Working paper FREE-Cahier FREE n°5-2010

When Fair Trade increases unfairness: The case of quinoa from Bolivia

Aurélie Carimentrand and Jérôme Ballet

jballetfr@yahoo.fr
aureliecarimentrand@yahoo.fr

Abstract
Fair Trade movement tackles the question of global justice. It is experiencing growing success. Fair Trade therefore sorts the beneficiaries, usually by means of certification. Numerous impact studies have assessed the beneficial effects of Fair Trade on the intended beneficiaries. Several studies have nevertheless called into question both the impact of certification and Fair trade. Following these studies this paper shows that Fair Trade in quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) is actually increasing inequalities between Bolivian producers.

Keywords: FairTrade, Inequalities, Quinoa, Bolivia

FREE
Association 1901 à vocation scientifique
SIREN : 483 263 620 / SIRET : 483 263 620 00013
email : freeethique@yahoo.fr web: /http://ethique.neuf.fr/

Introduction

Global justice remains a major challenge. For few decades now Fair trade movement promotes products of developing countries, in a way to improve poor producer revenues[1]. Fair Trade is experiencing growing success. For the last decade, it has been increasingly familiar to consumers, and sales have been growing in Europe, North America, and the Pacific Rim (Fair Trade Federation 2006). In Europe, sales of Fair Trade products have risen from 260 million Euros in 2000 to 1,699 million Euros in 2007 (Krier 2008, p. 51). In North America and the Pacific Rim, sales of Fair Trade products in 2007 were estimated to be 947 million Euro (Krier 2008, p. 54). At the international level, the current standard definition of *Fair Trade* stems from a consensus among four representative international organizations of the Fair Trade movement: *Fairtrade Labelling Organizations International* (FLO), *International Fair Trade Association* (IFAT, now known as the World Fair Trade Organization - WFTO), *Network of European Worldshops* (NEWS!), and *European Fair Trade Association* (EFTA) (Box 1). These four organizations are known collectively as "FINE" from their initials.

Box 1 – Presentation of the members of FINE

The Fairtrade Labelling Organizations International (FLO): The FLO consists of the twenty national associations that manage the Max Havelaar/Transfair Fair Trade label in fifteen countries in Europe [Fairtrade Mark (Ireland), Fairtrade Foundation (Great-Britain), Förningen för Rättvisemärkt (Sweden), Max Havelaar Belgium, Max Havelaar Fonden (Denmark), Max Havelaar France, Max Havelaar Norge (Norway), Max Havelaar Stiftung (Switzerland), Reilun Kaupan (Finland), Sitchting Max Havelaar (Netherlands), Transfair Austria, Transfair Germany, Transfair Italy, Transfair Minka (Luxemburg), Asociación para el sello de comercio justo (Spain)], in Japan (Fairtrade label Japan), in North America (Transfair USA and Transfair Canada), in Oceania (Transfair Labelling Australia & New Zealand) plus one associate member (Comercio Justo Mexico). A single logo has been adopted in order to make it easier to recognize this label.

The World Fair Trade Organization (WFTO, ex-IFAT): The WFTO includes more than 300 organizations specializing in Fair Trade: national Fair Trade federations (such as *Artisans du Monde* in France), producer organizations, NGOs that support Fair Trade …

The Network of European Worldshops (NEWS!): NEWS! is a network of fifteen national federations of "World shops" representing more than 2500 shops in Europe.

The European Fair Trade Association (EFTA): EFTA includes 11 European importers specializing in Fair Trade in 9 European countries: Solidar'Monde (France), Gepa (Germany), CTM (Italy), Magasins du Monde – OXFAM and Oxfam Wereldwinkels (Belgium), Fair Trade Organisatie (Netherlands), Intermon Oxfam and Ideas (Spain), Claro (Switzerland), Traidcraft and Oxfam (Great-Britain), and EZA Fairer Handel (Austria).

Source: Websites of these organizations (www.fairtrade.net; http://www.wfto.com; www.worldshops.org; http://www.european-fair-trade-association.org) consulted in September 2009).

In 2001, the "*FINE consensus*" defined Fair Trade as follows:

"*Fair Trade is a trading partnership based on dialogue, transparency and respect, which seeks greater equity in international trade. It contributes to sustainable development by offering better trading*

conditions to marginalized producers and workers – especially in the South, and securing their rights. Fair Trade organizations (backed by consumers) are engaged actively in supporting producers, raising awareness, and campaigning for changes in the rules and practice of conventional international trade".

This definition puts marginalized producers center stage as beneficiaries. Fair Trade therefore sorts the beneficiaries, usually by means of certification, which is not understood here as the granting of a single, clearly defined analytical object, but as a series of systems and various practices that contribute to a mechanism of regulation and governance including a multitude of players (Mutersbaugh et al. 2005).

Numerous impact studies have assessed the beneficial effects of Fair Trade on the intended beneficiaries: artisans, agricultural producers, and employees. These studies have been conducted on behalf of Fair Trade organizations (Hopkins 2000; Southgate 2000; Dietz *et al.* 2000; Mestre *et al.* 2002, AlterEco 2002), NGOs involved in Fair Trade projects (Chauveau and Eberhart 2002), and foundations (Aranda and Morales 2002; Lyon 2002; Martinez 2002; Mendez 2002; Pérez-Grovas and Cervantes 2002 for instance), or by independent researchers (Diaz Pedregal 2006; Milford 2004; Ronchi 2000 amongst others).

However, some recent studies have seriously called into question the impact of certification in general (rather than specifically that of Fair Trade certification) on small producers, and have also revealed various ambiguities associated with Fair Trade. The first group of studies noted that certification does not necessarily assist the most marginalized producers, and can in fact actually exclude them due to the high costs associated with certification (Klooster 2005; Taylor 2005; Gonzalez and Nigh 2005 amongst others). Mutersbaugh (2002) points out that in the case of the organic certification of coffee in Mexico, the producers have to follow a myriad of restrictive rules. As a result, the monitoring system associated with certification has interfered with local governance, leading to tension between the different producing villages.

In the second group, Renard (2005) and Mutersbaugh (2005) have shown, on the basis of studies of Mexican coffee, that Fair Trade labels do not all correspond to the same quality, and that in particular the arrival of large agrofoods corporations in the Fair Trade niche market can affect the balance between different producers, and this is not always to the advantage of the smallest producers. Getz and Shreck (2006) have also shown that the development of the Fair Trade certification of bananas in the Azua Valley in the Dominican

Republic had accentuated socioeconomic inequalities between producers in the regions concerned.

This article follows on from these earlier studies. We intend to show that Fair Trade in quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) is actually increasing inequalities between Bolivian producers.

The article is structured as follows. In the first section we describe the context in which international trade in quinoa has developed. In the second section, we highlight the effect of socioeconomic differentiation associated with the mechanization of the cultivation of quinoa, and the development of trade in this crop in Bolivia. In the third section, on the basis of an analysis of the national association of quinoa producers in Bolivia (ANAPQUI) engaged in the Fair Trade sector, we discuss the effects of the development of Free Trade networks on producers.

1. The context in which the international quinoa trade has developed

Quinoa is a typical example of an exotic product that became familiar to European consumers via distribution networks specializing in Fair Trade and organic agriculture before making its appearance on the shelves of large and medium-sized sales outlets.

It is produced essentially in South America, in the high plateaus or altiplano of Bolivia, Peru and to a lesser extent, of Equator. These three countries produced 17,747 metric tonnes of quinoa in 1970, but this had reached 58,443 tonnes in 2005 (FAOSTAT 2005), with 56% of the world production in 2005 coming from Peru and 43% from Bolivia. At present, the bulk of Free Trade quinoa comes from Bolivia and it is nearly all certified as "organic produce". The Fair Trade quinoa exported to Europe, and notably to France, is associated with various brands, and labels: *Max Havelaar, Solidar'Monde, Bio-équitable, Main dans la Main, Alter Eco*[2]…

Like many other products, in the 1970s, quinoa fell from favor amongst local consumers, who preferred products imported from the countries of the North instead, because these carried an image of modernity (Repo-Carrasco 1992). From the 1980s, and to a greater extent, in the 1990s, the image of quinoa changed slowly in response to the increased demand from the countries of the North, via the demand of consumers concerned about social and environmental questions, but also about their own health (Cáceres 2005). In the 1980s, very

little quinoa was exported from Bolivia. During the 1980s, the volume of exports increased, rising from 344 metric tonnes in 1990 to 1423 tonnes in 2000. Since the early 2000s, there has been a real boom: exports reached 7641 metric tonnes in 2006 with a value of nearly nine million dollars US: France is one of the main quinoa-importing countries.

This reversal of the production trend was accompanied by major organizational changes in the structure of the networks over time. Cáceres et al. (2007) identify three periods in the organizational structure of the networks. The first period, the 1970s and 1980s, was marked by the creation of producer organizations (*CECAOT* and *ANAPQUI)*, and their reinforcement by the setting up of quinoa-processing activities in the wake of Fair Trade led by charitable organizations and alternative Fair Trade movements. The second period, in the early 1990s, corresponds to the establishment of organic production standards for exports to the countries of the North (Cáceres and Carimentrand 2004a, b; Laguna et al. 2006). The third period, from the middle of the 1990s, corresponds to the first fruits of the expansion of the quinoa network and was associated with the construction of organic and Fair Trade supply lines to the countries of the North, essentially led by private businesses in the countries of the North[3]. This was characterized by the creation of new quinoa processing plants, and by the introduction of systems for the contractualization of agriculture. Some of these networks are intended mainly to supply outlets specializing in Fair Trade and organic products, but most have also been constructed in the wake of major distribution chains, such as *Carrefour* (Cacéres et al. 2007). In 2005, 20% of the quinoa production was exported, and virtually all the quinoa exported was certified as organic (CEPROBOL, 2005).

This last period reflects the changing conventions confronting Fair Trade in response to pressure from multinationals and labeling strategies during the transition from a civil convention to a commercial convention (Renard 2003, 2005). The arrival of private companies in the quinoa segment has consolidated the model of a contract between the producers and agro-industrial companies, introducing an international division of labor in which the erstwhile producers are restricted to the role of growers. This means that they are subject to selection based on quality requirements. It also means that most of the added-value is transferred to the agro-industrial companies (Cacéres and Carimentrand 2004a).

2. A development leading to socio-economic differentiation

The exports of Fair Trade quinoa from Bolivia consist of the *salinas* varieties of quinoa, which are grown in the southern altiplano[4], and in particular the white quinoa *real* (or royal quinoa). The *salinas* (or saltpan) quinoas are grown in eight administrative provinces: the provinces of Ladislao Cabrera, Eduardo Avaroa and Sebastián Pagador in the department of Oruro and those of Daniel Campos, Nor Lípez, Sur Lípez, Enrique Baldivieso and Antonio Quijarro in the department of Potosí. Each province is divided into municipalities that include several communities. For example, the province of Daniel Campos includes two municipalities: LLica and Tahua, which in turn include 49 communities (Alianza, Belen, Palaya…). There are an estimated 15,000 quinoa producers in the altiplano of southern Bolivia (Collao 2003).

From the end of the 1970s, some producers decided to specialize in the mechanized cultivation of quinoa, whereas others continued with a balanced mix of arable and livestock production (the latter consisting mainly of lamas and sheep). This period also corresponds to the first attempts to organize producers into associations, with the creation of the umbrella organization of cooperatives known as *Opération Tierra* (CECAOT) in 1975, and of the national association of quinoa producers (ANAPQUI) in 1983, as well as the first attempts to carry out the industrialized desaponification[5] of quinoa.

Whereas traditionally quinoa is cultivated on the mountain slopes, the mechanized growing of quinoa has developed on the plains, and this resulted in a process of socioeconomic differentiation between the various quinoa producing communities of the altiplano of southern Bolivia, and even within these communities (Laguna 2000; Félix 2004; Vancauteren 2005). However, traditional manual cultivation systems and mechanized systems continue to coexist in the altiplano of southern Bolivia, with sharp disparities between the different provinces and different communities. Mechanized systems dominated the province of Ladislao Cabrera, whereas traditional systems are more common in that of Daniel Campos. In this latter province, however, there are some communities pioneering the mechanized cultivation of quinoa (for example Palaya, Alianza and Belen) (Félix 2004).

The mechanization of quinoa growing, combined with the renewed economic value of this crop has allowed some types of producers to boost their incomes considerably, leading to a process of unequal development amongst the different producers. The arrival of tractors has

indeed allowed producers to increase the areas under cultivation in a context in which the manual production of quinoa does not allow a farmer to produce more than one hectare per farmer (Félix 2004, p.29)[6]. This intensification of quinoa production has also made it a more profitable crop. As a result, the area of quinoa grown per producer is very variable, ranging from under five hectares to over fifty hectares.

The development of the mechanized cultivation of quinoa has made a considerable contribution to the socioeconomic upheaval in the altiplano of southern Bolivia. Socioeconomic differences of this sort, resulting from the introduction of tractors, are not specific to this region. They have also been observed in many other areas of the world. In most cases, ownership of agricultural equipment confers an important advantage, which promotes control of the land, as shown for example by Belloncle (1985) in the case of Mali. In the situation we are concerned with, some specific aspects of the system of land-ownership and of the local topography have also played a considerable part in this process.

In the altiplano of southern Bolivia, a new form of unofficial land ownership has emerged with the informal appropriation of common land suitable for mechanization. In the traditional agrarian system of the *Aymaras*, a member of the local community can appropriate land for himself by clearing it. Before tractors arrived, this involved land located on the slopes that had to be cleared by hand (Félix 2004). Applying this rule to areas of the plain that are cleared mechanically has had a considerably impact on the distribution of land ownership within these communities, and a drastic reduction in the common land traditionally used as pastures for lamas, and its appropriation by individuals for the mechanized cultivation of quinoa.

The colonization of the land of the plains has led to injustices and conflicts between families and communities (Félix 2004), because this process has mainly been to the advantage of the richest families, who had capital assets they could sell (notably in the form of livestock) in order to invest in the agricultural machinery required to clear land suitable for mechanized agriculture.

In view of the topographical restrictions of mechanization, ”mountain” communities have been excluded from this mechanized cultivation of quinoa, and still engage in considerable pastoral activity, whereas the “plain” communities and “mixed” communities have participated fully in this process of modernizing agriculture.

Producers who have invested the profits made from the mechanized cultivation of quinoa in the plains in the development of urban activities, and producers who provide agricultural services (rental of tractors and other agricultural machinery) have been the ones who have profited most from the mechanization of quinoa growing.

3. Inequalities exacerbated by Fair Trade: the case of ANAPQUI

There are several supply chains for Fair Trade quinoa. The main ones are the European importers who specialize in Fair Trade (i.e. the members of EFTA: *GEPA* in Germany, *Solidar'Monde* in France…), the *Bio-équitable* network developed by the *Euro-nat* company, that of *Main dans la Main* developed by *Rapünzel* and, since 2005, the *Max Havelaar* labeling network.

The Bolivian quinoa producers association (ANAPQUI) is the main supplier of Fair Trade quinoa to Europe. This is the biggest association of quinoa producers certified by the *Flo-Cert*[7] certifying organization, which awards the *Max Havelaar* label and is the main trading partner of the members of EFTA for the importation of quinoa for sale in World Shops. Over the period 2001-2006, between 31% and 39% of ANAPQUI's quinoa exports destined for Fair Trade outlets. Over this period, the volume of ANAPQUI's quinoa exports destined for the Fair Trade sector rose from 170 to 585 metric tonnes. This increased 3.5 fold over this period despite a fall in 2005. The marked increase in 2005 and 2006 was linked in particular to ANAPQUI's joining the *Max Havelaar* label network.

Our analysis of the impact of Fair Trade on inequalities in the ANAPQUI producers association is based on a series of documents and audit reports about this association, in particular the report from the Alter Eco company (2007), on any official statistics available, on a set of data gathered in the field in 2004 during a one-month research mission to Bolivia, as well as on information gathered during interviews with resource individuals, notably with ANAPQUI managers, and the monitoring manger of *Solidar'Monde*.

ANAPQUI is an umbrella Organization that includes eight regional organizations of quinoa producers. This organization is involved in the collection, industrial processing, and marketing of quinoa, notably for export. In 2005, ANAPQUI included more than five hundred organic quinoa producers[8] in the altiplano of southern Bolivia. Their mean production was 4 metric tonnes, and the mean surface area cultivated was 6.5 hectares. Moreover, 70% of the quinoa produced by ANAPQUI members was produced by

mechanical cultivation in the plains, and 30% by traditional cultivation methods on the slopes *(Alter Eco*, 2007, p.9).

In the current context of growing socioeconomic differentials between the quinoa producers of the altiplano of southern Bolivia, we show in this section that Fair Trade does not seem to be an effective instrument for reducing social inequalities between quinoa producers. In fact, it actually seems to exaggerate these inequalities. This is a paradoxical situation given the objectives of assisting marginalized producers proclaimed by the Fair Trade movement, and it looks to us as if it is due to three concomitant factors: on the one hand, the most disadvantaged producers quite simply do not belong to the producers organizations that benefit from Fair Trade; on the other hand, the targeting of "small producers" defended by the Fair Trade organizations that import quinoa, such as *Solidar'Mond*e or *Alter Eco,* does not correspond to the objectives of the organizations of producers with which they work; finally, the *FLO* standards of Fair Trade for quinoa (FLO, 2004) do not make any social distinctions between producers.

3.1 The exclusion of some of the small producers

For the agricultural year 2004-2005, 54% of the quinoa producers who belong to ANAPQUI cultivated less than five hectares of quinoa, 18% between five and twenty hectares and 28% more than twenty hectares. As a consequence, the volume of quinoa delivered by the producers to their regional organization ranged from a few hundredweight to 200 hundredweight[9], and more than one quarter of ANAPQUI producers can be classified as "big" producers of quinoa. The quinoa produced is bought by the regional organizations of ANAPQUI all year round at the price set by the directors of the national association. If we take the price paid to producers in 2005, 250 bolivianos[10] (i.e. about 31 dollars US)[11], incomes varied from less than 12,500 bolivianos (i.e. about 1553 dollars US) to over 50,000 bolivianos (i.e. about 6211 dollars US), which clearly reveals the differences in incomes related to the sale of quinoa.

If we divide the members of ANAPQUI into their regional organizations, it can be seen that most of the big producers belong to the APROQUIRY regional organization, located in the Ladislao Cabrera province, which is not surprising as large mechanized farms predominate in this province.

According to Vancauteren (2005), the proportion of small producers has decreased considerably within the organizations of quinoa producers. Their withdrawal is apparently mainly linked to their disappointment about how these organizations work. ANAPQUI and its regional organizations do not seem to have escaped from the tendency to deviate from collective interests towards particular interests, and the control exerted by a few groups of influential individuals on these groups. As a result, the association lost all credibility and legitimacy amongst some small producers whose interests it no longer defended

However, Fair Trade inevitably involves organizations of producers, at least in the *FLO-Max Havelaar* system, and within integrated supply chains such as *Artisans du Monde*. Small producers are therefore inevitably excluded from the scope of the organizations benefiting from Fair Trade, which is a commonplace criticism of the inability of Fair Trade to target the poor. As a result, small producers have to market their quinoa as best they can on the local market, Challapata, or through private traders who exploit their isolation and weak negotiating capacity to impose their own rules[12].

Getz and Shreck (2006) have pointed out that the exclusion of some banana producers in the Dominican Republic was linked to restrictions of the access to certified organizations, notably due to the excess of offer over demand for Fair Trade bananas. In the case of quinoa, the exclusion tends to result from the self -exclusion of small producers due to the mechanisms of the "privileges" that the bigger producers, who also have a preponderant weight in the organizations, assign to themselves.

3.2 A mismatch between the principles of Fair Trade and the objectives of the producers

As Getz and Shreck (2006) point out in the case of banana producers in the Dominican Republic, most of the producers working for Fair Trade in fact know nothing about Fair Trade. The same thing is true of the quinoa sector. However, we also observe the reverse phenomenon, i.e. the fact that the Fair Trade organizations know little or nothing about the concrete circumstances of small producers. This has led them to establish general rules that are out of step with the problems of the most disadvantaged producers. Thus, as highlighted by Maldidier (2006), Fair Trade does not take into account the power relationships that are woven into these organizations, and which are linked to the socioeconomic stratification. For example, there is no policy within ANAPQUI to give preference to purchasing from the poorest producers in the association, nor any policy of redistribution in favor of these

producers. To cite Maldidier (Ibid., p.9): "the same price is paid for quinoa to all producers and there is no explicit rule intended to regulate the amount of quinoa purchased from each of the groups or each of the members. The producer who farms manually on the hillsides, and who produces small quantities has, in theory, the same right to sell it as the producer who produces far bigger volumes in a mechanized and extensive fashion in the plains". But in fact, this right depends informally on the power relationships within the organizations. In this context, the price differential for quinoa linked to Fair Trade mainly works to the benefit of the "big" producers of quinoa.

The objectives of these producers are not those of Fair Trade, and the most powerful producers are cashing in and getting rich at the expense of the smallest producers. The mechanisms of Fair Trade therefore "underwrite" the strategies of the biggest producers, thus contributing *de facto* to the self-exclusion of the small producers.

3.3 Inappropriate standards

As we have just seen, there is a mismatch between the principles of Fair Trade and the practices of organizations of producers. The FLO Fair Trade standards for quinoa, defined in 2004 (FLO 2004), do not specifically take into account the inequalities between producers. These standards do not stipulate any measures for correcting the growing socioeconomic gap between the quinoa producers of the altiplano of southern Bolivia. The social criteria of the specifications only concern how the cooperative or group of producers operates. It must be democratic and transparent. We should recall here that the *FLO* Fair Trade standards for organizations of producers[13] stipulate that "small producers" must supply more than 50% of the total production intended for Fair Trade (FLO 2003). However, the definition of "small producers" used by the FLO does not specify an income ceiling: "the term "small producers" means that they are not structurally dependent on salaried labor and work their farm mainly using their own labor and that of their family". The seasonal labor that the "big" quinoa producers call upon does not therefore mean that they lose the status of "small producers" for Fair Trade purposes, as defined by the FLO.

4. Conclusion: what are the prospects?

In a context marked by the pressure exerted by the international demand and by competition from other Fair Trade networks, the question of the diversity of the social and agro-ecological contexts of the different zones of quinoa production has been ignored in favor of other priorities, notably the guarantee of a larger volume of quinoa that can qualify for labeling, and the time required to launch this new network. Setting up new Fair Trade networks is important for national bodies such as *Max Havelaar*. In 2001, the UK *Fairtrade Foundation* expressed the view that a way had to be found to develop new networks within six months, in order to be able to compete with other companies and even supply supermarkets with products that can be assimilated to Fair Trade (Levret 2003).

The resulting race to recruit new networks has resulted in the introduction of standards that are inappropriate to the specific social, economic, and environmental contexts of the production system. The increase in inequalities as a result of Fair Trade is partly attributable to the application of decontextualized standards. According to Vancauteren (2005) the *Max Havelaar France* association, responsible for creating the *Max Havelaar* label for quinoa, masks the complexity of the social organization of quinoa production.

However, in view of this situation, and of the environmental problems linked to the mechanized cultivation of quinoa, notably soil erosion (Ballet and Carimentrand 2008), the *Solidar'Monde* organization would like to market a "mountain grown" quinoa[14], which could be one way to reverse the current trend. To do this, *Solidar'Monde* is trying to persuade ANAPQUI to differentiate between crops from the mountains and those from the plain, which would be a first step towards recognizing the specific value of this type of quinoa, and therefore of this type of farming.

Notes

1. However, we should note that the development of Fair Trade has not been linear. It has consisted of several stages. For a historical description, see amongst others Adams (1989), Barratt-Brown (1993), Moore (2004), Ballet & Carimentrand (2007), Raynolds et al. (2007).
2. For a full description of these brands, see Ballet and Carimentrand (2007).
3. Note that after this period it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish between Fair Trade and organic quinoa. The quinoa supply chain is in fact constructed around the twin poles of Fair Trade and organic agriculture. Virtually all the quinoa exported to Europe now carries both these labels.
4. The high plateaus of the central Andes.
5. Pearl quinoa (which is ready for consumption) is obtained after a process which involves cleaning, "desaponifying" and sorting the quinoa grains. The desaponification of quinoa consists of

eliminating the saponins, which are bitter and toxic substances found in the pericarp of the quinoa grain.

6. Félix (2004, p. 57) considers that manual cultivation of quinoa corresponds on average to a workload of 67 man days (m.d) per hectare, whereas mechanical cultivation only requires 27 m.d.
7. In December 2007, three organisations of Bolivian producers were certified by *FLO-Cert*: ANAPQUI, CECAOT and APQUISA. Source: *FLO-Cert*. website www.flo-cert.net/flo-cert/operators.php?id=10 (consulted on 11 December 2007).
8. In 2005, *ANAPQUI* included 532 producers of organic quinoa, and 332 producers in the process of converting to organic production, and produced an estimated 2170 metric tonnes of organic quinoa and an estimated 1043 tonnes of quinoa "in transition"(Source: ANAPQUI).
9. These are the traditional units used locally (rather than metric units).
10. The *boliviano* is the Bolivian currency.
11. The exchange rate used here is: 1 US$ = 8.05 bolivianos for the year 2005. This exchange rate was calculated from the exchange rates published monthly on the Central Bank of Bolivia's website (www.bcb.gov.bo)
12. However, we should note one indirect beneficial effect of Fair Trade: the local price has generally increased for everyone (Carimentrand 2008).
13. These are generic standards. They are applicable not only to organisations of quinoa producers, but also to all the organisations of producers of labelled products.
14. Personal conversation with the person in charge of improving the *Solidar'Monde* guarantee, June 2007.

References

Adams, R., 1989. *Who profits?*. Oxford: Lion Publishing.

Alter Eco, 2002. Etude d'impact du commerce équitable au Sri Lanka. Alter Eco, Paris.

Alter Eco, 2007. Alter Eco internal audit report: ANAPQUI, june 2007. Alter Eco, Paris.

Aranda, J., Morales, C., 2002. Evaluación de los beneficios actuales y el potencial para el combate a la pobreza, de la participación en redes de comercio justo de café en la coordinadora estatal de productores de café Oaxaca. Colorado State University, DESAL/Ford Foundation, USA.

Ballet, J., Carimentrand, A., 2007. *Le Commerce équitable*. Paris: Ellipses.

Ballet, J., Carimentrand, A., 2008. La responsabilité des firmes vis-à-vis du développement : le cas de la filière quinoa du Fair Trade en Bolivie. *Mondes en développement*, 36 (4), pp. 13-26.

Barratt-Brown, M., 1993. *Fair Trade: Reforms and Realities in the International Trading System*. London: Zed Books Ltd.

Belloncle, G., 1985. *Participation paysanne et aménagements hydro-agricoles. Les leçons de cinq expériences africaines*. Paris: Karthala.

Carimentrand, A., 2008. Les enjeux de la certification biologique et équitable du quinoa (*Chenopodium Quinoa* Willd.) du consommateur au producteur. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Versailles – Saint Quentin en Yvelines University, France.

Chauveau, C., Eberhart, C., 2002. Etude du commerce équitable dans la filière café en Bolivie. CICDA, France.

Collao Pérez, R., 2003. La cadena productiva de la quinua en Bolivia. UPC SBPC, La Paz, Bolivia.

Diaz Pedregal, V., 2006. *Commerce équitable et organisations de producteurs. Le cas des caféiculteurs andins au Pérou, en Equateur et en Bolivie*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Diaz Pedregal, V., 2007. *Le commerce équitable dans la France contemporaine. Idéologies et pratiques*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Dietz, M., Piepel, K., Van Biesbrock, J., 2000. Development Impact of Fair Trade: Contributions for Discussions. Misereor-Bread for the World-Friederich Ebert Foundation.

Eberhart, N., 2007. Dispositif de mesure d'impact du commerce équitable sur les organisations et familles paysannes et leurs territoires. Proposition méthodologique. AVSF, Lyon et Nogent sur Marne, France.

Fair Trade Federation, 2006. Fair Trade Trends in North America and the Pacific Rim. Fair Trade Federation, Washington.

Félix, D., 2004. Diagnostic agraire de la Province Daniel Campos, Bolivie. Le développement de la filière quinoa et ses conséquences sur l'équilibre du système agraire des Aymaras de la marca LLica-Tahua ». Unpublished Master Thesis, Montpellier Supagro, France.

FLO, 2003. Standards génériques du commerce équitable pour les organisations de petits producteurs, version 01.03. www.fairtrade.net (consulted on january 2006).

FLO, 2004. Fairtrade standards for quinoa for small farmer's organizations. www.fairtrade.net (consulted on january 2006).

Getz, C., Shreck, A., 2006. What organic and fair trade labels do not tell us: towards a place-based understanding of certification. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 30 (5), pp. 490-501.

Gonzales, A., Nigh, R., 2005. Certification and smallholder participation in the global market (Mexico). *Journal of Rural Studies* 21, pp. 449-460.

Hopkins, R., 2000. Impact Assessment Study of Oxfam Fair Trade. Oxfam UK, London.

Klooster, D., 2005. Environmental certification of forests: the evolution of environmental governance in a commodity network. *Journal of Rural Studies* 21, pp. 403-417.

Krier, J.-M., 2008. Fair Trade 2007: new facts and figures from an ongoing success story. DAWS, Netherlands.

Laguna, P., 2000. El impacto del desarrollo del mercado de la quinua en los sistemas productivos y modos de vida del Altiplano Sur boliviano. Proceedings of the 16th Congress of the international association of production systems, Santiago, Chili.

Levret, C., 2003. Etude sur la mise en place de nouvelles filières commerce équitable, proposition d'un système d'organisation au sein de FLO International et de ses membres. *Série Master of Science,* 63. CIHEAM-IAMM, France.

Lyon, S., 2002. Evaluation of the Actual and Potential Benefits for the Alleviation of Poverty through the Participation in Fair Trade Coffee Networks: Guatemala Case Study. Colorado State University, DESAL/Ford Foundation, USA.

MAE, 2004. Programmes d'appui aux actions non gouvernementales en Bolivie. Evaluation (1993-2004) des POD (petites opérations de développement) et des cofinancements ». Paris, Direction générale de la coopération internationale et du développement, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères.

Maldidier, C., 2006. Quelle construction sociale de la qualité "équitable" d'un produit? Vers des systèmes de garanties plus fiables et plus équitables. Proceedings of the *2nd international symposium on Fair Trade*, Montréal (Québec, Canada) 19-21 June 2006.

Martinez, M.E., 2002. Evaluation of the Actual and Potential Benefits for the Alleviation of Poverty through the Participation in Fair Trade Coffee Networks: The Case of the Tzobolotic Coffee Coop Chiapas, Mexico. Colorado State University, DESAL/Ford Foundation, USA.

Mendez, E., 2002. Fair Trade Networks in Two Coffee Cooperatives of Western El Salvador: An Analysis of Insertion through a Second Level Organization. Colorado State University, DESAL/Ford Foundation, USA.

Mestre, C., Heeren, N., Castro, I., Rasamoelina, E., 2002. Evaluation de l'impact sur les producteurs du Sud de l'action Fair Trade mise en oeuvre par Artisans du Monde depuis 25 ans. Artisans du Monde, France.

Milford, A., 2004. Coffee, Co-operatives and Competition: The Impact of Fair Trade. Chr. Michelsen Institute, Norway.

Moore, G., 2004. The Fair Trade Movement: Parameters, Issues and Future Research. *Journal of Business Ethics* 53(1-2), pp. 73-86.

Mutersbaugh, T. 2002. The number is the beast: a political economy of organic-coffee certification and producer unionism. *Environment and Planning A* 34, pp. 1165-1184.

Mutersbaugh, T., Klooster, D., Renard, M.-C., Taylor, P., 2005. Certifying rural spaces: Quality-Certified Products and Rural Governance. *Journal of Rural Studies* 21, pp. 381-388.

Pérez-Grovas, V., Cervantes, E., 2002. Evaluación de los beneficios actuales y el potencial para el combate a la pobreza, de la participación en redes de comercio justo de café en la Union Majomut. Colorado State University, DESAL/Ford Foundation, USA.

Raynolds, L.T., Murray, D., Wilkinson, J., 2007. *Fair Trade. The Challenges of Transforming Globalization*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Renard, M.-C., 2005. Quality Certification, Regulation and Power in Fair Trade. *Journal of Rural Studies* 21, pp. 419-431.

Repo-Carrasco, R., 1992. *Cultivos Andinos y la Alimentación Infantil*. Serie Investigaciones n°1. Comisión de Coordinación de Tecnologia Andina (CCTA), Lima (Perú).

Ronchi, L., 2000. Fair Trade in Costa Rica: An Impact Report. University of Sussex, UK.

Southgate, A., 2000. Analysis and Conclusions of the Participatory Impact Assessment Process of Apeca. Oxfam GB, UK.

Taylor, P., 2005. A fair trade approach to community forest certification?: A framework for discussion. *Journal of Rural Studies* 21, pp. 433-447.

Vancauteren, D., 2005. AVSF: Encore un effort pour accompagner l'entrée de la paysannerie dans le system capitaliste. End of contract report, AVSF, Nogent sur Marne, France.