

Contested Accountability: Civil Society and the International Fair Trade Association

Heidi Ullrich

**International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development
Geneva, Switzerland**

Prepared for discussion at the CSGR Conference at the University of Warwick, UK
17-19 September 2007

Draft – please do not cite or circulate
Comments welcome: hullrich@ictsd.ch

Contested Accountability: Civil Society and the International Fair Trade Association¹

“There is much work to be done for IFAT to be transparent, democratic and engaged.” (Member of IFAT Executive Committee)

“IFAT is not moving fast enough to keep up with the challenges facing the Fair Trade Movement.” (Member of IFAT)

Introduction

Global fair trade sales increased 41 percent between 2005 and 2006 totaling approximately US\$2.2 billion² (FLO; 2007b). Additionally, over one 1.4 million producers and workers³ in developing countries worldwide directly benefited from the activities promoted by the Fair Trade Movement according to 2007 estimates (FLO; 2007b).⁴

At the same time, the International Fair Trade Association (IFAT)⁵, which functions as a private global governance mechanism regulating Fair Trade Organizations (FTOs) through setting widely recognized Fair Trade monitoring and certification standards, has experienced tenfold growth since it was established in 1989 and currently has a membership of 330 of Fair Trade organizations, importers and retailers in 70 countries worldwide. It is the only global Fair Trade association that develops and regulates voluntary standards and certification mechanisms for organizations of Southern Fair Trade producers and Northern Fair Trade sellers⁶ and thus has the potential to play a unique global governance role within the Fair Trade Movement.

However, according to a recent study commissioned by its Executive Committee, IFAT is facing a “great danger that...it will fragment and die” if it does not adapt to the challenges posed by current realities (Myers and Wills; 2007: 5). It is apparent that some of IFAT’s FTO members are concerned not only about the weakening in the global governance role of IFAT, but also recognize that the cause may be due to their own lack

¹ This study is part of a project on Civil Society and Accountable Global Governance being coordinated by Jan Aart Scholte at the Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation at the University of Warwick and the United Nations University. It has benefited substantially from the comments received at a Civil Society and Accountable Global Governance workshop organized in Gothenburg, Sweden in June 2007. In particular, prepared comments by Mike Muchilwa, Monitoring Coordinator of IFAT and Jhony Joseph, Director of IFAT member organization, Creative Handicrafts contributed insight and practical knowledge of IFAT and the Fair Trade Movement.

² Calculated from an estimated Euro 1.6 billion using the exchange rate of 1.8218 on 26 July 2007.

³ This figure includes the dependents of fair trade workers.

⁴ Notwithstanding its steady growth in terms of global trade, sales of fair trade products are still negligible when compared to the nearly \$26 trillion in global imports and exports of good and services traded in 2005 (World Bank; 2007).

⁵ IFAT is registered under the name “International Federation of Alternative Trade” and uses the International Fair Trade Association in its advocacy and public communication activities.

⁶ Ironically, at the meeting that established IFAT, the sole representative of a Southern producer was not allowed to participate (Waddell; 2002: 13).

of proactive engagement. This is evident in the statement of an IFAT member during the May 2007 Biennial IFAT Conference: “Until we lose our fear, we no longer [will] have the authority.”⁷

To begin to understand the reasons behind the grave threats that IFAT is experiencing to its existence and authority, despite the healthy development of the Fair Trade Movement, it is necessary to identify some of the key challenges it is facing. The rapidly changing nature of the Fair Trade Movement has been a significant contributing factor. Within the Fair Trade Movement, the majority of the growth in the last decade has been in food products and textiles rather than in the traditional area of handicrafts.⁸ Although IFAT’s monitoring system and standards apply to Members that produce both Fair Trade handicrafts and food products, the majority of IFAT Members focus on handicrafts. Thus, IFAT has in general limited its regulatory functions to setting and monitoring standards primarily for FTOs specializing in handicrafts rather than those operating in the growth areas of food and textiles. This has contributed to IFAT’s regulatory function being marginalized compared to those of its sister organization, the FairTrade Labeling Organizations International (FLO-I) that regulates the labeling of Fair Trade products, and in particular food products.

An even greater challenge to the global governance role of IFAT, as well as FLO-I, is the threat of their private voluntary regulatory functions being replaced by the public standards-setting body the International Standards Organization (ISO), whose standards generally become binding. A resolution⁹ adopted by the ISO Consumer Policy Committee (COPOLCO) in May 2006 invited the global consumer organization, Consumers International (CI), to “develop a proposal for new technical work in fair trade, including certification (INNI; 2007),” which would likely lead to an international standard on Fair Trade within the ISO. The initiative arose due to the concern expressed by consumer organizations of the growing confusion that exists among consumers between the various alternative approaches to conventional trade, including Fair Trade, ethical trade, and social accountability, as well as numerous Fair Trade labeling schemes (See Annex A). However, organizations that set standards and develop certification schemes with developmental and ethical aims in mind, such as such as IFAT and FLO-I are concerned that their “social and environmental standards are by their very nature substantially different from the technical standards ISO traditionally works on”.¹⁰

To a considerable extent, IFAT’s tenuous situation is due to an accountability gap arising from two primary sources. First, due to institutional structures and lack of resources, IFAT has not been able to respond effectively to the needs of its member FTOs, in particular Southern Fair Trade producers that make up two thirds of its membership, including a rigorous and independently verified monitoring system of recognized global standards for Fair Trade Organizations. This has resulted in Southern members of IFAT being constrained from promoting their interests within IFAT. Second, IFAT and its

⁷ Noted by a member of IFAT during the IFAT Conference in Blankenberge, Belgium on 13 May 2007.

⁸ However, growth in sales of Fair Trade handicrafts has recently picked up in North America and the Pacific Rim.

⁹ COPOLCO Resolution 23/2006.

¹⁰ As quoted in a letter from the International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labelling Alliance (ISEAL) to Consumers International, COPOLCO, and the ISO Secretariat dated 10 May 2007.

member FTOs have neither sought nor been the target of engagement with key civil society organizations such as consumer groups and business associations despite the clear overlap of interests. Thus, there is an accountability gap between IFAT and its key constituents of Fair Trade producers and consumers.

The argument taken in this study is that this accountability gap has resulted in IFAT's accountability being increasingly contested by other global governance regulatory bodies, namely FLO-International and the ISO. The contestable nature of accountability has previously been noted in the literature. Ebrahim and Weisband (2007) argue that: "we live in a world in which numerous types of accountability battle for recognition and legitimacy" (10). However, recent events may have offered IFAT the opportunity to close the existing accountability gap and strengthen its role as the private global regulator of Fair Trade Organizations.

First, at the IFAT Annual Governing Meeting (AGM) in May 2007, IFAT members approved a New Strategic Plan that will result in a decentralization of its structure including policy-making responsibilities being made by an integrated international Governing Board as well as the regions officially being recognized as part of the structure of IFAT. The Governing Board will delegate specific responsibilities to each of the regions. This decentralization will institutionalize a bottom-up approach with the aim of facilitating greater engagement by the Southern FTO members of IFAT.

Second, also during the AGM, IFAT and its members approved plans for a strengthened monitoring system that will improve the ability to monitor compliance with Fair Trade standards and thus increase consumer trust in Fair Trade products made by IFAT producers. As part of the New Strategic Plan, IFAT will work toward the introduction of a FTO label for use on food products as well as the handicrafts by the end of 2008.

Third, in late May 2007, COPOLCO, rather than agreeing to develop an international standard on Fair Trade within the ISO, instead passed a resolution calling for the establishment of a fact-finding process including IFAT, FLO, and other interested stakeholders to clarify the issues surrounding Fair Trade standards and determine the most appropriate regulatory system. This resolution not only has thus allowed IFAT to retain its responsibility to its members of setting and monitoring standards for FTOs for the time being, but also presents an opportunity for greater engagement with key civil society groups. The advocacy officer for IFAT and its sister organizations informed IFAT members that:

The fact-finding process could be the starting point of an effective collaboration between the Fair Trade Movement, ISEAL, the consumer movement and other interested stakeholders to increase clarity among consumers about different options on the ethical market place.¹¹

¹¹ As communicated by Anja Osterhaus, Advocacy Co-ordinator, Fair Trade Advocacy Office on 30 May 2007.

It remains to be seen to what extent IFAT members organizations and relevant civil society groups will use these recent events to reduce the gap in IFAT's accountability.

Structure and Methodology

This study examines the impact that engagement (or non-engagement) by civil society groups has had on enhancing the accountability of IFAT within the Fair Trade Movement. Following the above identification of the challenges IFAT is facing as a private global governance institution, the paper identifies the key components of accountability in IFAT through outlining its governance and operational structure, including its monitoring system. Secondly, it explores the extent of civil society engagement with IFAT within the context of the Fair Trade Movement. This section sets the context of IFAT's role as the private global regulator of fair trade organizations. Thirdly, the study outlines and evaluates IFAT's 'New Strategic Plan', an initiative of its members that was adopted in May 2007. The study concludes with an assessment of the extent to which engagement by civil society groups have helped or hindered the accountability of IFAT and offers recommendations for strengthening its relations with civil society in order to close the current accountability gap in its global governance role.

Given the lack of previous analysis on IFAT, the methodology used in the preparation of this study relies heavily on primary research such as interviews with IFAT members, including Southern producers and Northern importers and retailers, various IFAT staff, executive committee, and regional forum members as well as consumer organization representatives. Documentation, primarily web-based, produced by IFAT and other Fair Trade Organizations constituted a major source of background information. Additionally, participation at the biennial IFAT Conference in May 2007 resulted in significant insights that critically informed the analysis.

IFAT and Accountability

Before identifying the core elements of IFAT's accountability, it is necessary to briefly outline IFAT's governance and operational structure prior to the recent changes that were adopted at the May 2007 AGM. IFAT is divided into a tripartite structure consisting of its Members, Executive Committee and Secretariat.

As a federation consisting of Members, IFAT's Member FTOs, consisting of Fair Trade producers, Southern exporters, Northern importers and World Shops retail outlets, play the key role in the direction that the organization takes. Membership is divided into five regions consisting of Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and a combined North America and Pacific Rim. Over the last several years, in addition to the existing European Fair Trade Association (EFTA), several other regions have established regional chapters including Cooperation for Fair Trade in Africa (COFTA), Asia Free Trade Forum (AFTF), and *Asociacion Latino Americana de Comercio Justo* (IFAT-LA). However, prior to the adoption of the New Strategic Plan, these regional chapters were independent, autonomous bodies with no institutional link to IFAT. Thus, Regional Directors did not take part in governance body activities.

The Executive Committee serves as the governance body of IFAT. The Committee consists of at least five but no more than eight representatives elected by the Members at the AGM for a term of four years with the ability to stand for two terms. Executive Committee members elect a Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, Secretary and Treasurer. Its members are responsible for the development and implementation of decisions agreed to by the Membership at the AGM. Although decisions are generally made by consensus, in matters where significant differences exist, simple majority voting takes place.

The IFAT Secretariat, based in Culembourg in the Netherlands, is charged with overseeing the implementation of agreed policies and decisions. The Executive Director of the Secretariat works with the Chairperson of the Executive Committee to ensure that activities remain within budgetary limits.

The highest decision-making body in IFAT is the AGM. All Members have equal voting rights. While in the early 1990s, Northern Members outnumbered Southern Members, this balance has shifted with Southern Members now making up two-thirds of IFAT's Membership. Thus, Southern FTOs have the majority of votes in the AGM. All major decisions require approval among Members at the AGM, including on issues of market access, monitoring and advocacy. Additionally, Members are required to approve the appointment of the Executive Director as well as all financial issues such as financial accounts, budgets and the selection of auditors.

The Components of Accountability

A precise definition of accountability is problematic given that, as noted by Ebrahim and Weisband, “the reality is...ambiguous – ...it is a socially-embedded, politicized, pluralistic, and value-heavy construction” (2007; 3). However, the authors outline the core components of accountability as related to global governance: transparency, answerability or justification, compliance, and enforcement or sanctions (Ebrahim and Weisband; 2007: 5).

In terms of internal transparency, IFAT, specifically its Executive Committee and Secretariat, receive mixed results. Some IFAT members interviewed for this study noted that the governing body and Secretariat provide regular information in the form of a bi-monthly newsletter on activities, issues of interest, and enquiries by businesses for Fair Trade products. Representatives of FTOs also note that there are regular communication flows between members, Executive Committee and the Secretariat. The Secretariat, despite being extremely short-staffed¹², will directly contact individual FTOs when a particular issue of interest arises. However, there was also evidence that much more could be done to increase internal transparency in terms of adequate and timely information and discussion on common threats and strategic plans. Members also cited that collecting and providing statistics on Fair Trade sales and areas of growth potential was an activity that IFAT should provide to its members.

¹² In July 2007, there were three staff and two volunteers based at the IFAT Secretariat and three external staff members two of whom are in Europe and one in Africa.

External transparency to non-members, other civil society organizations and the general public is an area that could be strengthened. Although IFAT has a useful website (see: <http://www.ifat.org/>), key governance documents such as its constitution, annual report, and statistics on turnover of Fair Trade sales are not available to the public.

With respect to answerability, or explaining their actions or non-actions, IFAT, specifically the Executive Committee, performs well. Minutes of meetings of the Executive Committee and AGM are distributed to all members so that the reasoning behind their decisions can be known. Another example of IFAT explaining the reasons behind its actions is the recent adoption of the New Strategic Plan. This was the result of an open and inclusive process within the IFAT membership in which the Secretariat and Executive Committee provided the reasons why such an action was necessary and coordinated the development of several options that were distributed to Members, and explained the details prior to the vote at the 2007 AGM.

For IFAT, the component of compliance, with particular reference to the monitoring of processes applied by its Members and certifying that they are meeting the standards of Fair Trade as agreed by the membership, is arguably the core of its activities. The IFAT monitoring system will be discussed in detail below. Regarding compliance to issues of governance, one of the responsibilities of the Executive Committee is to act as guardian of the IFAT Constitution. The Minutes of their meetings are recorded and approved by the Secretariat and then distributed to all Members for reasons of transparency.

The IFAT Constitution provides provisions for enforcement or sanctioning of both Member FTOs as well as members of the Executive Committee. Article IX sets out the reasons for termination of membership to IFAT including noncompliance with the provisions set out in the Constitution, such as abiding by IFAT principles (IFAT; 2006). Members of IFAT also have the ability to remove a member of the Executive Committee from office through the adoption of a resolution (IFAT; 2006: Art. IX).

What IFAT is Accountable for

An assessment of the extent to which engagement by civil society associations have advanced the accountability of IFAT necessarily must first clarify the source and targets of that accountability. Key issues to be addressed include what IFAT is accountable for, to whom it owes this accountability and the means with which it seeks to practice this accountability.

According to its Constitution, IFAT is responsible for working to:

- 1) improve the livelihoods of marginalized producers and workers, especially in the South;
- 2) change unfair structures of international trade;
- 3) improve and co-ordinate the co-operation of its member organizations;

- 4) promote the interests and provide services to its member organizations and individuals (IFAT; 2006 Art. III – emphasis included).

To Whom IFAT is Accountable

Derived from the above points, IFAT is accountable to three primary groups. Firstly, to marginalized Fair Trade producers and workers, with an emphasis on those operating in developing countries. Since the majority of IFAT producer organizations are co-operatives who work with poor and unskilled workers, there is a direct link between the Fair Trade producer groups and marginalized workers.

Secondly, IFAT is accountable to its member organizations. Article V of the IFAT constitution identifies three types of members consisting of:

- 1) Fair Trade Organizations – companies, partnerships or other legal entities whose primary activity is Fair Trade;
- 2) Fair Trade Networks – organizations that serve as national or international associations of Fair Trade producers and FTOs;
- 3) Fair Trade Support Networks – organizations that provide technical, financial, general business among other activities that promote Fair Trade (IFAT; 2006: Art. V).

Thirdly, the IFAT Constitution states that the organization shall be accountable to individuals. There is clear mention in Article V of Individual Associates who show interest in increasing their knowledge of and promoting Fair Trade as well as Honorary Members who are internationally recognized experts that have played a significant role in the Fair Trade Movement. It is also implied that individuals may be considered to be consumers who purchase Fair Trade products (IFAT; 2006: Art. V).

The Means to Practice Accountability

The IFAT Constitution clearly sets out the means through which it objectives or responsibilities are to be achieved:

- 1) Promoting, stimulating and enabling co-operation and exchange of information between its members in the fields of marketing, market research, product development, campaigning, etc.;
- 2) Co-ordinating international campaigns, initiated or decided on by the AGM;
- 3) Promoting, stimulating and enabling co-operation in the field of marketing of goods and commodities from member organizations, especially in the South;
- 4) Promoting, stimulating and enabling the financing of Fair Trade and marketing, product development, etc.;
- 5) Issuing a periodical newsletter;

- 6) Organizing and convening a conference in combination with the AGM;
- 7) All other activities decided on by the AGM or the Committee (IFAT; 2006: Art. IV).

Notably, the Constitution emphasizes that all of the above will be carried out “through member organizations and individuals” (IFAT; 2006: Art. IV). However, the IFAT Secretariat manages these means of practicing accountability in three primary ways: market access, fair trade monitoring, and advocacy.

First, IFAT works to increase market development opportunities through linking Northern Fair Trade importers and retailers with Southern Fair Trade producers. Southern producers have access to business support services that assist them in designing products that meet the design and quality standards of Northern consumers. IFAT provides forums that bring Northern retailers and Fair Trade producers together including international and regional conferences and as well as through their website.

Second, upon the request of its Members, in 1997 IFAT developed a Monitoring System whose goals include to build trust Fair Trade products in order to increase sales, to encourage IFAT’s Member FTOs to improve their working practices through a system of control that requires stakeholder dialogue and measures their adherence to the Fair Trade Standards. Table 1 outlines the ten IFAT Standards for Fair Trade Organizations.

Table 1: IFAT’s Standards for Fair Trade Organizations

Table 1: IFAT’s Standards for Fair Trade Organizations	
1	<i>Creating Opportunities for Economically Disadvantaged Producers</i>
	Fair Trade is a strategy for poverty alleviation and sustainable development. Its purpose is to create opportunities for producers who have been economically disadvantaged or marginalized by the conventional trading system.
2	<i>Transparency and Accountability</i>
	Fair Trade involves transparent management and commercial relations to deal fairly and respectfully with trading partners.
3	<i>Capacity Building</i>
	Fair Trade is a means to develop producers’ independence. Fair Trade relationships provide continuity, during which producers and their marketing organizations can improve their management skills and their access to new markets.

4	<i>Promoting Fair Trade</i>
	Fair Trade Organizations raise awareness of Fair Trade and the possibility of greater justice in world trade. They provide their customers with information about the organization, the products, and in what conditions they are made. They use honest advertising and marketing techniques and aim for the highest standards in product quality and packing.
5	<i>Payment of a Fair Price</i>
	A fair price in the regional or local context is one that has been agreed through dialogue and participation. It covers not only the costs of production but enables production which is socially just and environmentally sound. It provides fair pay to the producers and takes into account the principle of equal pay for equal work by women and men. Fair Traders ensure prompt payment to their partners and, whenever possible, help producers with access to pre-harvest or pre-production financing.
6	<i>Gender Equity</i>
	Fair Trade means that women's work is properly valued and rewarded. Women are always paid for their contribution to the production process and are empowered in their organizations.
7	<i>Working Conditions</i>
	Fair Trade means a safe and healthy working environment for producers. The participation of children (if any) does not adversely affect their well-being, security, educational requirements and need for play and conforms to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child as well as the law and norms in the local context.
8	<i>Child Labor</i>
	Fair Trade Organizations respect the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, as well as local laws and social norms in order to ensure that the participation of children in production processes of fairly traded articles (if any) does not adversely affect their well-being, security, educational requirements and need for play. Organizations working directly with informally organized producers disclose the involvement of children in production.
9	<i>The Environment</i>
	Fair Trade actively encourages better environmental practices and the application of responsible methods of production.
10	<i>Trade Relations</i>
	Fair Trade Organizations trade with concern for the social, economic and environmental well-being of marginalized small producers and do not maximize profit at their expense. They maintain long-term relationships based on solidarity, trust and mutual respect that contribute to the promotion and growth of Fair Trade. Whenever possible producers are assisted with access to pre-harvest or pre-production advance payment.

Source: IFAT; 2007e

The IFAT Monitoring System is based on a three-tier process incorporating clear standards and indicators, self-assessments by Members and supported by Mutual Review reports from trading partners.

Table 2: IFAT's Monitoring System	
Step 1: Self-Assessment	Every two years IFAT members must assess themselves against the IFAT Standards for Fair Trade Organizations through applying the self-assessment guidelines, standards and accepted indicators. The process of self-assessment includes three parts consisting of ‘Having a look’ in which members complete checklist, ‘Having a Chat’ in which the FTO is required to consult with their stakeholders including producers and consumers, and finally ranking their compliance to the IFAT standards. The FTOs prepare a report that identifies the degree of compliance with the IFAT standards.
Step 2: Mutual Review	FTOs send their self-assessment report to the IFAT Secretariat and their trading partners for review in order to ensure transparency and accountability. This process provides trading partners to verify the credibility and reliability of the FTO.
Step 3: External Verification	Each year, between 5 and 10 percent of IFAT Members taking part in the self-assessment exercise are randomly selected to have the findings of their self-assessment report verified by an independent inspector in order to validate the process. Inspectors visit the selected FTOs, and in the case of Southern Members also visit some of their producers as well as collect information through telephone and e-mail interviews. The process of external verification, in effect an independent audit, ensures that FTOs are complying with the IFAT standards and the self-assessment reports are credible.

Source: IFAT; 2007g and IFAT Monitoring Coordinator, Mike Muchilwa.

Upon the successful completion and verification of the self-assessment review, Members are registered as having met the demands of the IFAT monitoring system.

In response to the mainstreaming of Fair Trade products as well as the development of labels for Fair Trade food products, IFAT Members recognized the importance of certification of FTOs to ensure their credibility among consumers, businesses and politicians. In 2004, IFAT officially launched the Fair Trade Organization Mark that was granted to registered IFAT members who have successfully met the standards and requirements. The FTO Mark serves to distinguish FTOs from commercial traders, such as Starbucks, that are involved in Fair Trade only through the purchase of products labeled under the FLO certification system.

IFAT members, both Northern importers and retailers as well as Southern producers, note similar concerns regarding the existing monitoring and labeling system. A key point of concern is that the IFAT monitoring and certification system is not rigorous enough to ensure compliance with Fair Trade standards. Mandatory external verification was identified as a way in which the system could be strengthened. An additional issue raised by Southern IFAT Fair Trade producers was that Northern IFAT importers were not purchasing Fair Trade items exclusively from IFAT producers. With respect to the

labeling system, although the FTO Mark for organizations was credited with increasing the credibility and sales of Fair Trade products, the lack of a label for textiles was seen as a significant weakness in the promotion of sales. However, these issues were major points of discussion during the May 2007 AGM in the context of the New Strategic Plan and will be discussed below.

Third, IFAT promotes Fair Trade through playing an active role in global advocacy and campaigning activities that aim to raise awareness of Fair Trade among the general public and politicians. As detailed later in the study, outreach activities of IFAT and three other Fair Trade organizations are carried out by the Fair Trade Advocacy Office they established for this purpose. Activities include the organization of an annual World Fair Trade Day, a Global Journey that promoted Fair Trade around the world through various public events between January 2004 and May 2007, and campaigning for recognition of Fair Trade standards at the regional and global level.

According to the principles of best practice in good governance¹³ outlined in the 2005 International Non-Governmental Organization Accountability Charter, IFAT overall rates relatively high despite not being a signatory. In terms of its governance structure, IFAT meets nearly all of the requirements including a governing body that supervises the chief executive, directs programmed and budgetary issues; written procedures governing the appointment and terms of reference of governing board members, and a regular general meeting at which governing members may be replaced (INGO; 2005).

However, as the following section shows, IFAT scores less well on stakeholder engagement. According to the Charter, to be more accountable, international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) must “listen to stakeholders’ suggestions on how...[to] improve our work and will encourage inputs by people whose interests may be directly affected” (INGO; 2005: 4). IFAT will need to improve its engagement with its stakeholders, including consumer groups, environmental organizations, business associations, and trade unions to close its current accountability gap.

Civil Society Engagement with IFAT

Scholte (2006) has defined civil society as:

a political space where voluntary associations of people seek, from outside political parties, to shape the rules that govern one or the other aspect of social life. As such, civil society encompasses *inter alia* anti-poverty initiatives, business forums, clan and kinship unions, community associations, consumer advocates, environmental campaigns, ethnic lobbies, faith-based organizations, human rights promoters, labor unions,

¹³ According to the Charter, the principles of best practice in governance include: “a governing body which supervises and evaluates the chief executive and oversee program and budgetary matters,... written procedures covering the appointment, responsibilities and terms of members of the governing body, and preventing and managing conflicts of interest..., (and) a regular meeting with the authority to appoint and replace members of the governing body” (INGO; 2005: 4).

peace advocates, peasant groups, philanthropic foundations, professional bodies, relief organizations, research institutes, women's networks, and youth associations (2-3).

While this study applies the above definition, it will focus on the engagement of civil society organizations such as Southern Fair Trade producers, Northern Fair Trade importers and World Shops, and consumer organizations.

From Alternative Trade to the Fair Trade Movement

Civil society groups, in particular volunteer associations of retailers, importers and producers of Fair Trade products, have shaped the evolution of fair trade from its origins as an alternative trade system through its transition to the Fair Trade Movement. In fact, leading FTOs developed the widely accepted definition of fair trade:

a trading partnership, based on dialogue, transparency and respect, that seeks greater equity in international trade. It contributes to sustainable development by offering better trading conditions to, and securing the rights of, marginalized producers and workers – especially in the South. (IFAT; 2005c).

Throughout the evolution of the Fair Trade Movement and in its ongoing transformation into increasingly a mainstream system of ethical developmental trade, interventions by some by some (as well as also lack thereof by other) civil society organizations continue to contribute to shaping the structure and strategy of IFAT.

The origins of alternative trade are based in the efforts of a member of a civil society group. Beginning in the 1940s, the Mennonite Central Committee, a religious relief agency based in the U.S. imported and sold handicrafts made in Puerto Rico, Haiti and by Palestinian refugees as a means to improve the livelihoods of marginalized producers.

The concept of alternative trade was based on serving as an alternative to the widely accepted neo-liberal trading system. Rather than being motivated by profit, emphasis was placed on economic justice and equity (Waddell; 2002: 21). A key component of alternative trade was the notion of providing small, and often poor, Southern producers a means to improve their livelihoods through increased trade with the North.¹⁴

Alternative trade items were produced, imported and sold through global networks of Alternative Trade Organizations (ATOs) consisting of producers, importers and retailers. With the opening of the first volunteer World Shop (also known as Fair Trade Shops) in 1958, Northern consumers were able to directly support Southern handicraft producers through their purchases (FLO; 2007b). Hence, from the outset the key constituencies of alternative trade included poor and marginalized producers in the South, Northern

¹⁴ This is evident in the early Mennonite Central Committee program entitled "SELFHELP Crafts of the World" as well as the slogan used by UNCTAD in the late 1960s of "Trade, not Aid" (Kocken; 2005: 2).

importers and retailers, as well as consumers worldwide given their economic opportunity and greater choice.

The concept of alternative trade spread to Europe in the late 1950s with initial activity occurring in the U.K. and the Netherlands. In both countries, developmental civil society organizations not only continued the idea of selling fair trade handicrafts in shops, but also took the initial steps toward developing a Fair Trade Movement. In the U.K., Oxfam led the way by establishing the first Fair Trade Organization (FTO) in 1964. At the same time, alternative trade advocates in the Netherlands expanded the scope of fair trade items by being the first to sell food products, such as sugar cane and coffee from developing countries in addition to handicrafts (IFAT; 2007a).

Mirroring the growing political activism of developing countries within such groupings as the G77 and the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in shaping the New International Economic Order (NIEO), throughout the 1960s and 1970s Southern alternative trade organizations became increasingly proactive in advancing the interests of small producers and marginalized sections of society. This activity occurred at the domestic, regional and global level. At the domestic and regional levels, Southern alternative trade groups used fair trade networks to link small producers as well as offer training and social services to disadvantaged citizens. At the global level, Southern alternative trade groups strengthened networks between Southern producers and Northern importers focusing on trade, advocacy activities, as well as to a lesser extent mutual support of socialist ideals.

The expansion of the range of alternative trade items beyond the traditional handicrafts to include food products such as coffee, tea and cocoa resulted in an increase in awareness and interest among certain segments of the population in the North, particularly in Europe, throughout the 1980s. As demand¹⁵ for alternative food products grew among Northern consumers, conventional market outlets such as grocery chains and coffee shops began to stock alternative trade products. Over two-thirds of Fair Trade products are now being sold in mainstream retail and catering outlets (IFAT; 2007c).

Increasing demand for alternatively traded food products, as well as a downturn in the demand for alternative traded handicrafts, necessitated a re-evaluation of the system of exchange by the mid-1990s. Exclusive use of separate ‘alternative trade systems’ throughout the production and exchange process were overly expensive due to low economies of scale. In contrast, a ‘fair trade system’ in which only certain key functions such as production were certified as adhering to fair trade standards while using existing means of transport, storage and other conventional links ensures fair trade products remain competitive (Waddell, 2002: 23). Thus, the transition in terminology from ‘alternative trade’ to ‘fair trade’ can be attributed more to economic reasoning than any ideological fervor associated with civil society intervention, and in particular the

¹⁵ Fair trade coffee provides between 25-50 percent of sales for Fair Trade Organizations in the North (IFAT; 2007b).

emergence at this time of a vocal civil society responding to the perceived threats of globalization.¹⁶

The continued growth in demand and increasing trend toward the mainstreaming of alternative trade into the commercial trading system have been significant on the Fair Trade Movement in terms of regulatory and accountability impact. The types of civil society associations that have chosen (or not) to engage in the regulation of Fair Trade as it has evolved have shaped the Fair Trade Movement in profound ways. Their interventions (or lack thereof) have been largely responsible for the achievements of IFAT as well as the challenges to its role as global regulator of Fair Trade Organizations that it currently faces.

Key Role of Fair Trade Organizations

Civil society engagement within the Fair Trade Movement has consisted primarily of the activities of Fair Trade Organizations (FTOs) including producer cooperatives and associations, importers, retailers (i.e., World Shops), as well as to a lesser extent developmental cooperative financial institutions. Correlated to the growth in interest among citizens in the Free Trade Movement, national level FTOs were established throughout the world, particularly in Europe, at an increasing pace beginning in the 1970s.

Initially these FTOs met periodically on an informal basis in order to learn from each other and coordinate their activities. As part of the transition from a system of alternative trade to the development of the Fair Trade Movement, a complex web of global and regional Fair Trade Associations and Fair Trade Networks took shape. This network developed through the initiative of FTOs as a means to increase their effectiveness and face common challenges.

In addition to IFAT, the primary umbrella groups are the FairTrade Labeling Organizations International (FLO), the European Fair Trade Association (EFTA), and the Network of European World Shops (NEWS!). Together, these member-driven associations represent more than one million Fair Trade producers and over 200 Fair Trade importers, 3,000 World Shops and thousands of volunteers (Fair Trade Advocacy Office; 2007a).

Due to the need for certification of Fair Trade food products and the proliferation of Fair Trade labeling initiatives, FLO was founded in 1997 by 20 developed country national fair trade labeling initiatives¹⁷, such as Max Havelaar, TransFair and the Fairtrade

¹⁶ Waddell argues that although fair trade is a “product of civil society that aims for change in commercial markets and their structure [and therefore could be seen] as a response to mass movement concerns about problems of globalization and sustainability...free trade’s roots are in development and social questions outside of these more recent movements” (2002:19 and 24).

¹⁷ FLO members are active in Australia, Canada, 15 European countries, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, and the United States.

Foundation, to serve as the standard setting organization for Fair Trade commodity products and develop a standardized certification mark.

To ensure efficiency in their operations, FLO is divided into two organizations. FLO International develops and reviews Fair Trade product standards and promotes a common Fair Trade certification. FLO-CERT works to ensure that producers comply with Fair Trade standards through a transparent and accountable process of inspection, audit, and review. This process consists of independent inspectors visiting producers in Africa, Asia and Latin America on a regular basis, review by a Certification Committee whose members include representatives of FLO's labeling initiatives, producers, importers and retailers, and external experts. In the case a producer is judged by the Certification Committee not to meet the standards, an Appeals Committee is available to review the decision.

In 2002, FLO launched the blue and green International Fair Trade Certification Mark to create an image of common standards on Fair Trade food products sold under the various Fair Trade Labeling groups. In the five years since its development, the Certification Mark has gained some recognition in many of the countries in which FLO is active. However, the decision by FLO's members Max Havelaar in Switzerland and TransFair in both Canada and the United States to continue to use their individual labels on Fair Trade products diminishes the global recognition of the Certification Mark among consumers and businesses.

Although IFAT and FLO serve as private global regulatory mechanisms for Fair Trade organizations and Fair Trade products respectively, EFTA and NEWS! are regional associations with membership in IFAT. EFTA, representing eleven Fair Trade importers in nine European countries¹⁸, was founded in 1990 to assist in the exchange of information and cooperation among its members to increase their efficiency. EFTA also provides its members with a database of Fair Trade producers of both handicrafts and food products. NEWS! was established in 1994 and represents approximately 3,000 World Shops through 15 national associations¹⁹ in 13 Central and Western European countries. Similar to EFTA, it serves as a means of coordination among national associations of world shops and to lobby the institutions of the European Union

For purposes of global advocacy and campaigning, since 1998 these four civil society organizations have cooperated under the acronym of F.I.N.E.²⁰ Working from a small Fair Trade Advocacy Office located in Brussels F.I.N.E. coordinates raising of awareness among stakeholders, advocacy activities at regional institutions such as the European Commission and European Parliament as well as international organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the International Standards Organization. Through F.I.N.E, the Fair Trade Movement has been active at recent WTO Ministerial

¹⁸ The members of EFTA are located in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, and the UK.

¹⁹ The national members of NEWS! are Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the UK.

²⁰ F.I.N.E is derived from the first letter of the four associations: FLO, IFAT, NEWS!, and EFTA.

conferences. At the WTO's 6th Ministerial Conference that took place in Hong Kong in December 2005, F.I.N.E. coordinated the Fair Trade Movement's first joint statement on Fair Trade as well as its participation in a Fair Trade Fair. F.I.N.E. coordinated activities with trade-related NGOs including OXFAM and the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP). Achievements at the European level include adoption of resolutions concerning Fair Trade by the European Parliament in 1994 and 1998 and a Communication on Fair Trade passed by the Commission in 1999 (IFAT; 2007d).

These Fair Trade umbrella organizations have been instrumental in creating partnerships between Northern Fair Trade importers and marginalized Southern producers. Their activities have resulted in raising awareness of Fair Trade among Northern consumers, business representatives, and politicians as well as creating standards for Fair Trade organizations and food products.

Civil Society Organizations: Non-Engagement

With respect to both accountability as well as representation, it is significant to note that until the last few years civil society groups with a stake in the activities and outcomes of the Fair Trade Movement, such as consumer organizations, environmental groups, business forums, and trade unions have not been engaged to any significant extent in the Fair Trade Movement, and have been particularly absent with respect to the activities of the global Fair Trade standards and certification associations. This lack of engagement may be attributable to the Fair Trade Movement being a lesser priority than the larger commercial trading system given limited resources among these civil society groups. However, with the growth in Fair Trade and increased interest in ethical trade and corporate social responsibility, these civil society groups are beginning to dedicate greater resources to the setting of standards and norms related to Fair Trade.

At the same time, Fair Trade umbrella groups and FTOs have historically been deficient in proactive outreach to their broader stakeholders. In particular, Waddell notes that within IFAT although "participation of stakeholders is a highly valued quality...the stakeholder definition appears under-developed" (Waddell; 2002: 25). This lack of stakeholder definition results in the situation that when issues related to Fair Trade do not emanate directly from the Fair Trade community, engagement with other stakeholders is not forthcoming (Waddell; 2002: 18).

Engaging with Consumer Groups: A first step toward closing the Accountability Gap?

As the current activity toward developing an international standard on Fair Trade within the ISO COPOLCO shows, the lack of engagement with its wider stakeholders, particularly consumer groups, threatens to undermine the role of IFAT as the global governance mechanism for the setting of standards for Fair Trade Organizations as well as FLO-I with respect to Fair Trade products. As was noted during the May 2007 Biennial IFAT Conference members are aware of the implications of this lack of dialogue with this key constituency: "We, of IFAT, are ignoring consumers. Many other

organizations that are not part of IFAT are promoting Fair Trade while not following our standards.”²¹

However, the consumer movement has also not engaged with the umbrella organizations representing the Fair Trade Movement. Prior to their initial intervention at the May 2006 COPOLCO meeting in which they called for Fair Trade standards to be developed within ISO, Consumers International (CI) failed to contact either IFAT or the Fair Trade Advocacy Office to discuss the issue. At the first meeting between CI and F.I.N.E. in December 2006, CI indicated that it intended to take the lead in mainstreaming Fair Trade through the ISO.

In April 2007, CI and AFNOOR, the French national standards organization and COPOLCO produced a report analyzing the results of a survey they had taken among consumer groups, Fair Trade organizations, and COPOLCO members regarding the development of an international fair trade standard within the ISO. The report was to be distributed at the May 2007 COPOLCO Meeting which would discuss the next steps in the process of incorporating Fair Trade standards into the ISO. Although responses from CI members were mixed, members of IFAT and FLO expressed “a quasi-unanimous rejection of the standardization project” (AFNOR; 2007: 19).

Concerns raised by representatives of the Fair Trade Movement over the possibility of the ISO developing Fair Trade standards include that such standards would likely be less ambitious than IFAT and FLO standards, meeting and monitoring ISO standards involves a lengthy and expensive process which would adversely effect the small and marginalized organizations that make up the majority of Fair Trade producers, and that IFAT and FLO’s responsibility to serve the interests of Fair Trade producers would be reduced.

However, the authors of the report interpreted the overwhelming rejection of the development of an ISO standard for Fair Trade by the IFAT, FLO and their members due to their being:

genuinely mistrustful of a normative system, which risks making them lose the control of a process which originated with them, and which would call into question their own standards. They are unanimous in dismissing the idea of a ‘standardization of their activities, which would hamper their necessary adaptation to the realities of the most destitute producers. Their objections concern as much the process of standardization itself as the possible content of a standard on fair trade (AFNOR; 2007: 7)

Given that no representative of a standards-setting Fair Trade Organization was involved in the analysis of the survey results, resulting in its questionable objectivity, the process of any future standardization will need to ensure greater transparency and accountability by all relevant stakeholders.

²¹ Noted by a member of IFAT during the IFAT Conference in Blankenberge, Belgium on 13 May 2007.

Following a year of concerted efforts on behalf of the Fair Trade Advocacy Office and a small number of IFAT Members against future ISO standardization of Fair Trade, on 25 May 2007 members of COPOLCO passed Resolution 10/2007 Fair Trade that acknowledged that it was premature to incorporate Fair Trade certification within the scope of ISO. In order to develop greater understanding of the “potential for problems associated with accurate unreliable claims concerning the ethical dimension of consumer products and services” (ISO, 2007), a joint fact-finding process was to be established including representatives of IFAT, FLO, ISEAL, CI, and AFNOR as well as other interested stakeholders. This fact-finding process will provisionally be hosted and supported by CI rather than by IFAT and the other Fair Trade umbrella organizations. In late July 2007, a Steering Group was established consisting of IFAT, FLO, ISEAL, CI and AFNOR which, at the time of writing, was defining the activities to be involved in the process of identifying the challenges and opportunities of establishing Fair Trade standards within the ISO.

The ruling of COPOLCO reduces the immediate threat of IFAT responsibility for Fair Trade monitoring and certification being transferred to the ISO. However, it also provides IFAT with a window of opportunity to institutionalize engagement with key members of civil society, in particular consumer organizations and global standard setting bodies and address their concerns related to Fair Trade certification.

In order to reach out to other stakeholder groups, and specifically consumer organizations, IFAT and FLO recently produced an information brief stating:

...recognizing the need to protect consumers against misleading ethical and ‘fair’ claims, the Fairtrade Labeling Organizational International and the International Fair Trade Association invite interested stakeholders to participate in a dialogue on how to improve transparency, accessibility and participation within Fair Trade as soon as possible.

This dialogue will allow us to work together to improve Fair Trade, to make it a more open system, more transparent for consumers and with a wider participation from other sectors of the society, and at the same time strengthen Fair Trade contribution to sustainable development and poverty reduction (Fair Trade Advocacy Office; April 2007a).

As the Fair Trade Movement continues to generate greater interest among consumers, business organizations and other stakeholders, the ability of IFAT to retain its authority as the private regulator of FTOs and limit the contesting of its accountability will depend largely on greater and more effective engagement with its stakeholders. However, in equal measure, relevant civil society organizations will need to increase their efforts at transparent and objective analysis and IFAT’s monitoring and certification standards in order to increase its accountability and answerability in the global regulation of Fair Trade Organizations.

IFAT's New Strategic Plan: Advancing Accountability?

This section outlines IFAT's recently adopted New Strategic Plan in terms of the extent they advance the institution's accountability to its Members and broader constituents. A preliminary assessment of the Plan is also offered.

New Strategic Plan

Recognizing the need for IFAT to adapt to the challenges facing it, in September 2006 the Executive Committee instructed the Executive Director, Stefan Durwael, to manage the development of options for ways in which the structure, governance and strategy of IFAT could be strengthened in order to better reflect the interests and needs of its Members. Durwael invited two Honorary Members of IFAT, who were considered to be experts of the Fair Trade Movement, to consult with the membership and make recommendations. In January 2007, the consultants presented their 'Agenda for Change' to the Executive Committee. Following these consultations, a 'New Strategic Plan' that incorporates many of the Agenda for Change recommendations but reflects the networking characteristics of the Fair Trade Movement, was presented to the membership and adopted at the AGM in May 2007.

The key features of the New Strategic Plan in terms of structure, governance and strategy include:

Structure

- Decentralization: The IFAT structure is to decentralize in order to give the five regions greater responsibility in terms of capacity building, identifying market access opportunities, monitoring, communication, and membership recruitment. The regions will also take lead responsibility for specific global activities as requested by IFAT Global.
- Recognition of Regions: According to the Memorandum of Agreement between the IFAT and the IFAT regions that will be in effect between May 2007 and May 2009, the five regions are to have the status of 'organized branches' that will have the right to "manage their own affairs and develop their own plans to meet the needs of members as long as these are in line with the overall IFAT strategic direction and membership criteria" (IFAT; 2007f: 2)
- Secretariat: The IFAT Secretariat is continue to be a small international office, but its location will be determined on the basis of where the most strategic location is judged to be.

Governance

- Board to replace Executive Committee: The Executive Committee is to be renamed 'Board' and expand in size from five to nine 'Board Directors'.

- Broader Representation on Board: Five Board Directors, proposed by the Regional branches and approved by the AGM, as well as three independent Board Directors, elected by Members, are to sit on the Board.
- Independent President of Board: The President of the Board, re-placing the term of ‘Chair’ will be independent and granted an allowance of between Euros 10,000 to 12,000 annually as an honorarium. The Chair will be elected for a term of 2 years and may be re-elected for up to three terms.

Strategy

- Phase 1 implementation of New Strategic Plan: Phase 1, to take place between 2007-2009, is to focus on uniting and strengthening the Fair Trade Movement through building trust, promoting market access and strengthening IFAT (Wills, 2007).
 - o Strengthening of Monitoring System – to retain the credibility and authority of IFAT standards for FTOs and ensure compliance, a review of the Monitoring System occurred in early 2007 and was discussed at the May 2007 AGM. A feature of the strengthened Monitoring system includes the ability of the Regional branches to comment on the system and self-assessment reports. Additionally, the development of an impact assessment is to be developed during 2008-2009.
 - o Development of Craft and Food Product Label – to respond to the trends in Fair Trade demand and production, IFAT is to urgently develop an FTO label for handicrafts products and food by the end of 2008.
 - o Branding of IFAT – In order to “gain greater consumer and official recognition”, IFAT is to hire a professional branding firm by November 2007 (Myers and Wills; 2007: 12).
 - o Updating Mission and Vision Statements – IFAT’s Mission and Vision statements are to be updated to reflect greater ambition.
- Phase 2 implementation of New Strategic Plan: Phase 2, to take place between 2009-2011, will involve a review of progress and development of plans to move IFAT forward (Wills, 2007).

Advancing Accountability?

The New Strategic Plan responds to several of the challenges facing IFAT due to the changes that have occurred within the organization as well as the Fair Trade Movement over the last decade. Many of the elements within the Plan will strengthen the ability of IFAT to carry out its responsibilities toward its Members, including the development of a product label for Fair Trade handicrafts and food products and the strengthening of the

Monitoring System. Additionally, the decentralization in IFAT's structure to provide greater institutionalized responsibility and input from the regions reflects its membership balance²² and thus increases the democratic nature of its governance as well as the accountability to its Southern Members.

However, inclusions as well as omissions in the New Strategic Plan also raise the question of to what extent it advances the accountability of IFAT. While the Plan incorporates extensive changes to the structure and governance of IFAT, it does not directly address the issue of closing the accountability gap with its broader constituents, such as consumers through such means as greater transparency. Nor does the New Strategic Plan incorporate concrete steps to increase engagement with key civil society groups such as consumer organizations, environmental groups, business associations and trade unions or its long-term relationship with FLO and COPOLCO within the ISO.

Thus, there is some concern whether IFAT is placing too much emphasis and dedicating too many of its resources to organizational and governance issues rather than on engaging with its constituents and other stakeholders to work together to improve the livelihoods of marginalized producers and workers, especially in the South as well as to bring about real change to international system of exchange to ensure that trade is more fair.

Addressing the Challenges of IFAT Accountability

This study has provided an assessment of the extent to which engagement by civil society groups, including IFAT's Member FTOs, have helped or hindered the accountability of IFAT. It argued that there is currently an accountability gap between IFAT and its key constituents of Fair Trade producers and consumers. Furthermore, this accountability gap has resulted in IFAT's accountability being increasingly contested by other global governance regulatory bodies, such as FLO and the ISO.

Although the recently adopted New Strategic Plan closes the accountability gap to some extent, recommendations to be considered include:

First, reduce the accountability gap through greater engagement with members and constituents such as producers, importers, consumers, poor and disadvantaged, business circles, and politicians. This includes putting in place effective measures to reduce the accountability gap that currently exists in IFAT through greater pro-active engagement with key constituents and stakeholders.

Second, resolve the issue of whether IFAT Members will be 100 percent Fair Trade in terms of production process as well as exporting and importing activities or whether the focus should be on increasing market access opportunities by focusing on mainstream trade. Can these two approaches be compatible to all Members?

²² There is some concern over the significant differences in the strengths of the five regions. While the Asian region is extremely active and organized with many Members, the North American and Pacific Rim is smaller with less coordinated activity.

Third, ensure that the IFAT Monitoring System includes mandatory rather than random external verification. Such verification would increase the credibility of IFAT's Southern Producers.

Fourth, balance the establishment of an institutionalized democratic and bottom up approach to governance with efficiency.

Annex A

Fair Trade Certification Labels		
Organization	Certifying	Label
IFAT	Fair Trade Organizations	
FLO	Fair Trade Products, especially food products	
Transfair (USA and Canada)	Fair Trade Products	
Max Havelaar (Switzerland)	Fair Trade Products	

References

- AFNOR (2007). *Report and Recommendations on the Standardization of Fair Trade*. Prepared by Fatma Bensalem of AFNOR with the participation of Sadie Homer of Consumers International and Dana Kissinger-Matray of ISO/COPOLCO.
- Cahier de la Solidarite. *India on the Move: Scanning the Social Actors*. Available at: http://www.crid.asso.fr/IMG/pdf/cahier21_india_on_the_move.pdf (Accessed. 9 April 2007)
- EFTA. *Homepage*. <http://www.european-fair-trade-association.org/Efta/index.php> (Accessed 8 April 2007).
- Ebrahim, Alnoor and Weisband, Edward (Eds.). (2007). Forging Global Accountabilities: Participation, Pluralism and Public Ethics. Cambridge, UK. Cambridge University Press.
- Fair Trade Advocacy Office (2007a). “An ISO Norm on Fair Trade?” Brussels. April.
- Fair Trade Advocacy Office (2007b). “Fair Trade Standards and their Verification in Brief”. Brussels. April.
- Fair Trade Advocacy Office (2005). Fair Trade in Europe 2005: Facts and Figures on Fair Trade in 25 European Countries. Survey prepared by Jean-Marie Krier.
- Fair Trade Original (2007). *History*. Available at: http://www.fairtrade.nl/main_en.php?item_id=656 (Accessed 3 May 2007).
- FLO (2007a). *Homepage*. Available at: <http://www.fairtrade.net/>. (Accessed 8 April 2007).
- FLO (2007b). *Global Fairtrade sales increase by 40% benefiting 1.4 million farmers worldwide*. Available at: [http://www.fairtrade.net/single_view.html?&cHash=39deaaa893&tx_ttnews\[backPid\]=104&tx_ttnews\[tt_news\]=26](http://www.fairtrade.net/single_view.html?&cHash=39deaaa893&tx_ttnews[backPid]=104&tx_ttnews[tt_news]=26). (Accessed 14 September 2007).
- Freteur, Thomas (2006). *FTO's in Europe- Building a Common Future. Report from the European Regional IFAT Conference*. Available at: http://209.85.129.104/search?q=cache:b_vL0aUKSooJ:www.bafts.org.uk/Upload_files/2006IFATEuropeanConferenceReport.doc+Mike+Muchilwa&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=2 (Accessed 15 April 2007).
- Gutiérrez, A. (1996). *NGOs and Fairtrade, the Perspectives of Some Fairtrade Organisations*. Trieste, Italy: La Città Invisibile.

- IFAT (2007a). *Where did it all begin?* Available at:
http://www.ifat.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=10&Itemid=17&limit=1&limitstart=1. (Accessed 9 April 2007)
- IFAT (2007b). *Crafts and Food.* Available at:
http://www.ifat.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=10&Itemid=17&limit=1&limitstart=2. (Accessed 9 April 2007)
- IFAT (2007c). *Market Access and Fair Trade Labeling.* Available at:
http://www.ifat.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=10&Itemid=17&limit=1&limitstart=3 (Accessed 9 April 2007)
- IFAT (2007d). *Awareness Raising, Campaigning and Advocacy.* Available at:
http://www.ifat.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=10&Itemid=17&limit=1&limitstart=4 (Accessed 9 April 2007)
- IFAT (2007e). *The Ten Standards of Fair Trade.* Available at:
http://www.ifat.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2&Itemid=14
 (Accessed 15 April 2007)
- IFAT (2007f). “Memorandum of Understanding between IFAT the International Fair Trade Association and the IFAT Regions Covering the Period May 2007 – April 2007.” Draft. 10 May 2007.
- IFAT (2007g). “Monitoring: Building Trust in Fair Trade”. Available at:
http://www.ifat.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=21&Itemid=68
 (Accessed 14 September 2007)
- IFAT (2006). *IFAT Constitution.* Culemborg, The Netherlands.
- IFAT (2005a) Code of Practice. Approved at the 1995 IFAT Conference. New Windsor, Maryland. USA.
- IFAT (2005b). *The Ten Standards of Fair Trade.* As approved at the Quito, Ecuador AGM. Available at:
http://www.ifat.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2&Itemid=14
 (Accessed 7 January 2007).
- IFAT (2005c). *What is Fair Trade?* Available at:
http://www.ifat.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1&Itemid=11.
 (Accessed 8 April 2007).
- INNI. “ISO Assesses Whether to Undertake Standardization on Fair Trade.” INNI Online Update. Issue #14. May 2007. Available at:
http://inni.pacinst.org/inni/inni_online_update_14.htm
 (Accessed 14 September 2007).

“International Non-Governmental Organization Accountability Charter.” 2005. Available at: <http://www.ingoaccountabilitycharter.org/read-the-charter.html> (Accessed 9 June 2007)

Kocken, Marlike (2005). “Fifty Years of Fair Trade: A Brief History of the Fair Trade Movement.” Prepared for IFAT. Available at: http://www.ifat.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=67&Itemid=106 (Accessed 14 September 2007)

Myers, Paul and Wills, Carol (2007). “IFAT: An Agenda for Change”. Kolkata, India. EKTA Trust.

Nicholls, Alex and Opal, Charlotte (2005) Fair Trade: Market-Driven Ethical Consumption. London, U.K. Sage Publications.

Oxfam (2007). *Fairtrade FAQs*. Available at:
http://www.oxfam.org.uk/what_we_do/fairtrade/ft_faq.htm (Accessed 9 April 2007)

Ruggie, John Gerard (2003). “Taking Embedded Liberalism Global: the Corporate Connection” in Held, David and Koenig-Archibugi Matthias (Eds). (2003). Taming Globalization: Frontiers of Governance. Oxford, UK. Polity Press.

Scholte, Jan Aart (2006). “Civil Society and Accountable Global Governance” Project prospectus.

Shared Interest. Available at: <http://www.shared-interest.com/about.htm> (Accessed 7 April 2007)

Taylor, Peter Leigh. “Poverty Alleviation Through Participation in Fair Trade Coffee Networks: Synthesis of Case Study Research Question Findings.” Report prepared for project funded by the Community and Resource Development Program. Ford Foundation. New York, New York. September 2002. Available at: <http://www.colostate.edu/Depts/Sociology/FairTradeResearchGroup/doc/pete.pdf>

Ten Thousand Villages (2007) <http://www.tenthousandvillages.com/home.php>. (Accessed 3 May 2007.)

Tradecraft (2004) *Factsheets – Fair Trade is FINE!* Available at: <http://www.traidcraftinteractive.co.uk/docs/74.pdf> (Accessed 8 April 2007)

Waddell, Steve (2002) “Fair Trade and the International Federation of Alternative Trade: Focusing upon implementation.” Draft paper prepared for GPPN Conference Delegates.

Wills, Carol (2007). “Comparison between the Current IFAT Position, the Agenda for Change and the New Strategic Plan.” Kolkata, India. EKTA Trust.

World Bank (2007) *Data and Statistics*. Available at:
<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/DATASTATISTICS/0,,contentMDK:20394937~menuPK:1192714~pagePK:64133150~piPK:64133175~theSitePK:239419,00.html>. (Accessed 1 May 2007)