

3rd revised edition

# TTIP and CETA

a threat to high-quality  
European agriculture,  
animal husbandry and  
food supply



Document linked to the Manifesto 'Keep the Farm TTIP- and CETA-free!'

## Colophon

This document has been endorsed by the following (former) members of the TTIP and agriculture coalition:

- Nederlands Vakbond Varkenshouders (Dutch Union of Pig-keepers)
- LTO Varkenshouderij (Dutch Federation of Agriculture & Horticulture - department Pig-keeping)
- Nederlandse Vakbond Pluimveehouders (Dutch Union of Poultry Farmers)
- Dutch Dairymen Board (member of European Milk Board)
- Nederlandse Melkveehouders Vakbond (Dutch Union of Dairy Farmers)
- Nederlandse Akkerbouw Vakbond (Dutch Arable Farming Union)
- Vereniging voor Biologisch-Dynamische Landbouw en Voeding (Federation for Biodynamic Agriculture and Nutrition)
- Platform Aarde Boer Consument (Platform Earth Farmer Consumer)
- Bionext (representing the Dutch organic sector: producers, processing, trade, retail)
- Milieudefensie (Friends of the Earth Netherlands)
- FNV Agrarisch Groen (Trade Union Agricultural workers)
- TNI – Transnational Institute

Author and coalition coordinator:

Guus Geurts

guusgeurts@yahoo.com

+ 31 6 4397 9849

Third revised and translated edition, January 2017

English translation made possible by support from TNI

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	5
<b>Chapter 1.</b> General consequences of liberalization and mutual recognition of standards	7
<b>Chapter 2.</b> Difference in standards between the EU, the US and Canada	9
<b>Chapter 3.</b> Standards under pressure	13
3.1 European legislation already affected by TTIP	13
3.2 The dangers of Regulatory Cooperation and Investment Protection	13
<b>Chapter 4.</b> The most important points in CETA	15
<b>Chapter 5.</b> Consequences of TTIP for European agriculture and animal husbandry within specific sectors	17
<b>Conclusions: a summary of our objections</b>	21
<b>Sources</b>	23



# Introduction

Since 2013, the European Union has been negotiating a free trade and investment treaty with the United States (*Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership or TTIP*). In the spring of 2016 the finally negotiated text of a similar treaty between the EU and Canada was presented: CETA (*Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement*). The European Parliament will vote on CETA in the spring of 2017 after which it will need to be ratified by all individual European States. In both treaties food, agriculture, animal husbandry and horticulture play a major role. In this document a coalition of seven farming organisations, Bionext, Friends of the Earth Netherlands, FNV Arable Green, TNI – Transnational Institute and Platform Earth Farmer Consumer, list the consequences of these treaties for the agricultural sector. Who are the potential ‘winners’ and ‘losers’?

The future structure of the TTIP treaty remains largely unknown, but the prospects for European farmers and consumers are not good. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, TTIP negotiators are discussing abolishing or lowering import tariffs for agricultural products. Secondly, the mutual recognition of each others’ standards relating to environment, animal welfare, food safety and labour rights is on the agenda.

In both cases there are negative implications for European farmers and consumers. The EU has set high tariffs for agricultural products. This is because they protect farmers against unfair competition from countries that have lower standards and can therefore produce

## Coalition against TTIP and CETA

In 2015 a number of farming organisations decided to join forces to oppose TTIP and CETA: The Dutch Union of Pig Farmers, The Dutch Federation of Agriculture and Horticulture – Department Pig-keeping, The Dutch Union of Poultry Farmers, The Dutch Dairymen Board, The Dutch Dairy Farmers Union, The Dutch Arable Farming Union and the Federation for Biodynamic Agriculture and Nutrition. In 2016 they were joined by Friends of the Earth Netherlands, FNV sector Arable Green, Bionext, and Platform Earth, Farmer, Consumer. In October 2016, The Dutch Union of Pig Farmers and The Dutch Federation of Agriculture and Horticulture (temporarily) left the coalition. In 2017 TNI – Transnational Institute joined the coalition.

goods less expensively. The U.S. has lower standards than the EU. If TTIP is given the go-ahead, the European market will be flooded with cheap, low standard American products resulting in unfair competition, thereby undermining the position of farmers and workers. It will also have a negative effect on food safety, the environment and animal welfare. Currently, the cost price of American meat and eggs is 40% lower than in The Netherlands.<sup>1</sup> This disparity is due to more stringent European environmental- and animal welfare standards. Moreover, American fodder and land prices are much lower than those in Western Europe, and American workers are faced with far lower job security. It remains a point of concern that the U.S. has signed only two of the eight fundamental conventions with regard to labour as drawn up by the International Labour Organization (ILO).<sup>2</sup>

The first version of our report was published in April 2016. In July 2016 a second revised edition was issued which included the most important results of a research undertaken by *The Council of Canadians* (and diverse European NGOs) about the consequences of CETA for agriculture and food safety. This current document is an English translation of that report that has been updated with the latest information.

The first chapter of this report gives a general outline

of TTIP and CETA. It explains why especially the European agriculture, animal husbandry and food supply are under threat. Chapter 2 clarifies the difference in standards between the EU, the U.S. and Canada. Chapter 3 gives examples of European legislation currently being altered due to pressure of these treaties and a number of reasons why standards now and in the future are under threat. Chapter 4 gives a survey of the most important agreements within CETA while Chapter 5 lists the expected consequences of TTIP per sector. The report concludes with a summary of the most important objections to the agreements.

# Chapter 1.

## General effects of liberalization and mutual recognition of standards

TTIP strives to realize a single free market between the US and the EU by eliminating as many trade barriers as possible. These consist of import tariffs, import quotas for which a limited import duty is due or none at all (*Tariff Rate Quota*, outside the quota import duties do apply) and Non-Tariff measures (including standards). Import tariffs for most products are low, except for agricultural and livestock products; see table 1. European import tariffs are particularly high: they protect European producers (mostly family farmers) and consumers against cheap American and Canadian products. There is every reason for this: European protective regulations with regard to the environment, animal welfare and food hygiene are much more stringent than American or Canadian requirements. Import tariffs are therefore the only way to safeguard European family farms that must submit to much higher environmental, animal welfare and food safety conditions than their colleagues in the US and Canada. The TTIP and CETA treaties, just like the WTO, recognize only food safety as a legitimate criterion for the possible prevention of imports. During a debate with the VNO-NCW

(Confederation of Netherlands Industry and Employers) in 2015, EU negotiator Ignacio Garcia Bercero confirmed that in this respect TTIP would not deviate from WTO guidelines. The manner of production including environment, animal welfare and labour norms, among others (in WTO jargon collectively referred to as *Processes and Production Methods*) is therefore not a valid reason to block imports, even though the standards mentioned above are much higher for European farmers. Moreover, the WTO only recognizes food safety to a limited degree. This is highlighted by the “hormone meat” controversy between the EU and the US. The WTO ruled in favour of the US, who argued that meat produced with the use of hormones is fit for consumption; and that the EU therefore had no legitimate grounds to ban imports.<sup>3</sup>

**Table 1. Average import tariffs for several categories in 2010** <sup>4</sup>

Agricultural product	Import tariff imposed by the US on EU imports	Import tariff imposed by the EU on US imports
Dairy products	20,2%	42%
Dairy products (Farm Europe, 2015)	30-50%	50-250%
Sugar	18,7%	24,3%
Processed food products with vegetables	7,6%	18,4%
Processed food products with cereals	5,8%	8,5%
Vegetables	4,8%	10,6%
Meat	4,7%	45,1%
Beef	26%	61%
Cereals	Low	40-90%
Soya beans		10%
Citrus, apples/pears, fruit juices		30, 40/40, 50 tot 150%

In relation to the US, the EU currently has a large trade surplus in agricultural products (see table 2). TTIP will change this radically because the import of American products will rise sharply. This will be clarified further on in this document.

**Table 2. Trade in food products between the US and the EU in 2015**  
(European Commission 2016) <sup>5</sup>

Food product	EU export to the US (million Euro) in 2015	Food product	EU import from the US (million Euro) in 2014
Spirits, liqueurs and vermouth	3.867	Tropical fruit, fresh or dried, nuts and spices	2.695
Wine, cider and vinegar	3.321	Soya beans	1.727
Beer	1.468	Waste from oleaginous crops	432
Vegetable oil seeds (excl. soya)	41	Vegetable oil seeds (excl. soya)	305
Processed products made from vegetables, fruit or nuts	834	Processed products made from vegetables, fruit or nuts	271
Vegetables, fresh, dried or frozen	269	Vegetables, fresh, dried or frozen	329
Fruit, fresh or dried, excl. citrus and tropical fruit	81	Fruit, fresh or dried, excl. citrus and tropical fruit	210
Food preparation (not specified)	493	Food preparation (not specified)	523
Pasta, biscuits and bread	820	Other fodder and food ingredients	204
Wheat	0	Wheat	296
Other cereals	75	Other cereals	123
Flour, malt and starch	308	Flour, malt and starch	34
Vegetable oils, excluding palm and olive oil	139	Vegetable oils, excluding palm and olive oil	200
Livestock	374	Livestock	148
Beef	6	Beef	236
Pork	268	Pork	10
Poultry	1	Poultry	1
Cheese	905	Cheese	2
Butter	77	Butter	0
Milk powder and whey	27	Milk powder and whey	2
Casein and modified starch	351	Casein and modified starch	268
Eggs (and honey)	107 *)	Eggs (and honey)	29
Other products	5.575	Other products	3.945
<b>Total</b>	<b>19.407</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>11.986</b>
<b>Agricultural trade balance between the EU and the US</b>			<b>7.421</b>
<b>Trade balance excluding alcoholic beverages</b>			<b>161</b>

\*) The export of eggs (and honey) during past years was much lower namely: €7 (2011), €9 (2012), €10 (2013) and €14 million (2014).

The spectacular rise in 2015 was caused by an outbreak of bird flu in the US.

## Chapter 2.

# Differences in standards between the EU, the US and Canada

Legal standards that play a role during free trade negotiations like TTIP and CETA can be divided as follows:

- Sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures to assure food safety, human-, animal- and vegetable health and biodiversity by preventing the incursion of disease and epidemics. These are recognized by the WTO under the Codex Alimentarius.
- Technical trade barriers (TBT): requirements and regulations regarding labelling, packaging, registration, monitoring and transport.
- Environmental, labour and animal welfare standards.

To a certain extent TTIP and CETA will respect SPS provisions in the EU, US and Canada but they will also strive to minimize and/or 'harmonize' these and all other standards as far as possible.

The Dutch Minister for Foreign Trade Lilianne Ploumen and Euro Commissioner Cecilia Malmström have repeatedly promised that European standards regarding food safety, environment, labour rights and animal

welfare will not be eroded. This may apply to the written text of the agreements however we have serious doubts, as do other civil society organizations, as to how reliable these promises will prove to be in practice.

The question is rather which standards the EU can retain in TTIP under pressure from US negotiators backed by the American agricultural business lobby. The strength of this lobby is evident when we examine the demands made of the American negotiator Michael Froman by the US Senate.<sup>7</sup>

Comments made by EU commissioner for agriculture, Phil Hogan, make clear that the pressure brought to bear on Europe was effective: *'In contrast to earlier statements made by some EU officials, Hogan said the EU is prepared to discuss all agricultural market access barriers in the TTIP negotiations, including restrictions on beef, pork and poultry production practices.'*<sup>8</sup>

The SNS chapter of the WTO states that 'scientific justification' is required before setting higher standards. The free trade agreement between the US, Canada and Mexico is in line with this stipulation.<sup>9</sup> This is contrary to the EU precautionary principle which, in absence of scientific evidence, places the burden of proof with the company requesting access to the EU market.

### US negotiators against EU standards

The American TTIP negotiators are firmly opposed to a number of EU food safety standards, because in their opinion they are unjust and there is no scientific evidence that the practices or substances banned are harmful. It concerns the ban on growth hormones in beef production, the ban on the use of ractopamine (growth stimulant) in the production of pork, the ban on the growth of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in certain EU member states, tracing requirements for GMOs in food, buffer zones with regard to GMO cultivation, the prohibition of 'chlorinated chicken', stricter norms for pesticides on food and stricter norms for the somatic cell count of milk and the use of antibiotics in animal husbandry.<sup>6</sup>

### Food safety relating to meat production - TTIP / CETA

There is much criticism of TTIP's possible acceptance of chlorine-treated chicken meat. Less well-known is that Canada also treats poultry with chlorine; however poultry meat was excluded from the CETA agreement. Nonetheless, agreements were made about the import of beef that according to *The Council of Canadians* was also treated with chlorine: *'More significantly, given CETA means that Canadian beef producers will be able to sell an additional 50,000 tons of beef to Europe, our regulations also allow beef to be washed and processed with chlorinated water.'*<sup>10</sup>

Since 2013 the European Commission allows beef to be imported that has been treated with lactic acid as a show of good will to the US with an eye to TTIP.<sup>11</sup>

It is also alarming that in 2012 and in 2014, E-coli bacteria was discovered in beef exported to the US that came from JBS Food (formerly XL Foods) in Alberta, Canada. This slaughterhouse is responsible for 40% of

all exported Canadian beef. Austerity measures have led to the dismissal of 100 Canadian food inspectors which has caused standards to deteriorate.<sup>12</sup>

### Admission of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) – CETA

Although permitted in the US and Canada, the EU prohibits the growth of most GMO crops. The EU does allow the import of GMO products for animal fodder, agro fuels and industrial purposes. There is no mandatory labelling of GMO products in Canada (or the US) although voluntary labelling is allowed in Canada. In the EU, labelling is compulsory if a product contains more than 0.9% GMO material.

In Canada, a genetically modified apple has been approved at the request of the Okanagan Specialty Fruits Inc. Because of CETA, the European import duty for apples has been cut to 0% and according to *The Council of Canadians*; there is a chance that this apple will be introduced on the European market. National embargos on the growth of GMOs implemented by some European Member States may come under pressure through the use of Investor-State Dispute Settlement or the Investment Court System (ISDS or ICS) as part of the CETA agreement.<sup>13</sup>

The CETA agreement states that the EU and Canada will work together in the Dialogue on Biotech Market Issues. Among other issues, this protocol discusses the residue levels in GMOs. Negotiators have agreed to minimize the effects of biotechnological regulation on trade and promote the 'science-based approval processes' of biotechnical products. Moreover, proposals will be made to accelerate the acceptance of GMO rapeseed by EU regulators.<sup>14</sup> According to the *Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives*, this collaboration will 'create new channels for industry to apply pressure to weaken EU food safety standards'.<sup>15</sup>

### Admission of colourants – CETA

Colourants that are prohibited in the entire EU or in specific member states are permitted in Canada. These include, among others, Fast Green FCF, Citrus Red No.2, Allura Red, Ponceau SX, Brilliant Blue FCF, indigotine and tartrazine. Canadian products carry no warning labels if they contain synthetic colourants while in Europe regulations are much stricter. According to *The Council of Canadians*, stricter European regulations would come under pressure as a result of regulatory cooperation.<sup>16</sup>

### Admission of pesticides TTIP / CETA

In general, when it comes to the import of chemical products, EU standards are higher than those of the US. This is because the precautionary principle applies. This means that substances are banned if there is any risk to public health. In America the so-called scientific approach applies: any substance is allowed on the market until it is proven to be unsafe.

In practice this leads to worrying and extraordinary differences. Eighty-two pesticides that have been banned in the EU are permitted in the US. These include substances that have been proven to be carcinogenic, hormone disruptive and/or extremely dangerous. In addition, neonicotinoid insecticides are used in nearly 100% of American maize and rapeseed cultivation and on half of the soybean acreage. In Europe there is an injunction against the most important neonicotinoids for flowering crops. Neonicotinoids may contribute to acute bee fatality. More than 65 % of all pesticides in the US are free to be used while research into their effects is still being conducted.<sup>17</sup>

*Health Canada*, whose role is to monitor food safety, has been severely criticized for its negligence in this area. The department that supervises the use of pesticides is accused of allowing certain repellents on the market without drawing up a risk analysis. An accurate assessment of pesticides' effect on public health is also lacking, according to an evaluation report dating from autumn 2015.<sup>18</sup> In Canada neonicotinoids are also permitted, among other reasons because in the opinion of *Health Canada*, the risks are acceptable. This is the case in spite of objections from the province of Ontario, which adheres to the precautionary principle and wants tougher action against these substances.<sup>19</sup>

### Residue limits – TTIP / CETA

There are also different norms for maximum residue levels (MRLs) of pesticides on food in the EU and the US. If it was up to the European Commission, the *Codex Alimentarius* would apply for MRL's. The Codex's norms, also recognized by the WTO, permit higher residue levels than currently allowed in the EU. In her answers to questions raised in the Dutch parliament, Minister Ploumen admitted that European MRLs are being aligned with those of the Codex.<sup>20</sup> Unless exceptions are made, this means that the European market will be open to food with much higher residue levels than are currently acceptable<sup>21</sup> (which implies a demonstrable deterioration in food safety) and that the EU – in time – will probably lower its food safety norms. With CETA a similar threat looms, because the US and Canada have a number of mutual MRLs. These were drawn up in a *Technical Working Group* (with NAF-

TA) that is comparable to the *Regulatory Cooperation Forum* within CETA and the *Regulatory Cooperation Body* within TTIP.<sup>22</sup> (See also chapter 3.)

There also exist several notable differences in MRLs between Canada and the EU, for example with regard to ziram on apples: EU: 0.1 as opposed to Canada (and the US): 7.0 – while the codex norm is 5.0. This means that CETA will bring about a decline in food safety if, due to its implementation, MRLs are aligned with the Codex.<sup>23</sup>

### Hormones and tracking & tracing - TTIP / CETA

Various growth hormones are widely used in American beef production<sup>24</sup> and the hormone ractopamine is also used in pork production. Until now, the EU has refused entry to meat produced with this hormone. This EU measure is stricter than Codex norms that do allow a minimum residue level (MRL) of this substance in pork meat. *The Council of Canadians* warns that this import ban may come under fire through the ISDS/ICS mechanism that is a part of the CETA agreement.<sup>25</sup>

Furthermore, the rBST hormone (*recombinant Bovine Somatotropin, also known as recombinant bovine growth hormone or rBGH*) is frequently used by American dairy farmers. rBST resembles a body's own hormone used to increase milk production. In cows it can lead to mastitis (udder infection), fertility problems and lameness. Result: an increased use of antibiotics. This substance has also been linked to human health problems. Both the EU and Canada have banned its use.<sup>26</sup> However, the hormone cannot be traced in dairy products and the *tracking & tracing* system in American animal husbandry is weak or nonexistent.

European Commissioner for Trade Malmström says that the US is responsible for delivering 'hormone-free dairy products' but the Dutch Dairywomen Board has little confidence in proper compliance because American safety checks are inadequate. Inspections at farms are not allowed and there is no compulsory medicine registration, nor obligatory identification and registration for cattle, as is the case in Europe.<sup>27</sup>

The requirement for registering animals in Canada is also limited or lacking, which means monitoring of, for example, hormone use (for milk and meat production) in Canada is far from watertight. In other words: there are insufficient guarantees that Canadian milk from cows raised on hormones will continue to be barred if the CETA agreement comes into force. In Canada, excluding certified organic products, there is as yet no hormone-free slaughter chain. Significantly less identification and registration takes place than in Europe and regulations for the destruction of cadavers is lacking. This makes it all the more difficult to trace the source

in the event of an outbreak of animal disease or food contamination and/or speedily remove suspect products from the food chain.<sup>28</sup>

### Animal welfare and environment - TTIP / CETA

The United States have no federal legislation with regard to animal welfare on farms or transport of livestock, although there are limited rules for abattoirs. Some states do have more extensive animal welfare standards. There is limited observance of mandatory identification and registration for animal husbandry and environmental standards are much lower than in Europe. In areas around large livestock farms averaging 30 thousand animals (Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations or CAFOs), environmental requirements are negligible, permitting large lakes of manure that result in air, water and soil contamination. Cattle are fed mainly on GMO maize and hormones and antibiotics are used widely.<sup>29</sup>

Canada has only voluntary codes of conduct for animal welfare and federal authorities do not hold farmers to account if they fail to comply. These codes of conduct are far inferior to mandatory EU standards. As a consequence, cost prices are much lower than in the EU, leading to unfair competition that disadvantages European farmers according to *The Council of Canadians*. In their view, ISDS will also target these European standards when CETA is ratified.<sup>30</sup> The Dutch government hopes that 'intensive collaboration aimed at enhancing animal welfare through the exchange of information, expertise and experience' will improve the situation in Canada,<sup>31</sup> but this is not enforceable under CETA.

### Labour conditions and employment opportunities - TTIP

There is also a difference in labour rights between the EU and the US. According to American labour unions, the freedom of federation and the remuneration and protection of workers are under pressure. In a number of states the (financial) negotiating position of labour unions is being eroded by so-called *Right to Work* legislation. This has recently led to complaints being submitted to the ILO commission that monitors the freedom of trade unions.<sup>32</sup>

Because of lower standards, agricultural products in the US can be produced more cheaply than in Europe. The liberalization instigated by TTIP will lead to unfair competition with European products. The FNV (Dutch trade union for agricultural workers) fears that the already low profit margins in European agriculture and horticulture will be squeezed even more. Experience

has taught us that ultimately agricultural workers will foot the bill in the form of work uncertainty, and deteriorating labour provisions and conditions. The FNV is concerned about the watering down of the admission policy for pesticides because of the pressure brought to bear on the precautionary principle. This may have negative effects on the safety of agricultural workers. The FNV also foresees a major loss of jobs at abattoirs as well as even further erosion of labour provisions and conditions.

### **Decline in jobs and turnover in the food and agricultural sector – TTIP**

Currently the EU has a large trade surplus in agricultural goods with regard to the US. Due in part to the unfair competition outlined previously, TTIP as predicted by the US Department of Agriculture (USDA), will lead to a very sharp rise in the import of American products. This will have serious negative effects on family farmers and on employment opportunities for agricultural workers, subcontractors, trading firms and processing companies within the European food and agricultural sector.<sup>33</sup>

### **Consequences for our environment, family farms and liveability in rural areas – TTIP / CETA**

We have given factual summaries of how TTIP and CETA will affect our standards. When we add them all up, we must ask ourselves: what do TTIP and CETA mean for the health of our food, life in rural areas and nature in general?

These trade agreements will result in further upscaling and intensification. In turn, this will harm nature and the landscape, also prompting a sharp drop in the number of family farms. Local employment will decrease. In many ways these agreements mean deterioration of rural areas and an acute decline in liveability in rural areas.

The example of the NAFTA agreement also bodes ill. NAFTA led to increased exports between the countries involved but also to lower prices for farmers, a greater gap between farmer and consumer prices, fewer farmers and more upscaling (45% of Canadian farms disappeared between 1970 and 2011), bigger concentrations of agribusiness and increased use of insecticides. NAFTA left millions of farmers in Mexico no choice but to quit their farms mainly because of the import of subsidized maize, while the price of tortillas (with maize as its main ingredient) rose by 279% between 1994 (when NAFTA was ratified) and 1999.<sup>34</sup>

### **Summary**

EU standards with regard to animal welfare, food safety and environment are higher than those enforced in the United States and Canada. If, as a result of TTIP and CETA, import tariffs are lifted and/or tariff-free import quotas (TRQ) are introduced, European farmer will be immediately confronted with unfair competition from American and Canadian goods because the principle of mutual recognition of standards applies. (Only on the grounds of food safety may the EU refuse certain import products). Although lower standards apply for American and Canadian products and European standards cannot be lowered officially, American and Canadian products are still allowed to enter the European market while farmers in the EU must comply with stricter legal standards.

# Chapter 3.

## Standards under pressure

### 3.1 Consequences of TTIP for European legislation already occurring

Minister Ploumen for Foreign Trade in the Netherlands has repeatedly promised that standards relating to food safety, the environment and animal welfare will not suffer because of TTIP. However, the changes many farmers fear are already taking place. A number of examples:

- Due to pressure by the American food industry, the European Commission is inclined to allow chicken meat that has been treated with peroxyacetic acid instead of chlorine. This is diametrically opposed to the current *Farm to Fork* principle of EU regulation that prescribes stricter hygiene requirements for the entire food chain rather than sterilization of products by chemical means.<sup>35</sup>
- As a concession to the US, the EU has allowed beef to be treated with lactic acid in abattoirs.<sup>36</sup>
- The European Commission has delayed the introduction of stricter legislation with regard to endocrine disrupting pesticides under pressure from a lobby of European and American pesticide companies. In 2014 it became apparent that, in assessing the risk of these substances, the European Commission has altered its position and now sides with the less strict American approach. In June 2016 the European Commission presented its risk assessment. This led to severe criticism from the *Health and Environment Alliance*, among others.<sup>37</sup>
- Despite earlier proposed legislation for mandatory labelling, American meat from descendants of cloned animals will shortly be allowed on the European market unlabelled.<sup>38</sup>
- The Dutch European Commissioner Frans Timmermans has been appointed to reduce 'superfluous European regulations' among other things, as part of his *Better Regulation* programme. This runs parallel with a similar process in the US. It cannot be seen independently from the TTIP agenda that strives to reduce non-tariff barriers and increase the business world's influence on regulations.<sup>39</sup>

### 3.2 The dangers of Regulatory Cooperation and Investment Protection

The organizations that make up the TTIP and agriculture coalition all subscribe to the basic premise that standards can only be raised if farmers are compensated for the increased costs associated with such an increase. Standards can, therefore, only be increased on condition that the EU market is protected against agricultural products that are produced in accordance with lower standards. This is exactly what these free trade agreements, and others like them, make impossible. What if the EU wanted to raise its standards in the future? It would be practically impossible if CETA and TTIP were to become effective. The following points make this clear:

- The mutual recognition of animal welfare -, environmental- and labour standards, given the lower standards in place in the US and Canada, will trigger a *race to the bottom*, because European companies will be forced to lobby for lower norms in order to stay competitive.
- Within the *Regulatory Cooperation Body* (RCB) that will be set up as part of TTIP, civil servants from the EU and the US will assess new environmental and social legislation proposals with regard to 'trade interference,' under great pressure from lobby groups representing multinationals. This will occur outside the scrutiny of elected public representatives, thereby subverting their legislative competence. Because TTIP is a *living agreement*, existing legislation will also come under threat.<sup>40</sup>
- Just how far-reaching the negative effects might be is revealed by an analysis of NAFTA, for which a similar regulatory body, the *Technical Working Group* (TWG), was set up. Its job, among other matters, was to harmonize pesticide regulation. The TWG was dominated by large pesticide companies; '*There is evidence that patented producers, through their industry organization, Crop Life, are highly involved in the process, while generics and agricultural producers are not. From TWG minutes, there seem to be key roles adjudicated to global pesticide industry and government federal agencies leaving behind farmers, NGOs and consumers.*' (...) '*Research on harmonization efforts, like those around MRLs, shows harmonization*

*has helped to increase the market size and concentration of the chemical industry. (...) In the area of pesticide registration, harmonization to a higher standard doesn't happen.'*<sup>41</sup>

- Within CETA a comparable *Regulatory Cooperation Forum* will be established with the same goal and working method as the RCB. This forum will discuss, among other topics, food safety standards, for example with regard to GMOs and MRLs. As yet no agreement has been reached on sensitive issues. But if the EU and Canada cannot agree about the harmonization of this ruling, *The Council of Canadians* warns that European regulations may be targeted by an ISDS case.<sup>42</sup>
- They also warn that the European precautionary principle will come under increasing pressure if it is seen as a 'needless trade limiting measure'. Chapter 12 of CETA states that 'parties must ensure that admission procedures are as simple as possible; they may not impede or delay the providing of services or the carrying out of any other economic activity'. If the precautionary principle is an impediment, it is possible to challenge this via 'a dispute'. Chapter 21 of CETA outlines the possibilities for this.<sup>43</sup>
- Due to agreements about investment protection covered under ISDS / ICS in TTIP and CETA, a *regulatory chill* will prevail. That is to say, politicians will be very hesitant about increasing community standards because they fear financial claims from multinationals.
- *The Council of Canadians* also warns that ISDS / ICS can even be used to attack existing legislation and standards, as was shown by accords within the NAFTA agreement. *'It's clear that the harmonization process has been uneven. Despite numerous committees tasked with resolving disputes, ISDS has been used to try and force the hand of states to deregulate.'*<sup>44</sup>
- They also have doubts if the precautionary principle can survive if it is attacked by ISDS / ICS. They base their doubts on the case of hormone meat, where the WTO overruled the EU. *'The precautionary principle, although recognized as a legal concept in international law, was not recognized by the WTO Appellate Body.'*<sup>45</sup>
- Through NAFTA, the Canadian and American economies are integrated to a large degree. 42.000 American companies have a branch in Canada. This means they can use CETA to challenge European legislation regarding food safety via ISDS / ICS.<sup>46</sup> The chance of this happening is very real as shown by experiences

with NAFTA. The European Commission states that the CETA agreement guarantees its 'right to regulate' but various external parties have their doubts. *The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)* concludes that, on the basis of a 2013 version of the CETA agreement, the EU, contrary to what it asserts, has made its 'right to regulate' subordinate to the conditions of the agreement. The organization wrote: *'Contrary to what is often implied by referring to a "right to regulate" provision, this approach in fact prioritizes conformity with treaty obligations over the right to regulate.'*<sup>47</sup>

# Chapter 4.

## The most important points in CETA

### Current state of affairs

In 2013, the EU and Canada reached an agreement regarding the *Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement* (CETA). In October 2016, CETA was signed by the European Commission and Canada. The addition of an *interpretative declaration* to the CETA text was a concession to misgivings from the region of Wallonia. However, Professor Gus van Harten criticized the text because, among other issues, it was not legally binding.<sup>48</sup> In November 2016, 455 European and Canadian community- and farming organizations, small and medium-sized businesses and labour unions sent a joint declaration to the European and Canadian Parliaments asking them to reject CETA.<sup>49</sup> The agreement will be put to the vote in the European Parliament in February 2017. If the European Parliament were to approve CETA, the national parliaments of all European Member States would need to decide on ratifying the agreement.

### Content of CETA

Within the agricultural sector, there are important differences between the way Canada and Europe cater to food safety, the environment and animal welfare. These were examined in Chapter 3.

If CETA were ratified, the current import tariffs between the EU and Canada for a range of agricultural products would be lifted completely. For a number of contentious products (beef, pork and sweet maize) the EU has retained a degree of protection in the form of tariff-free import quotas that are gradually increased over a five year period. Outside this quota, higher import tariffs still apply. But these tariff-free import quotas, also known *Tariff Rate Quota* (TRQ) also have negative effects on European prices because a surplus already exists in these sectors.

Because of this liberalization, Canadian goods that have been produced under less stringent standards with regard to animal welfare, food safety and the environment, would have access to the European market. This leads to unfair competition because stricter registration provisions, among other requirements, means farmers in the EU have higher costs.

Problems can also occur with food safety as discussed in Chapter 1. Deficient or entirely absent compulsory registration suggests that monitoring of hormone use in Canada (for milk or meat production) is far from water-

proof. In other words: there are insufficient guarantees that Canadian milk from cows raised with hormones can still be barred from entering the EU if CETA comes into effect.

### A survey of the most important agreements concerning agriculture and food<sup>50</sup>:

- The EU will lift 93.8 % of its import tariffs in agriculture for Canadian products. This covers 97 % of the total import from Canada.
- Canada will lift its import tariffs for 91.7% of EU products. This corresponds with 95% of the import from Europe.
- The current tariff-free import quota (TRQ) for beef from Canada to the EU will be raised from 15,000 to 45,840 tonnes (70% fresh, 30% frozen)
- Tariff-free import quotas to the EU for pork will be raised by 75,000 tonnes during the course of six years. Currently the TRQ is set at 5,549 tonnes.
- In the build-up to a total lifting of the European import tariff for Canadian wheat, the TRQ for *common wheat* (with a 0% tariff) will be raised from 38,853 to 100,000 tonnes
- European import tariffs for oats, rye, barley and oilseed will be lifted for Canadian products. Currently high import tariffs apply.<sup>51</sup>
- Chicken and turkey meat, eggs and egg products are not included in the agreement.
- Trade in dairy products to the EU will be completely liberalized. The European Commission says that on the basis of current trade, this will not lead to higher imports. However, according to the European Milk Board (EMB), Canada has approximately 94,000 tonnes of milk powder in stock. Exporting this to the EU might be an attractive option.<sup>52</sup>
- Cheese is a contentious issue for Canada; the tariff-free quota of this dairy product will gradually be increased. The EU may export an extra 16,000 tonnes of *fine cheese*, tariff-free to Canada and a TRQ on the basis of WTO agreements will be increased by

800 tonnes. Under CETA, the EU may export a total of 30,000 tonnes tariff-free to Canada. The EU may also export 1,700 tonnes of *industrial cheese* tariff-free. The export of European cheese to Canada is expected to increase by 128%.

- Under CETA, Canada is allowed to retain its *supply management* system for the production of dairy products, chicken and eggs (17,000 farmers).
- The European commission is especially pleased with the liberalized trade in processed products like beverages, jam, cereal-based products, vegetables and fruit.
- The EU has gained concessions to protect products with *Geographical Indications* in exchange for the import of more meat to the EU (Farm Europe, 2015).

# Chapter 5.

## Consequences of TTIP for European agriculture and animal husbandry within specific sectors.<sup>53</sup>

Without TTIP, extensive trade in agricultural products between the EU and the US already takes place. In 2015, the EU exported agricultural goods worth € 19.4 billion to the US and imported products valued at € 12 billion. This adds up to a positive trade balance of € 7.4 billion for the EU, which can mainly be attributed to alcoholic products.

The US is the number one export country for the EU while vice-versa, Europe is the second biggest importer, after Brazil, of American goods. During the last ten years, trade in agricultural products grew with approximately 5% per year, and an enormous 18.5% between 2014 and 2015 when imports also rose with 16%. It is notable that with regard to animal husbandry products, the EU enjoys a positive trade balance for animal products, especially cheese, pork, eggs and butter. In contrast, a lot of beef is imported from the US. In the arable crop sector the considerable import of wheat, soya and oilseeds is noteworthy. In general the EU exports more processed products and imports more raw products from the US.<sup>54</sup>

### Research

Several investigations have examined the consequences of TTIP for agriculture. To start with, Case 1 looks at the most important results of research by the Agricultural Economics Research Institute at the University of Wageningen (LEI-WUR) regarding the effects on Dutch agriculture and animal husbandry. Research from outside the Netherlands will also be discussed. Subsequently, we will examine what the consequences are per sector, for the EU as a whole and sometimes also specifically for the situation in The Netherlands.

The most extensive study of the consequences for European agriculture and animal husbandry is that of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), which has undertaken research and mapped out a number of different scenarios. (1 Dollar = 0.87877 Euro).<sup>56</sup>

*Scenario 1* foresees the abolishing of all tariffs and all tariff-free import quotas. EU imports from the US (€ 4.82 billion) will rise much more than EU exports to

### Case 1. Effects of TTIP for Dutch agriculture and animal husbandry according to LEI-WUR

- In July 2014, the Agricultural Economics Research Institute at the University of Wageningen (LEI-WUR) published the report *Effects of an EU-US trade agreement on the Dutch agro-food sector*.<sup>55</sup> The most important conclusions are:
- The Dutch meat industry is not competitive enough. Research shows that the meat industry would lose part of its export in a global market and imports from the US would increase.
- The Dutch dairy sector is competitive and should be able to profit from further liberalization.
- If all import tariffs were to be lifted, the export of Dutch dairy products, meat, oils, vegetables and fruit would increase.
- The US would profit especially from the increased export of dairy products, red and white meat. This would result in a negative trade balance for The Netherlands and Europe for these products. The export of these products by the US to other countries will decrease.
- The EU and The Netherlands will gain a segment of the American dairy market. Increased American export of dairy products and white meat will be at the expense of Dutch exports of these products to other EU countries.

the US (€ 701 million). US exports will grow in almost all categories. The EU will see a decrease in the production of, among other products: wheat, other cereals including maize, beet sugar, refined sugar, processed fodder, beef, pork, other meat, whey and butter. The prices of all products will fall, including those that will be exported to the US in increasing quantities: cheese, fruit and vegetables.

*Scenario 2* is a combination of scenario 1 plus the lifting of non-tariff measures. This scenario foresees an increase of the American exports by € 8.42 billion and

of EU exports by € 1.76 billion. The USDA calculated the effects of American import and export on production in Europe if scenario 2 were to be implemented. In that case the USDA predicts, just like LEI WUR, a sharp decrease in the trade of agricultural products between EU member states. In scenario 2, the American trade deficit in agricultural products as regards Europe will decrease from € 7.42 billion (2015) to € 88 million. For scenario 1 the trade deficit is estimated to decrease to € 2.3 billion.

The USDA has not developed a scenario in which environmental, animal welfare and labour standards have been lowered explicitly. However, according to scenario 1 & 2, as a result of mutual recognition of standards, European farmers will experience unfair competition from American goods produced in accordance with lower standards.

## Beef

### Current production circumstances

- Production of beef by the Dutch cattle sector is mainly an offshoot of the dairy sector. Bull calves and some heifer calves are fattened for veal; dairy cows are slaughtered when they have reached the end of their milk-producing life. For many other European countries, such as France and Ireland, the production of beef is a major commercial goal. The basis of the cattle feed in these countries is grass and animals are mostly raised outdoors.
- The US beef sector mainly produces beef at mega-farms where animals are primarily corn-fed. A major difference between the EU and the US is that growth hormones which are banned in the EU are allowed in the US.
- The cost of production in the US is between 35 and 200 euro per 100 kg carcass weight. In the EU, costs are 150 euro per 100 kg higher.<sup>57</sup> These differences are partially due to the use of hormones.

### Export balance

- The EU has an import surplus from the US (see table 2). To solve the WTO dispute between the EU and the US about hormone produced beef, it was agreed that the US would be allowed to export hormone-free beef to Europe on a tariff-free basis.
- In 2014 this tariff-free quota was 48,500 tonnes. For an additional 11,500 tonnes there was an import tariff of 20%.
- The import tariff in the EU is much higher. (see table 1)

### Changes because of TTIP

- As a result of TTIP, beef imports from the US will increase due to lower production requirements and cheaper import tariffs. European agricultural production will drop along with prices.
- According to the USDA, total liberalization of trade and the abolishment of tariff-free import quotas will lead to an increase in American beef exports of approximately € 1.3 billion (currently € 208 million). If meat produced with the use of hormones is also permitted, exports will rise to € 1.64 billion. This scenario foresees the EU exporting goods to the US to a value of € 115 million.
- Just as with CETA, it is possible that the EU will not liberalize agriculture as a whole but will allow tariff-free admission of beef quotas from the US instead of lifting tariffs completely. But, according to French cattle farmers, this will also have extremely negative consequences. Income for the sector could decrease by 40 to 50%, causing many farmers to go bankrupt.<sup>58</sup>
- Due to lower beef prices, Dutch farmers will receive less money for the milk cows they send for slaughter.
- Complete liberalization of the market or the admission of American and Canadian beef via tariff-free import quotas will in both cases lead to unfair competition, lower prices and major problems for the European sector. Dairy farming will also suffer negative consequences.

## Dairy

### Current production circumstances

- In the US, the use of the rBTS hormone for the stimulation of milk production is permitted whereas in the EU, it is prohibited. The EU has set more stringent standards regarding somatic cell count (400,000 maximum) compared with the United States (750,000 maximum per ml).<sup>59</sup> The cost price for one litre of milk in the US is 26 cents; in The Netherlands it is 43 cents.<sup>60</sup>
- The support farmers receive from the government differs. The US has an insurance system for farmers which pays out if prices drop. The EU has instituted a decoupled income subsidy per hectare. These differences are not an issue in the TTIP negotiations but do influence proceedings.

### Export (balance)

- At the moment, countries in the EU export more dairy products to the US than they import (export is € 0.97 billion, import is € 77 million). For EU exports to the US there is a quota with a reduced tariff for all categories of dairy products.<sup>61</sup>

- The EU has higher import tariffs than the United States (see table 1).

### TTIP induced changes

- Lifting tariffs will give the US a relative advantage over the EU; the EU now has higher tariffs and the US has a lower cost price. American export of all dairy products to the EU will rise. For the EU, only the exports of cheese will grow. Expectations are that price competition will cause prices to drop.
- Farmers in US have an advantage over their counterparts in the EU in the way they receive state support (a security provision to compensate for low prices). Farm Europe compared the income development of American and European farmers between 2004 and 2013. This showed that the income of American farmers was structurally higher. The EU cannot deliver on its goal of realizing stable incomes for farmers who fall under the Common Agricultural Policy.<sup>62</sup>
- It is as yet unclear if geographic indication (protection of local products like Parmesan cheese) will be accepted by the US. If not, these products will face more local competition in the US and lose their price advantage.

## Arable crops

### Current production circumstances

- In the EU there is a ban on the cultivation of most GMO crops; in the US these crops are grown on a large scale. The EU does allow the import of GMO raw materials for animal feed, agro-fuels and industrial goals. In addition, 82 pesticides commonly used in the US are prohibited in Europe.
- The manner in which farmers receive government support differs. The US has an insurance system that pays out if prices drop below a certain level. Farmers in Europe receive subsidy per hectare. These differences are not an issue in the TTIP negotiations but do influence proceedings.

### Export (balance)

- Currently the US has a trade surplus: the US export of arable crops to the EU outweighs their import (see table 2).
- The EU has set high import tariffs for American products (for example 40-90% on wheat) which limit imports. The US has low import tariffs for EU goods (see table 1).

### TTIP induced changes

- The lifting of tariffs will give the US a relative advantage over the EU; the EU currently has higher tariffs and the US has a lower cost price.
- Expectations are that price competition will cause prices to drop. American farmers, thanks to the nature of the government support they receive (security against low prices), have an advantage over their European colleagues.
- Research conducted by the USDA<sup>63</sup> shows that if import tariffs and non-tariff barriers are lifted, the EU will import (much) more wheat (€ 93 million), maize (€ 317 million), soya (€ 766 million), other crops (€ 250 million) and processed cereals (€ 380 million) from the US and European prices for these products will drop.

## Poultry meat and eggs

### Current production circumstances

- In Europe the legal requirements with regard to animal welfare (living space for animals), use of antibiotics and environmental regulations (for example, legislation with regard to ammonia, nitrates and phosphates) are much stricter than the largely voluntary requirements for American products.<sup>64</sup> The EU has prohibited the use of traditional battery cages for egg-laying; in the US they are permitted.
- Stricter requirements for European farmers result in a 5% increase in the cost price of chicken meat. The cost price of chicken fillet produced by an American farmer is 78% of the cost price of a European farmer, due to less stringent standards and lower prices for chicken feed. Even if transport costs from the US to Europe are taken into account, American chicken fillet could be available on the European market at a price that is 17% lower than European chicken fillet.<sup>65</sup>
- The US is pushing for the admission of chemically treated poultry meat to the European market. The European Commission wants to allow chicken meat treated with peroxyacetic acid instead of chlorine.

### Export (balance)

- Chicken meat exports are equally large for the US and the EU (table 2). In 2015 the EU exported far more eggs to the US than it imported, partially because of an outbreak of bird flu in the US. Exports rose from € 14 million (2014) to € 107 million.<sup>66</sup> This should be regarded as an exceptional circumstance.
- The United States has a tariff-free import quota (TRQ) of 16.600 tonnes regarding the EU but this is not fully utilized.<sup>67</sup>

## TTIP induced changes

- According to Rabobank, TTIP will pose a definite threat to European and Dutch poultry meat producers. Large quantities of frozen chicken products will flood the European market. Expectations are that especially very cheap American chicken leg meat will threaten the optimized carcass yield of European producers. There may be opportunities for the EU to export poultry wings but with regard to volume and value, European poultry farmers will be at a disadvantage.<sup>68</sup>
- Rabobank predicts that 'on balance, TTIP will have a negative effect on the European egg sector'. This is due to higher transport costs, the ban on battery cages for egg-laying, stricter requirements regarding barn occupancy and environmental legislation, together with a prospective ban on beak cutting. 'Expectations are that large quantities of egg products will flood the European market that have been produced via a poultry rearing method that is prohibited in the EU. This will put the European egg sector (...) in a difficult position. The EU will sell more products but on balance, the liberalization will have a negative effect on the European egg sector. The Netherlands, one of the biggest producers and exporters of eggs and egg products in Europe and the world, will be among the hardest hit.'<sup>69</sup>

## Pork

### Current production circumstances

- In the US, the growth hormone ractopamine is authorized for use in pig farming. This can lead to problems concerning animal welfare. According to the EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), consumption of residues of this growth hormone constitute a public health hazard, increasing the risk of, for example, cardiovascular diseases. To date, the EU has prohibited the import of pork containing ractopamine. However the American agricultural business lobby is endeavouring to have ractopamine pork admitted to the European market on condition the meat is suitably labelled.
- Due to higher EU environmental and animal welfare standards and more expensive fodder, the cost price of pork in the EU is almost 30% higher than in the US.<sup>70</sup>

### Export (balance)

- The EU has a trade surplus regarding the export of pork to the US. A total of approximately 60,000 tonnes of pork is exported while only 1,500 tonnes

are imported.<sup>71</sup> This is a result of the high protectionary tariffs imposed by the European market. The EU allows import via tariff-free import quotas from all countries for a total of more than 80,000 tonnes.

- As a result of the CETA agreement, an additional TRQ of 75,000 tonnes for Canada can be added to that total. According to Canadian producers this amounts to an estimated sum of \$ 400 million.<sup>72</sup>

## TTIP induced changes

- Due to less stringent American production requirements, cheaper cost prices and the lowering of import tariffs, imports from the US will increase.
- According to the USDA, the lifting of all import tariffs and the abolishment of all non-tariff measures (like the admission of ractopamine) will result in an increase of US exports to Europe from \$ 10 million to \$ 2.4 billion. This will be to the detriment of EU production and the price of pork will fall.<sup>73</sup>

## Vegetables, fruit and other food

- The USDA has conducted the most detailed research into the consequences of TTIP. Their assumption in scenario 2<sup>74</sup> is that all tariffs, tariff-free import quotas and non-tariff measures will be abolished. If we take tariff lifting on its own, the EU will profit from the extra export of fruit and vegetables to the US. The consequences of scenario 2 are:
- Exports of vegetables to the US will increase by € 539 million, imports of US vegetables by the EU will rise by € 410 million; European production will decrease and prices will drop.
- Exports of fruit to the US will increase by € 435 million, imports of US fruit will increase by € 168 million; European production will grow and European prices will drop.
- Exports of processed fruit and vegetables to the US will increase by € 20 million, imports of processed fruit and vegetables from the US will rise by € 337 million; European production and prices will fall.
- Imports of 'other food' from the US will increase by € 985 million while European exports to the US will rise by € 52 million; European production will grow and prices will drop.

# Conclusions: a summary of our objections

**TTIP and CETA will lead to the European market being flooded by American and Canadian agricultural goods that have been produced according to lower standards. In other words: according to less stringent regulations regarding food safety, environmental protection, animal welfare and labour rights. This will undermine the income of Dutch and European farmers, the safety of produce, the rights of workers, the quality of the environment and of animal welfare.**

Our foremost objections to TTIP and CETA:

- TTIP and CETA – in accordance with WTO regulations – do not permit requirements to be imposed on how imported products are produced. Only food safety is recognized, to a limited degree, as a legal criterion to refuse imports of products which don't comply to European standards.
- In general, norms applied in the EU are higher because European (food) legislation is based on the precautionary principle. If there is a risk that a product is harmful, it is not permitted. America, however, favours a "scientific approach": substances are permitted until there is sufficient evidence that they are dangerous. As a result, 82 pesticides are permitted in the US that are banned in the EU. Maximum residue levels on food are also much lower in the EU.
- TTIP puts pressure on the precautionary principle of the EU.
- Production costs for American meat and eggs are 15 to 25% lower than in the EU; for American milk the margin is even greater: it is 40% cheaper than milk produced in The Netherlands. This is mainly due to the less stringent production standards, cheaper fodder and lower land prices.
- Abolishing import tariffs for arable crops and animal husbandry means that, due to mutual recognition of standards, there is no escape from unfair competition of American goods that have been produced in keeping with less rigorous food safety, environmental, animal welfare and labour standards. This will disrupt the European market and have far-reaching consequences for the continuity of the primary agricultural sector in Europe. Allowing tariff-free import quotas for American products will also result in unfair competition and lower prices.
- The European Commission and the Dutch government claim that standards will not be lowered but this promise offers no guarantee for farmers and consumers. It does not prevent unfair competition. Moreover, it will trigger a *race to the bottom*. Dutch and European farmers will also be forced to cut production costs. To survive they will lobby for lower standards.
- In the build-up to TTIP and CETA, legislation relating to issues mentioned above is being weakened or postponed. Standards regarding food safety are also being lowered. Examples include the admission of chicken treated with peroxyacetic acid and the suspension of legislation targeting endocrine disrupting pesticides. The maximum levels of residues of pesticides permitted on food (MRLs) will also be increased in line with the *Codex Alimentarius*. This is an obvious setback for food safety.
- CETA and TTIP make it virtually impossible to raise these standards. The treaties aim to 'freeze' these standards at their current level, partly through the use of the undemocratic *Regulatory Cooperation Body*, which effectively side-lines democratic decision making. To protect farmers' livelihoods, standards can only be raised on the condition that they are compensated for the increased costs that accompany them and protective action is taken against lower grade products flooding the EU market. This is exactly what makes these free trade agreements and others like them unworkable.
- Currently the EU has a positive trade balance with the US for agricultural goods. The many research projects undertaken show clearly that European agriculture and animal husbandry will be negatively affected in many ways by TTIP: more imports, less production and lower prices. This applies to pig farming, dairy farming, the beef- and poultry sector and arable crops. Only the exports of cheese will increase, but this will be accompanied by a European price drop. In addition, dairy farmers will suffer considerably from competition on the beef market.

- According to research by the LEI-WUR, TTIP will cause Dutch stock farmers to lose part of their export market within the EU. USDA research reveals that bilateral European trade in agricultural products will be seriously hit by TTIP.
- Unfair competition will compel farmers to scale up their enterprises and will inevitably cause the closure of family farms in both animal husbandry and land cultivation. Moreover, TTIP and CETA will result in large job losses among suppliers and in the processing industry. In turn this will bring (even) more pressure to bear on labour conditions and wages for workers in the entire agricultural and food sector.

Because of the above arguments, we want TTIP negotiations to be stopped immediately; we want the European Parliament to say 'NO' to CETA and urge European member states not to ratify CETA.

If TTIP negotiations continue, agriculture, animal husbandry and food from these sectors should be excluded from negotiation talks.

Signed by:

- BD-Vereniging - Vereniging voor Biologisch-Dynamische landbouw en voeding - Association for Biodynamic Agriculture & Food
- Bionext - representing the Dutch organic sector, including farmers, processing industry, trade and retail
- DDB - Dutch Dairyfarmers Board (member of European Milk Board)
- FNV Agrarisch Groen - Trade union for agricultural workers
- LTO Varkenshouderij - Dutch Federation of Agriculture & Horticulture - department Pig-keeping
- Milieudefensie - Friends of the Earth the Netherlands
- NAV - Nederlandse Akkerbouw Vakbond - Dutch Arable Farming Union
- NMV - Nederlandse Melkveehouders Vakbond - Dutch Dairy farmers' Union
- NVP - Nederlandse Vakbond Pluimveehouders- Dutch Poultry Farmers' Union
- NVV - Nederlandse Vakbond Varkenshouders - Dutch Pig Farmers' Union
- Platform Aarde Boer Consument (ABC) - Platform Earth Farmer Consumer
- TNI - The Transnational Institute



# Sources

- 1 - *TTIP: gevolgen voor de Nederlandse F&A-sector*, Jurriaan Kalif, Rabobank, 11 September 2015, see: <https://economie.rabobank.com/publicaties/2015/september/ttip-gevolgen-voor-de-nederlandse-fa-sector/>  
- *Nederland koploper melkproductiekosten*, 30-03-2016, see: <http://www.melkvee.nl/nieuws/8683/nederland-koploper-melkproductiekosten>
- 2 Page 5 & 6 *The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and Labour*, European Parliament, 2014: [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2014/536315/IPOL\\_BRI%282014%29536315\\_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2014/536315/IPOL_BRI%282014%29536315_EN.pdf)
- 3 Because the EU still refused to import these products, the US imposed punitive import tariffs on European Roquefort, whisky, fruit juices and veal. Later these tariffs were transformed into a tariff-free quota of 50.000 tonnes of beef for the European market, that in first instance was filled by American beef.  
See: *Toch koehandel met voedselveiligheid rond TTIP?*, Lise Witteman, Follow the Money, 4 March 2016, see: <https://www.ftm.nl/artikelen/toch-koehandel-met-voedselveiligheid-rond-ttip>
- 4 - *Risks and opportunities for the EU agri-food sector in a possible EU-US trade agreement*, J-C Bureau et al for Directorate-General for Internal Policies Agriculture and Rural Development in the European Parliament, 2014, see: [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2014/514007/AGRI\\_IPOL\\_STU%282014%29514007\\_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2014/514007/AGRI_IPOL_STU%282014%29514007_EN.pdf)  
- *EU-US Trade and Investments Partnership: Outline of a possible negotiation strategy for EU agriculture*, Farm Europe, 2015, see: <http://www.farm-europe.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/TTIP-final.pdf>
- 5 *AGRI-FOOD TRADE STATISTICAL FACTSHEET 2015 European Union – USA*, see: [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/trade-analysis/statistics/outside-eu/countries/agrifood-usa\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/trade-analysis/statistics/outside-eu/countries/agrifood-usa_en.pdf)
- 6 - *2014 Report on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures* - Ambassador Michael B.G. Froman, Office of the United States Trade Representative, 2014, see: [https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/FINAL-2014-SPS-Report-Compiled\\_0.pdf](https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/FINAL-2014-SPS-Report-Compiled_0.pdf)  
- *2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade*, United States Trade Representative, 2014, see: <https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/2014%20TBT%20Report.pdf>  
7 *Letter of US Senate Committee on Agriculture, nutrition and forestry to Froman*, US Trade Representative, 22 April 2016, see: <https://www.agra-net.com/agra/agra-europe/policy-and-legislation/trade-policy/us-senators-call-for-strong-agriculture-framework-in-ttip-513618.htm>
- 8 *EU Ag Commissioner, Chief U.S. Ag Negotiator Address USDA Outlook Conference* - U.S. Meat Export Federation, 20-2-2015, see: <https://www.usmef.org/eu-ag-commissioner-chief-u-s-ag-negotiator-address-usda-outlook-conference/>
- 9 - 7.3.6 *The World Trade Organization Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures*, see: <http://tradecommissioner.gc.ca/world-monde/141457.aspx?lang=eng>  
- Page 40: 'The NAFTA/SPS and the WTO/SPS agreements that were drafted at the same time are quite similar.' (Steinberg 1995; Gaines 1993)' in *Exotic Pests & Diseases: Biology and Economics for Biosecurity* Edited by: Daniel A. Sumner, May 2003, IOWA State Press
- 10 *EU food safety commissioner doesn't see majority support for TTIP in national parliaments*, Brent Patterson, 22 January 2015, see: <http://canadians.org/blog/eu-food-safety-commissioner-doesnt-see-majority-support-ttip-national-parliaments>
- 11 Page 11, *Food Safety, Agriculture and Regulatory Cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
- 12 *Inspection issues persisted at former XL Foods plant in 2014*, CTV News, 30 april 2015, see: <http://www.ctvnews.ca/canada/inspection-issues-persisted-at-former-xl-foods-plant-in-2014-cfia-documents-1.2351400> and page 12 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
- 13 - *Arctic® apples approved in Canada!*, Ok Speciality Fruits, 2016, see: <http://www.okspecialtyfruits.com/arctic-apples-approved-in-canada/>  
- *Canada-European Union: Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) - Increasing Exports of Agriculture and Agri-Food Products*, Government of Canada, 26 September 2014, see: <http://www.international.gc.ca/trade-agreements-accords-commerciaux/agr-acc/ceta-aecg/benefits-avantages/agriculture-agricoles.aspx?lang=eng>  
- Page 13 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
- 14 - *Consolidated CETA Text - 29. Dialogues and Bilateral Cooperation*, Government of Canada, 25 September 2014, see: <http://www.international.gc.ca/trade-agreements-accords-commerciaux/agr-acc/ceta-aecg/text-texte/29.aspx?lang=eng>  
- *Canada-European Union: Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) - Technical Summary of the Final Negotiated Outcomes*, Government of Canada, October 2013, see: <http://international.gc.ca/trade-agreements-accords-commerciaux/agr-acc/ceta-aecg/understanding-comprendre/technical-technique.aspx?lang=eng>  
- Page 13 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
- 15 *Making Sense of the CETA - An analysis of the final text of the Canada-European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement*, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives - Agriculture and Food Sovereignty, Ann Slater and Terry Boehm, National Farmers Union, 25 September 2014, see: <https://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/reports/making-sense-ceta#sthash.Eq7tFZLw.dpuf> and *Agriculture and Food Sovereignty*: [https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2014/09/making\\_sense\\_of\\_the\\_ceta\\_AGRIAND-FOODSOV.pdf](https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2014/09/making_sense_of_the_ceta_AGRIAND-FOODSOV.pdf)
- 16 - *Health Canada reviews comments received on the proposed changes to current food colour labelling regulations for prepackaged foods*, Health Canada, June 2011, see: [http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/fn-an/alt\\_formats/pdf/consult/\\_feb2010-food-aliments-col/food-aliments-col-summary-sommaire-eng.pdf](http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/fn-an/alt_formats/pdf/consult/_feb2010-food-aliments-col/food-aliments-col-summary-sommaire-eng.pdf)  
- *Food labelling and packaging*, Gov. UK, March 2016, see: <https://www.gov.uk/food-labelling-and-packaging/overview>  
- Page 14 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
- 17 Source for all info 'from 82 pesticides': Page 9-10 in *The Lowest Common Denominator - How the proposed EU-US trade deal threatens to lower standards of protection from*

- toxic pesticides* - Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL) – 2015, see: [http://www.ciel.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/LCD\\_TTIP\\_Jan2015.pdf](http://www.ciel.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/LCD_TTIP_Jan2015.pdf)
- 18 *Reports of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development, Pesticide Safety*, Autumn 2015, see: [http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/docs/parl\\_cesd\\_201512\\_01\\_e.pdf](http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/docs/parl_cesd_201512_01_e.pdf)
  - 19 - Ontario stands firm on neonic regulations, Susan Mann, 8 January 2016, Better Farming, see: <http://www.betterfarming.com/online-news/ontario-stands-firm-neonic-regulations-61218>  
- Page 11 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
  - 20 'In the future, besides European statistics, international norms of the Codex Alimentarius will also be adopted as part of European legislation, unless on the basis of risk assessment, these are judged to be insufficient for protecting European consumers. The Codex Alimentarius is a daughter organization of the FAO (Food & Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) and the WHO (World Health Organization) and comprises international norms and guidelines for the safety and quality of human nutrition about which all participating countries, including the EU and the US, decide together. If a Codex maximum residue level is acceptable from a public health perspective, the EU will adopt it. The goal of the European Commission is to also adopt this principle, as included in the WTO agreement concerning sanitary and phytosanitary measures, as part of TTIP. A Codex maximum residue level that is acceptable from a public health perspective will also be adopted if a European maximum residue level already exists that is set at a lower level. This also occurred in 2015. It is the result of existing policy and therefore not at odds with the promise that food safety- and environmental standards will not be lowered as a consequence of TTIP.'  
From Answers from Minister Ploumen of Foreign Trade to the Dutch Parliament: 'Antwoord op vragen van het lid Jasper van Dijk over het bericht "Nieuw rapport: 'Europese boeren kansloos door TTIP' 18 March 2016, see: <https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/kamervragen/detail?id=2016Z01114&did=2016D11728>
  - 21 Page 3 in 'The European Union's initial proposal for legal text on "Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS)" in TTIP. It was tabled for discussion with the US in the negotiating round of (29 September - 3 October 2014) and made public on 7 January 2015. The actual text in the final agreement will be a result of negotiations between the EU and US.' See: [http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2015/january/tradoc\\_153026.pdf](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2015/january/tradoc_153026.pdf)
  - 22 *Pesticide Regulation Under NAFTA: Harmonization in Process?*, Dan Badulescu and Kathy Baylis, 2006, see: <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/24163/1/cp060006.pdf>  
Page 7 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
  - 23 See tables on page 527 and 528: *A review of the global pesticide legislation and the scale of challenge in reaching the global harmonization of food safety standards*, C.E. Handford, C.T. Elliott, K. Campbell, February 2015, see: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ieam.1635/epdf> and <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25765969>  
Page 16 and 17 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
  - 24 The hormones banned by the EU in cattle farming were estradiol, progesterone, testosterone, zeranol, melengestrol acetate and trenbolone acetate. From: *Beef hormone controversy*, Wikipedia, see: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Beef\\_hormone\\_controversy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Beef_hormone_controversy)
  - 25 Page 12 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
  - 26 - *Bovine somatotropin*, Wikipedia, see: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bovine\\_somatotropin](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bovine_somatotropin)  
- *American Milk Banned in Europe Because it Does No Body Good*, 2013, see: <http://www.wakingtimes.com/2013/01/18/american-milk-banned-in-europe-because-it-does-no-body-good/>  
- <http://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancercauses/othercarcinogens/athome/recombinant-bovine-growth-hormone>
  - 27 Video (after 1.45 minutes): *TTIP-debate with European Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström in Amsterdam* – On 3 February European Commissioner Malmström visited Amsterdam to have a debate with enthusiastic and critical organizations about the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) between the EU and US. See: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a4cgJFy\\_d0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a4cgJFy_d0)
  - 28 Interview with Sieta van Keimpema, chairman Dutch Dairymen Board, vice president European Milk Board
  - 29 - *Understanding Confined Animal Feeding Operations and Their Impacts on Communities* - National Association of Local Boards of Health - Carol Hribar – 2010,  
- Page 3: 'The increased clustering and growth of CAFOs has led to growing environmental problems in many communities. The excess production of manure and problems with storage or manure management can affect ground and surface water quality. Emissions from degrading manure and livestock digestive processes produce air pollutants that often affect ambient air quality in communities surrounding. See: [http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/ehs/docs/understanding\\_cafos\\_nalboh.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/ehs/docs/understanding_cafos_nalboh.pdf)
  - 30 Page 12 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
  - 31 Page 3 in *Notitie: Gevolgen van het Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) voor Nederlandse land- en tuinbouw*, Stichting Onderzoek Multinationale Ondernemingen, SOMO, Juni 2016  
*Kamerbrief over afronding vrijhandelsverdrag tussen de EU en Canada (CETA)*, pagina 3, 17 november 2014, see: <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/kamerstukken/2014/11/17/kamerbrief-over-afronding-vrijhandelsverdrag-tussen-de-eu-en-canada-ceta>
  - 32 See for example: *Do International Freedom of Association Standards Apply to Public Sector Labor Relations in the United States?* Human Rights Review, L. Compa, 2012, 13 (3), pp. 373-378, see: <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/articles/780/>
  - 33 *Agriculture in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership: Tariffs, Tariff-Rate Quotas, and Non-Tariff Measures ER-198*, USDA Economic Research Service: Beckman, Arita, Mitchel & Burfisher, November 2015 see: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err198.aspx>
  - 34 Page 6 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>

- 35 [https://www.foeeurope.org/sites/default/files/eu-us\\_trade\\_deal/2015/ttip\\_chicken\\_briefing\\_-\\_march\\_2015.pdf](https://www.foeeurope.org/sites/default/files/eu-us_trade_deal/2015/ttip_chicken_briefing_-_march_2015.pdf)
- 36 Page 21 in *Agriculture, Food and the TTIP: Possibilities and Pitfalls*, Centre for European Policy Studies, Special Report No. 99, Tim Josling & Stefan Tangermann, 2014, see: [http://aei.pitt.edu/58723/1/SP\\_No\\_99\\_TTIP\\_and\\_Agriculture.pdf](http://aei.pitt.edu/58723/1/SP_No_99_TTIP_and_Agriculture.pdf)
- 37 *EU dropped pesticide laws due to US pressure over TTIP, documents reveal*, the Guardian, 22 mei 2015, see: <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/may/22/eu-dropped-pesticide-laws-due-to-us-pressure-over-ttip-documents-reveal> and page 14 - 15 in *The Lowest Common Denominator - How the proposed EU-US trade deal threatens to lower standards of protection from toxic pesticides* - Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL) – 2015, see: [http://www.ciel.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/LCD\\_TTIP\\_Jan2015.pdf](http://www.ciel.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/LCD_TTIP_Jan2015.pdf)  
*Europe's opportunity to stop hormone disruption crushed*, Health and Environment Alliance, 15 June 2016, see: <http://env-health.org/resources/press-releases/article/europe-s-opportunity-to-stop>
- 38 *Kloonvlees in de braadpan met dank aan TTIP*, Follow the Money, 19 mei 2015, see: <http://www.ftm.nl/kloonvlees-in-de-braadpan-met-dank-aan-ttip>
- 39 'Both under TTIP and through its unilateral Better Regulation agenda, the EU's governance system is changing significantly with a stronger role for well resourced regulated industries to write their own rules, either in order to 'reduce or avoid trade barriers' or in order to 'reduce regulatory costs'.  
'At the same time, the unilateral initiatives that the Juncker Commission is taking to new extremes under the heading of 'Better Regulation' will also have a significant and very similar impact on the way the EU will govern itself as TTIP would have if adopted.'  
Both at page 22-23 in '*BETTER REGULATION - TTIP under the Radar?*', Pieter de Pous, 2016, published by Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung, Bread for the World, European Environmental Bureau, see: <http://www.eeb.org/index.cfm/library/better-regulation-ttip-under-the-radar/>
- 40 *Regulatory Cooperation - How an EU-US trade deal risks creating a labyrinth of red tape*, Friends of the Earth Europe, 2015, see: [http://www.s2bnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/regulatory\\_cooperation\\_eu-us\\_trade\\_deal\\_risks\\_labyrinth\\_red\\_tape1.pdf](http://www.s2bnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/regulatory_cooperation_eu-us_trade_deal_risks_labyrinth_red_tape1.pdf)
- 41 - *Pesticide Regulation Under NAFTA: Harmonization in Process?*, Dan Badulescu and Kathy Baylis, 2006, see: <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/24163/1/cp060006.pdf>  
- Page 7 and 8 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
- 42 Page 8 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
- 43 - Page 48 in *Regulatory Co-operation in Making Sense of CETA - An Analysis of the Final Text...*, Hartman et al. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, September 2014, see: [https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2014/09/Making\\_Sense\\_of\\_the\\_CETA.pdf](https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2014/09/Making_Sense_of_the_CETA.pdf)  
- Page 17 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
- 44 Page 8 and 9 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
- 45 - WTO: DISPUTE SETTLEMENT: DISPUTE DS26 - European Communities — Measures Concerning Meat and Meat Products (Hormones), WTO, 25 September 2009, see: [https://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/dispu\\_e/cases\\_E/ds26\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_E/ds26_e.htm)  
- Page 15 in *Food safety, agriculture and regulatory cooperation in the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)*, The Council of Canadians, et al, August 2016, see: <http://canadians.org/sites/default/files/publications/report-ceta-food-safety-english.pdf>
- 46 Speech Maude Barlow of the Council of Canadians, Day of Action against CETA, 27 May 2016, see: <http://www.nottip.org.uk/day-of-actions-against-ceta/>
- 47 - Page 2 in *A Response to the European Commission's December 2013 Document "Investment Provisions in the EU-Canada Free Trade Agreement (CETA)*, International Institute for Sustainable Development, februari 2014. [http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2014/reponse\\_eu\\_ceta.pdf](http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2014/reponse_eu_ceta.pdf)  
- Page 5 in *Notitie: Gevolgen van het Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) voor Nederlandse land- en tuinbouw*, Stichting Onderzoek Multinationale Ondernemingen, SOMO, Juni 2016
- 48 *The EU-Canada Joint Interpretive Declaration on the CETA*, Gus van Harten, 22 October 2016, <http://www.bilaterals.org/?the-eu-canada-joint-interpretive&lang=en>
- 49 *European and Canadian civil society groups call for rejection of CETA*, 28 November 2016, see: <http://www.s2bnetwork.org/european-canadian-civil-society-groups-call-rejection-ceta/#sdendnote6sym>
- 50 - *CETA – Summary of the final negotiation results, European Commission*, 2014, see: [http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc\\_152982.pdf](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152982.pdf)  
- *Analysis of the Canada-EU Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement: A Call for Revising Strategic Business Plans*, Osler: Riyaz Dattu, Daniel Fombonne, Sonja Pavic, 2013, see: <https://www.osler.com/en/resources/governance/2013/corporate-review-november-2013/analysis-of-the-canada-eu-comprehensive-economic-a>  
- *EU, Canada trade deal reached in Brussels after 4 years of negotiations*, Financial Post: Jason Fekete, 18 October 2013, see: <http://business.financialpost.com/news/economy/eu-canada-trade-deal-finalized-in-brussels-after-4-years-of-negotiations>  
- Page 86-89 (Agriculture and Food Sovereignty) from *Making Sense of CETA – An Analysis of the Final Text of the Canada-European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement*, CCPA - Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, September 2014, see: <https://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/reports/making-sense-ceta>  
- *Freihandelsabkommen zwischen EU und Kanada (CETA) - Auswirkungen auf die Landwirtschaft – Schwerpunkt Milch und Fleisch - Machtverschiebung von Politik und kritischer Bewegung zu Konzernen*, Hintergrundpapier von Berit Thomsen, im Auftrag von Maria Heubuch, MdEP Die Grünen/EFA, 2015, see: [http://www.maria-heubuch.de/fileadmin/heubuch/pdf/ceta\\_studie\\_1510\\_web.pdf](http://www.maria-heubuch.de/fileadmin/heubuch/pdf/ceta_studie_1510_web.pdf)
- 51 'For example, EU tariffs will be eliminated on:  
- grains, including oats (EU tariffs of \$114/tonne), barley and rye (EU tariffs up to \$120/tonne) and low- to medium-quality common wheat (EU tariffs up to \$122/tonne);  
- durum and high-quality common wheat (maximum tariffs up to \$190/tonne and \$122/tonne respectively), for which CETA will lock in permanent duty-free access;  
- oils, including canola oil (EU tariffs of 3.2 percent to 9.6 percent); and  
- processed goods, including miscellaneous food preparations (EU tariffs that start at 12.8 percent) and processed pulses and grains, which include baked goods, pulse flour, meal and powder (EU tariffs start at 7.7 percent).' From:

- Canada-European Union: Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) - Benefits for Saskatchewan, 26-9-2014, see: <http://www.international.gc.ca/trade-agreements-accords-commerciaux/agr-acc/ceta-aecg/benefits-avantages/sk.aspx?lang=eng>
- 52 Figure as at 13 April 2016; [www.dairyfarmers.ca](http://www.dairyfarmers.ca) and interview with Sieta van Keimpema (EMB – DDB)
- 53 For this chapter information was also used from the report *TRADING AWAY EU FARMERS - The risks to Europe's Agriculture from the TTIP*, Friends of the Earth Europe, April 2016, see: [https://www.foeeurope.org/sites/default/files/eu-us\\_trade\\_deal/2016/report\\_-\\_trading\\_away\\_eu\\_farmers\\_the\\_risks\\_to\\_europes\\_agriculture\\_from\\_the\\_ttip\\_0.pdf](https://www.foeeurope.org/sites/default/files/eu-us_trade_deal/2016/report_-_trading_away_eu_farmers_the_risks_to_europes_agriculture_from_the_ttip_0.pdf)
- 54 *AGRI-FOOD TRADE STATISTICAL FACTSHEET 2015 European Union – USA*, see: [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/trade-analysis/statistics/outside-eu/countries/agrifood-usa\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/trade-analysis/statistics/outside-eu/countries/agrifood-usa_en.pdf)
- 55 *Effects of an EU-US trade agreement on the Dutch agro-food sector*, LEI WUR: S. van Berkum, M. Rutten, J. Wijnands and D. Verhoog, 2014, see: <http://edepot.wur.nl/311349>
- 56 *Agriculture in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership: Tariffs, Tariff-Rate Quotas, and Non-Tariff Measures ER-198*, USDA Economic Research Service: Beckman, Arita, Mitchel & Burfisher, November 2015, see: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err198.aspx>
- 57 *Is the TTIP a threat to EU beef production?*, DLG-Membership – International Newsletter – 01 / 2015, Dr. Claus Deblitz, see: <http://www.agribenchmark.org/fileadmin/Dateiablage/B-Beef-and-Sheep/Misc/Other-Articles-Papers/TTIP-EU-beef-production-150203.pdf>
- 58 - *Libre-échange : la Commissaire européenne au commerce et la presse, mobilisés sur les dangers du TTIP pour la filière viande bovine*, Interbev, 2015, see: <http://www.interbev.fr/ressource/mobilisation-sur-les-dangers-du-ttip-pour-la-filiere-viande-bovine/>  
- *Farmers fear for their future as new TTIP round opens*, Cécile Barbière, EurActiv.fr, 18 feb. 2016, see: <http://www.euractiv.com/section/agriculture-food/news/farmers-fear-for-their-future-as-new-ttip-round-opens/>  
- *Petition against the mass influx, into our restaurants and shops, of American beef from feedlots, under the TTIP*, Interbev, 2016: See the English text of the petition below the French text: <https://www.change.org/pl/parlementaires-fran%C3%A7ais-ttip-contre-les-viandes-am%C3%A9ricaines-issues-de-feedlots-dans-nos-assiettes>
- 59 *Submissions to the consultation on EU00S High Level Working Group on Jobs and Growth*, Eucolait, 2012
- 60 *Agriculture in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership: Tariffs, Tariff-Rate Quotas, and Non-Tariff Measures ER-198*, USDA Economic Research Service: Beckman, Arita, Mitchel & Burfisher, November 2015, see: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err198.aspx>
- 61 *TTIP: gevolgen voor de Nederlandse F&A-sector*, Jurriaan Kalf, Rabobank, 11 september 2015, see: <https://economie.rabobank.com/publicaties/2015/september/ttip-gevolgen-voor-de-nederlandse-fa-sector/>
- 62 *Has the Common Agricultural Policy realised its income objective?*, Farm Europe, 5 april 2016, see: <http://www.farm-europe.eu/travaux/has-the-common-agricultural-policy-realised-its-income-objective/>
- 63 *Agriculture in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership: Tariffs, Tariff-Rate Quotas, and Non-Tariff Measures ER-198*, USDA Economic Research Service: Beckman, Arita, Mitchel & Burfisher, November 2015 see: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err198.aspx>
- 64 *Animal Welfare for Broiler Chickens*, National Chicken Council, 2012, see: <http://www.nationalchickencouncil.org/industry-issues/animal-welfare-for-broiler-chickens/>
- 65 *Competitiveness of the EU poultry meat sector*, LEI Wageningen UR, P.L.M. van Horne and N. Bondt, 2014, see: [https://www.wageningenur.nl/upload\\_mm/a/2/d/2978fd38-e709-4e18-9c34-c1c1d7489fee\\_2014-038%20Horne\\_v5.1\\_WEB\\_def.pdf](https://www.wageningenur.nl/upload_mm/a/2/d/2978fd38-e709-4e18-9c34-c1c1d7489fee_2014-038%20Horne_v5.1_WEB_def.pdf)
- 66 *AGRI-FOOD TRADE STATISTICAL FACTSHEET 2015 European Union – USA*, see: [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/trade-analysis/statistics/outside-eu/countries/agrifood-usa\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/trade-analysis/statistics/outside-eu/countries/agrifood-usa_en.pdf)
- 67 - *Competitiveness of the EU poultry meat sector*, LEI Wageningen UR, P.L.M. van Horne and N. Bondt, 2014, see: [https://www.wageningenur.nl/upload\\_mm/a/2/d/2978fd38-e709-4e18-9c34-c1c1d7489fee\\_2014-038%20Horne\\_v5.1\\_WEB\\_def.pdf](https://www.wageningenur.nl/upload_mm/a/2/d/2978fd38-e709-4e18-9c34-c1c1d7489fee_2014-038%20Horne_v5.1_WEB_def.pdf)  
- *Poultry meat statistics 2014*, European Commission, DG Agriculture and Rural Development, 2014
- 68 *TTIP: gevolgen voor de Nederlandse F&A-sector*, Jurriaan Kalf, Rabobank, 11 september 2015, see: <https://economie.rabobank.com/publicaties/2015/september/ttip-gevolgen-voor-de-nederlandse-fa-sector/>
- 69 *TTIP: gevolgen voor de Nederlandse F&A-sector*, Jurriaan Kalf, Rabobank, 11 september 2015, see: <https://economie.rabobank.com/publicaties/2015/september/ttip-gevolgen-voor-de-nederlandse-fa-sector/>
- 70 *Pork and Swine Industry and trade summary*, USITC, United States International Trade Commission, 2014, see: [https://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/pork\\_and\\_swine\\_summary\\_its\\_11.pdf](https://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/pork_and_swine_summary_its_11.pdf)
- 71 *TTIP: gevolgen voor de Nederlandse F&A-sector*, Jurriaan Kalf, Rabobank, 11 september 2015, see: <https://economie.rabobank.com/publicaties/2015/september/ttip-gevolgen-voor-de-nederlandse-fa-sector/>
- 72 *Agriculture and Food Sovereignty uit Making Sense of CETA – An Analysis of the Final Text of the Canada-European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement*, CCPA - Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, September 2014, see: [https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2014/09/making\\_sense\\_of\\_the\\_ceta\\_AGRANDFOODSOV.pdf](https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2014/09/making_sense_of_the_ceta_AGRANDFOODSOV.pdf)
- 73 *Agriculture in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership: Tariffs, Tariff-Rate Quotas, and Non-Tariff Measures ER-198*, USDA Economic Research Service: Beckman, Arita, Mitchel & Burfisher, November 2015, see: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err198.aspx>
- 74 *Agriculture in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership: Tariffs, Tariff-Rate Quotas, and Non-Tariff Measures ER-198*, USDA Economic Research Service: Beckman, Arita, Mitchel & Burfisher, November 2015, see: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err198.aspx>



This report summarizes the consequences of TTIP and CETA for European agriculture, animal husbandry and food supply.

On the basis of research results, a coalition of Dutch farmers and civil society organisations, the trade Union FNV and Bionext demand that:

- TTIP negotiations between the EU and the United States are stopped;
- that if negotiations continue, agriculture, animal husbandry and food from these sectors are kept outside TTIP bargaining talks;
- that the European Parliament says 'NO' to the CETA agreement between the EU and Canada;
- that the EU and The Netherlands do not ratify CETA.



## TTIP and CETA: a threat to high-quality European agriculture, animal husbandry and food supply

Document linked to the the Manifesto  
'Keep the Farm TTIP- and CETA-free!'

3rd revised edition  
January 2017

TTIP and agriculture coalition  
Author: Guus Geurts