Rural Areas*, 1999.

< <http://www.maff.go.jp/soshiki/kambou/kikaku/NewBLaw/BasicLaw.html>>

Ethiopia

As a signatory to the Convention on Biodiversity, Ethiopia has taken significant steps to preserve traditional plants and seed varieties. Its *Seed Industry Policy* seeks to balance farmers' need for improved varieties with a national effort to preserve agro-biodiversity of domesticated plants and livestock.

Mauritius

Mauritius is highly dependent on a single crop, sugar cane, and is a net food importing developing country (NFIDC). It raised a few eyebrows, particularly among delegates of the Carins Group, with submission of a paper to the WTO entitled "Multifunctional Role of Agriculture in Small Island Developing States." These ideas are also detailed in a paper Mauritius submitted to the conference on Non-Trade Concerns (NTCs) in Agriculture held in Ullensvang, Norway, in July 2000, which included an interesting variation on the definition of multifunctionality:

Indeed, the role of agriculture in all countries is not limited to the production of food and fibre. In many cases, it underpins the socio-economic fabric of rural areas and often, that of countries themselves. In a number of developing countries, provides an instrumental link to the development of eco-tourism, production of energy, avoidance of the use of fossil fuels, the provision of social amenities and in fostering research and technology development. Moreover, it has an important role in the protection and preservation of the environment and biodiversity.⁴

Latin America

Research is in very early stages on the multifunctional character of traditional farming systems in Latin America, with a particular emphasis on the role of these approaches in protecting biodiversity and the maintenance of a wide range of food crops. For more information, see a paper submitted to the Maastricht conference in September 1999 by Miguel A. Altieri entitled *Multifunctional Dimensions of Ecologically-based Agriculture in Latin America*.⁵

⁴ PROSI Magazine, August 2000, No. 379 < <http://www.prosi.net/mag2000/379aug/mtius379.htm>>

⁵ Miguel A. Altieri, University of California at Berkley, *Multifunctional Dimensions of Ecologically-based Agriculture in Latin America*, submitted to the FAO/Netherlands conference on The Multifunctional Character of Agriculture and Land, September 1999. http://www.igc.org/csdngo/agriculture/agr_altieri2.htm

WEB RESOURCES

There is a wealth of information available on the World Wide Web on Multifunctional Agriculture. Some of the most useful sites include:

FAO/Netherlands Conference on “Multifunctional Character of Agriculture and Land,” Maastricht, The Netherlands, November 1999, proceedings of the conference.

<http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/X3577e.htm>

<http://www.iisd.ca/sd/agr/sdvol32no5.html> (Conference Summary by Institute for Sustainable Development)

Conference on “Non-Trade Concerns in Agriculture,” Ullensvang, Norway, July 2000.

Statement from the conference and papers submitted by participants.

<http://www.odin.dep.no/ld/engelsk/p10001664/index-b-n-a.html>

<http://www.prosi.net/press8.htm>

Royal Ministry of Agriculture, Norway, paper on “Non-Trade Concerns in a Multifunctional Agriculture - Implications for Agricultural Policy and the Multilateral Trading System.”

<http://balder.dep.no/ld/landbruk/faktorare.html>

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), paper on role of research in multifunctionality.

http://www.inrm.cgiar.org/documents/centers/PC_MCAL.htm

The Multifunctional character of Agriculture and Land in France, paper submitted to Maastricht Conference, November 1999.

http://www.agriculture.gouv.fr/euro/euro/pac/FAO/FAO_eng.htm

Iain Sandford, Second Secretary, New Zealand High Commission, comments at Canadian Federation of Agriculture Workshop on the Concept of Multifunctionality, Ottawa, 23 February 2000.

http://www.nzhcottawa.org/publications/SS_Speech_Multifunctionality.htm

European Food Security Network, summary table of NGO and Country positions on agriculture trade, credited to Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP).

<http://www.resal.org/international/negoc/wto/ngotextab1gb.htm>

Friends of the Earth, “The World Trade System: An Activist's Guide, Food and food security.”

http://www.foe.co.uk/campaigns/sustainable_development/publications/trade/wto_briefings/food.htm

European Commission, News and statements on Agriculture.

http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg06/index_en.htm

Roadmap to 2002, background information and calendar of key events leading up to 2002 Earth Summit.

<http://www.earthsummit2002.org/roadmap/default.htm>

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS USED IN THE REVIEW

ACP - African, Caribbean, and Pacific countries.

Agenda 2000 - Framework of discussion within the EU of changes to Common Agricultural Policy (CAP).

Blue Box - Agricultural Subsidies or other supports that include direct payments to farmers based on a fixed area of tillage or a fixed number of livestock. Devised to accommodate European Union's reform of its Common Agricultural policy through 2006.

CAP - European Union's Common Agricultural Policy.

CGIAR - Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research; research on food security and poverty eradication in developing countries, with a focus on sustainable agriculture development.

Earth Summit 2002 - United Nations General Assembly review of the ten-year results of the Rio Earth Summit in 1992. Also referred to as Rio+10.

EU - European Union.

FAO - Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations.

GATT - General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, predecessor to the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Green Box - Agricultural subsidies or other supports that cover research, environmental and other programs that have little or no impact on trade.

LDC - Least Developed Countries.

Lom Convention - international aid and trade agreement between ACP group and EU, aimed at supporting AACP States' efforts to achieve comprehensive, self-reliant and self-sustained development. The original 1975 agreement was revisited and re-signed in 1979, 1985. Lom IV covers the period 1990 to 2000.

MFCAL - Multifunctional Character of Agriculture and Land.

NFIDC - Net Food Importing Developing Countries.

NTA - New Trans-Atlantic Agenda, a series of dialogues begun in 1995 between participants from the United States and the European Union, divided into the Trans-Atlantic Business Dialogue (TABD), Trans-Atlantic Environment Dialogue (TAED), Trans-Atlantic Development Dialogue (TADD), Trans-Atlantic Labor Dialogue (TALD), and the Trans-Atlantic Consumers Dialogue (TACD).

NTC - Non-Trade Concerns.

OECD - Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; member states include: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, and United States. Headquarters is in Paris.

SARD - Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development.

SPS - Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards.

TABD, TACD, TADD, TAED, TALD - See NTA.

Uruguay Round - the last round of negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which ran from 1988 to 1994.

WTO - World Trade Organization.