Abstract
Among the outstanding details that remain to be addressed by AfCFTA member countries is submitting which products they consider "sensitive", or special products to be exempted from deeper tariff cuts. The heterogeneous levels of development, economic structures, and geographical, social and environmental conditions mean that the benefits of far-reaching integration might not be equally divided and that there can be no “one size fits all” solution that could be applied by all the African countries. This paper seeks to contribute to the ongoing integration process by providing some empirically based Special Products (SP) Special Safeguard Mechanism (SSM) concepts from a sustainable development perspective, along with some strategic options to be considered by policymakers. It proposes a possible methodology that governments could follow when developing their national lists of SPs. It proposes indicators that connect local realities – such as food insecurity, the composition of the traditional diet, rural employment structures, and market conditions – with trade disciplines.[1]
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1. Introduction
African Heads of States signed a free trade covering more than 1.2 billion people with a combined GDP of around $3.4 trillion across Africa deal to replace current regional and bilateral trade agreements and to eventually be extended to create shared policies on investment, competition and intellectual property. While it is a good idea to integrate eventually, many experts doubt the continent is ready for such a far-reaching agreement.

While AfCFTA member countries would benefit from freer agricultural trade, some fear that only a few middle-income countries and large multinational companies and food exporters capture the new opportunities that the AfCFTA would bring. Lower-income African countries would gain only little and might even lose from out to liberalisation. Many of these countries still have large rural populations composed of small and resource-poor farmers with limited access to infrastructure and few employment alternatives. Thus, these countries are concerned that domestic rural populations employed in import-competing sectors might be negatively affected by further trade integration, becoming increasingly vulnerable to market instability and import surges with the removal of tariff barriers.

Many African countries still depend on the export of a few commodities, the prices of which show high volatility and long-term decline. Commodity dependence, the expected erosion of preferences that some countries depend on for their export earnings, as well as increased food import prices due to the elimination of export subsidies, make it difficult for these countries to guarantee their growing populations the food they need.

On the other hand, agricultural trade imports have increased faster than exports in the majority of developing countries. In several instances, this has contributed to the displacement of domestic production. According to FAO, there have been increasing reports of food import surges in developing countries since the mid-1990s, particularly among low-income food-insecure countries (FAO 2003.) In this context, safeguarding domestic food production capacity has become an essential component of food security strategies in an increasing number of countries.

The competitiveness of Africa’s economies ultimately depends on the level of productivity of individual nations, regions, and cities to facilitate trade and
investment into opportunities for firms, farms, and social and physical infrastructure.

Some countries including Nigeria are cautious about the prospects for success, as no one knows with certainty what the CFTA means in the long term for economic growth and prosperity. Some fear it may have limited benefits or even negative impacts.

Special Products and (SPs) and Special Safeguard Mechanism (SSM) are two policy instruments that could mitigate the negative impacts of the AfCFTA. Is adequately identified and implemented, SPs should provide targeted protection for products that are important for food security, livelihood security and rural development, but which would not survive under competitive conditions.

Subsidised exports from industrialised countries, has made it more cost effective for people in towns and cities to source their food from the world market than from domestic production. Liberalisation has also contributed to farm concentration. This has led to increased productivity in some cases but has also increased inequalities and the marginalisation of small producers who are unable to take advantage of new trading opportunities.

2. Identifying Special Products

UNECA is hopeful that African countries can move "very quickly" to identify their “special” or "sensitive" products. However, many details are still not addressed. Before countries could submit the products, they consider special products or "sensitive", to be exempted them from tariff cuts, much needs to be done.

In 2005 WTO Members agreed that developing countries would have the flexibility to self-designate ‘an appropriate number’ of tariff lines as Special Products, doing so “guided by indicators based on the criteria of food security, livelihood security and rural development”. These products would be eligible for ‘more flexible’ treatment.[2]

Discussions focused on three main areas: (i) how the proposed flexibilities might affect developing country exports; (ii) the number of tariff lines, and; (iii) the related issue of the number and kind of indicators used to guide SP selection.

At most, to entirely exempt SPs from tariff reduction could slow down the increase of South-South trade. At the same time, it has also been argued that these flexibilities would, in fact, contribute to increasing South-South trade in the longer term, as they would allow developing countries to make investments in their agricultural sectors and readjust their production structure to become more competitive, or to diversify into other sectors of the economy.

3. Rationale Behind The Concepts Of Special Products (SP) And The Special Safeguard Mechanism (SSM)

Developing countries have justified the need for provisions on SPs and the SSM because further liberalisation might affect food and livelihood security and rural development. In this respect, it is useful to review the impacts of past liberalisation in developing countries. This is a subject of considerable controversy, with limited and inconclusive empirical evidence. While it is clear that removing trade distortions might contribute to employment and poverty alleviation by providing increased trade opportunities, it is widely recognised that indiscriminate liberalisation might also generate negative impacts (Bernal, L.2004)

Firstly, trade liberalisation is often accompanied by broader economic reforms, which usually entail the reduction of state intervention in the economy and the withdrawal of government support from some social and other services.

In many countries, this process has also been characterised by a conscious decision by governments to reorient agricultural production towards exports, sometimes by focusing their agricultural support on the promotion of non-traditional export-oriented sectors.

It brought benefits to the rural poor, through increased employment and by allowing some independent farms to produce for the export-oriented sector, thus enabling them to command higher prices. However, the concomitant effect of this reorientation of agricultural production towards exports has been the neglect of domestic food production.
This, combined with high transport costs in rural areas and low world prices resulting in part from subsidised exports from industrialised countries, has made it more cost-effective for urban areas to source their food from the world market than from domestic production. Liberalisation has also contributed to farm concentration. This has led to increased productivity in some cases but has also increased inequalities and the marginalisation of small producers who are unable to take advantage of new trading opportunities.

SPs and the SSM are two different instruments, addressing two different problems associated with trade liberalisation. The idea behind the SPs is to provide targeted protection for the rural populations of developing countries from the possible negative impacts of trade liberalisation. This protection is likely to take the form of tariff reduction exemptions or minimal tariff cuts over a more extended transition period for products that are deemed necessary for food security, livelihood security or rural development, but which would not survive under so-called competitive conditions. Mostly smallholder subsistence farmers, who represent a significant proportion of developing countries’ rural population, cultivate these products.

By contrast, the SSM would allow countries to raise tariffs above their bound levels for a limited duration to protect import-competing sectors against price depression and import surges. This tool could be useful for products that are ‘competitive’ – or which because of SP flexibility could ‘compete’ with imports – but which are still vulnerable to price fluctuation and revenue-related risks. The SSM allows countries to raise tariffs above their bound levels for a limited duration to protect import-competing sectors from import surges and price depression.

3.1 How AfCFTA members can identify their SPs?

Each country can undertake an internal and inclusive process of discussion and consultations to identify its SPs and products eligible for the SSM. It is a precondition for an informed and active participation in the negotiations. The primary challenge is to genuinely build on the three objectives when designating SPs, instead of being driven by narrowly defined commercial considerations.

3.2 The importance of a multi-stakeholder approach

A multi-stakeholder methodology is required to structure the internal discussion process (Figure 1). The process aims to place the analysis for the identification of SPs within the broader national strategy for sustainable agricultural development and poverty alleviation. It also includes a range of stakeholder groups such as farmers’ associations, consumers, industry representatives and civil society in the conversation about SPs, along with government officials and trade negotiators. These groups, which are directly affected by trade integration, bring new and often overlooked insights to the table regarding the criteria for selection of SPs.

Multi-stakeholder participation has been critical in the process of facilitating the identification of SPs and products with access to the SSM. While government officials and policymakers are responsible for the final selection of products to be designated on the basis of specific criteria, the decisions will also need to be informed by consultation between stakeholder groups such as farmers’ associations, consumers, industry and exporter representatives and civil society with customs, agricultural and central bank officials and trade negotiators.

Such a consultation process ensures that any empirical research is subjected to scrutiny and refinement by groups such as farmers’ groups, which are affected by the decision taken at the national level. This process also enables policy-makers to complement empirical research with new insights and perspectives on the selection criteria for SPs that may have been ignored or overlooked during the research process.

The methodology also attempts to operationalise the three concepts entailed in the WTO July Framework Agreement through an illustrative list of indicators, both quantitative and qualitative, applied at the national and sub-national levels. These indicators identify both the intended beneficiaries of the SP-SSM flexibilities and to assess the importance of specific products from a food/livelihood security and rural development perspective.
The methodology provides guidelines to assess the potential direct or indirect impact of further liberalisation on the products identified. In particular, it highlights the need for policymakers to take into considerations issues such as substitute products, vulnerability to imports or current levels of protection when finalising lists and ranking the identified products.

Figure 1 A Conceptual Framework for the Identification of Special Products in Developing Countries
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Source: adapted from Bartel, C. et al. (ICTSD)

The methodology was tested in studies selected by geographic distribution, the presence of domestic research capacity, political willingness to support the process, and their various statuses as Net Food-Importing Developing Countries (NFIDC), Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries (LIFDC), and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Kenya, Tanzania and Nigeria were among the 20 selected countries.

To assess the economic and social importance of particular products for specific high-poverty sub-regions within a country, the analysis should apply indicators that go beyond the national level, to understand circumstances at the sub-national or provincial level. Furthermore, in addition to the identification of products most relevant from the perspective of food security at the national and/or sub-national levels, there is a need to identify the vulnerable groups that are the intended beneficiaries of SP-SSM flexibilities – the rural poor and small farmers – and the specific products on which their livelihoods depend.

To identify the intended beneficiaries – subsistence and smallholder farmers but also small commercial farmers who might be affected by further liberalisation and become subsistence farmers – proposed indicators were based on income, or more precisely the lack thereof; the geographical distribution of poverty; and measures regarding production capacity, such as agricultural productivity and the size of landholdings.

An illustrative list of indicators to identify subsistence and smallholder farmers – the intended beneficiaries of SP-SSM flexibilities:

### 3.4 Identification of the intended beneficiaries

The intended beneficiaries of the SP provisions and flexibilities are those segments of the population whose livelihoods is at risk from the effects of liberalisation. These are the rural poor, often small farmers with no other source of income, and population groups where women usually are the primary source of labour in the production process. To address the needs of these groups, three categories of indicators are proposed.

#### 4. Indicators

##### 4.1 Indicators Related to the Income Level

The determination of these indicators depends on the availability of data in each country. Nationally established poverty indicators, including parameters on urban and rural poverty, can be used since they respond best to the reality of each country and its particular circumstances. The following Indicators can be used:
The number of households or persons below the national poverty line;

The number of people with incomes below the necessary to cover basic needs (i.e. food, shelter, health, clothes, education, etc);

The measurement of household expenditures; or,

The use international standards of poverty such as the World Bank’s poverty line of US$ 1 per person per day.

Geographical distribution of poverty

• The analysis of the geographical distribution of poverty on the basis of the administrative/political organisation of each country;

• An assessment based on the agro-ecological conditions of various regions.

Production capacity

• Very country-specific, but could include size of landholding, number of livestock, productivity.

4.2 Indicators related to the geographical distribution of poverty

Several studies suggest that poverty can be particularly severe in specific areas, so-called ‘pockets of poverty’, something which is often explained by the lack of an adequate resource base, for example, scarcity of fertile land and a lack of water resources, or isolation due to a lack of adequate infrastructure. The population’s livelihoods in poorly endowed regions usually depend on a single activity put at risk by liberalising trade in the few crops usually grown in those areas.

To address these issues, indicators must be based on: the analysis of the geographical distribution of poverty by the administrative/political organisation of each developing country; and an assessment based on the agro-ecological conditions of various regions.

4.3 Indicators regarding production capacity

The definition of subsistence and small-scale farmers depends on the particular circumstances of each country and its agricultural sector. No internationally agreed parameters exist for identifying such farmers, even though improving their livelihoods is fundamental to improving the living standards in rural areas. In this context, the indicators used would need to relate to the size of the production unit – for instance, the number of hectares for cultivation in the case of crops and number of heads for livestock – and its productivity; for instance, metric tons of produce per hectare and head of livestock.

Identification of relevant products from the perspective of livelihood security and rural development needs

In addition to identifying the beneficiaries, it is also necessary to identify the products on which their livelihoods depend. Livelihood security and rural development needs are linked to the resource base, economic activities and social networks on which rural populations depend. It follows then that specific products are particularly relevant for the well-being of large segments of a country’s population.

The two sets of indicators suggested below attempt to capture the relative contribution of specific products to the economy and employment generation, using these two variables as proxies for the broad concepts of livelihood security and rural development needs.

Measuring the economic importance of agricultural products

The following primary indicators can help capture the relative economic importance of a particular agricultural sector:

• The contribution of the product to the national agricultural GDP;
The contribution of the product to a particular region’s GDP;

- The area of land dedicated to the production of a particular product at the national or regional levels;

- The number of heads of livestock in the country or region;

- The share of per capita income derived from a particular sector at the national or regional level.

Qualitative analysis may also be necessary to address other variables such as the links between a particular sector and the rest of the economy, or the potential for value addition. Indicators of the potential for value addition and linkages of a product include the extent to which it can be locally processed; the share of domestic agricultural intermediate inputs used in non-agricultural sectors, and the value of goods and services used as inputs in the production of the sector.

Indicators related to the sustainability of agricultural sectors

Developing countries may also want to look at indicators related to the sustainability of their agricultural sectors. For example, the environmental impact or agro-ecological role of some farming practices might be included in the considerations to designate a particular product as an SP. Although these additional concerns may not fit neatly into criteria based on food security, livelihood security and rural development needs, they are nonetheless crucial to the development concerns of developing countries.

5. Measuring the contribution of agricultural products to employment

5.1. Measuring the contribution to employment

Indicators related to employment should reflect the importance of a particular sector as a source of income and livelihood for the population. Indicators such as the following can assess the contribution to employment of a particular product:

- Total (absolute size of) workforce engaged in the sector at the national level or in a region;

- The proportion of the national or regional agricultural population engaged in the production of a specific product;

5.2 Labour requirement.

It is often difficult to obtain data on agricultural employment broken down by product or sector. In most cases, countries have to develop formulas to calculate the labour requirement of particular sectors, or for the production of a particular product. One option would be to use ratios that developed for use in other contexts that closely resemble the production conditions for the product in question.[9]

5.3 Identification of relevant products from the perspective of food security

Food security can be assessed on different scales, from the national to the household and individual levels. The indicators developed should, therefore, reflect the relative importance of particular products to the consumption profile of the population at these different levels. When collecting data on consumption patterns, it is worth noting that national statutes or regulations may already identify some critical staple products and a basket of basic foods reflecting local preferences and circumstances.

Indicators related to food security could look at parameters such as:

- The share of a particular product in total national or regional consumption, as reflected by its contribution to the calorie intake of the population;

- The share of income spent on a particular product at the national or regional levels;

- Self-sufficiency and import penetration, especially on products prominent in the consumption profile of the population;

- The overall capacity of the country to finance food security programs, including its capacity to import food

5.4 Supplementary elements for the analysis

The categories of indicators proposed above are considered directly relevant for purposes of identifying potential SPs, based on the criteria of food security, livelihood security and rural development needs. There are, however, additional
considerations that developing countries may want to incorporate in their internal evaluations to facilitate the process of prioritisation.

5.5 Substitutes for existing products

In identifying SPs, developing countries should analyse situations where imports displace local production or substitutes that are not locally produced. Recent examples of such displacements have included imports of wheat to Africa displacing the consumption of cassava or millet in the region, and imports of powdered milk in the Caribbean displacing the local production of fresh milk as an input to the local dairy industry. The analysis is a two-step process. Firstly, it could look at the extent to which potential SPs are exposed to substitutes. Next, examine the import penetration of directly competing products and how this has changed over time vis-à-vis the local production. It is also essential to take into consideration how substitutes evolve in the future. The negotiated provisions for SPs should then aim to enable countries to maintain some protection against imports that are directly replacing substitutes and could lead to permanent changes in the consumption patterns of the population.

5.6 Unfair competition

When applying the indicators, developing countries should bear in mind that third parties can export imported products with substantial levels of subsidies. The list of highly-subsidised products is long and covers many developing countries’ staple foods, such as rice and corn. This problem is compounded by the fact that the Doha Round is unlikely to change the situation seriously and high levels of subsidies by industrialised countries will most probably continue to be allowed under future agriculture disciplines in the WTO. Negotiators should keep these trade distortions in mind when establishing their list of SPs and consider whether a potential SP or its substitute are particularly vulnerable to such distortions.

5.7 The current level of protection

The current level of protection provided to a potential SP, as reflected in the level of tariff overhang, may also be worth taking into account in the national identification process, and in the designation of SPs.

This allows countries to target those products where the designation as SP would be most useful, in light of other special and differential treatments (S&DT) provisions available to developing countries. In this case, the designation of SPs should include an analysis of the likely effect on each product of the commitments to be undertaken by developing countries.

5.8 Vulnerability to import displacement

Analysis of the extent to which imports could displace local production would need to include an assessment of both the competitiveness of the sector and the likelihood that imports would pose a threat to local production. Factors such as consumer preferences and transport-related considerations may reduce the threat of imports competing in the local market.

Studies showed that imports of potatoes in Peru, where the high cost of transporting the product relative to its value, and the particular consumer preference for local varieties, make it unlikely that imports increase significantly as a result of reduced border protection. This analysis may be necessary to decide on the actual designation of SPs to the extent that the freedom of members to select such products is constrained.

6. SOME EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

6.1 Will SPs Affect Intra Africa Trade?

Several agriculture-exporting developing countries have argued that the selection and treatment of SPs should not undermine the food- and livelihood security or rural development of their many poor and vulnerable farmers, whose welfare depends on improved market access for a few export products. The question is instead whether such flexibilities affect the overall balance of gains and losses for developing country exporters.

6.2 Strategic products of export interest to developing countries show similar trends.

In contrast, the SP flexibilities might play a critical role in addressing the food and livelihood security
needs of importing countries and attenuate possible negative impacts resulting from further liberalisation. That said, some products are more controversial than others and developing countries relying on exports of those products might have a hard time justifying domestically an absence of any new market access opportunities. Instead of entirely excluding such products from SP flexibilities, it might be easier to find ad hoc solutions for specific cases. For example, Malaysia is primarily concerned about access to the Indian market. An indication from India that it would not designate palm oil as an SP could alleviate many of those misgivings. The case of Thailand was more complicated as most countries are likely to designate rice as a 'special product'. However, here again, instead of entirely excluding rice, a compromise could be found if the three or four countries where Thailand has specific export interests agreed to provide a minimum level of market access improvements.

6.3 The Appropriate Number of Tariff Lines ...

Proposals put forward by WTO members range from five individual tariff lines to 20 per cent of all agricultural tariff lines. Under the harmonised system (HS), however, the five tariff lines proposed by the US would not even allow countries to designate one product. Take milk, for example. Many countries are likely to designate milk and other dairy products as SPs, given the importance of these products as a source of livelihood for households. At the 6-digit HS level, most countries have eight tariff lines for milk and cream alone, and nearly 20 if dairy products such as butter, cheese and yoghurt are also included. If selected at the 8-digit level, as some WTO Members suggest, the number for milk and dairy products can go up to 37 tariff lines.

A series of independent country studies carried out in collaboration with local researchers in eleven developing countries suggest that an ‘appropriate’ number of products would probably range from six to twenty. These studies used a set of food security, livelihood security and rural development indicators similar to those proposed by the G-33. The studies also took into account variables such as current levels of protection, including the difference between bound and applied rates, as well as import vulnerability.

The summary of the main findings is in Table 2. On average, the products identified as SPs represent 10 per cent of agricultural tariff lines. The most common products are rice, beef, corn, chicken, milk and dairy products, onions, potatoes, pork, tomatoes and some vegetable oils – often the same products that receive most domestic support in OECD countries.

Source: World Bank national accounts data, and OECD National Accounts data files.

6.4 The Share of Total Value of Agricultural Imports

The share of trade represented by SPs has also been a controversial issue. The WTO Secretariat calculated that designating 20 per cent of tariff lines as SPs could allow two unnamed developing countries to shield as much as 98.4 and 94 per cent of the total value of their respective farm imports from Doha Round tariff cuts. In practice, if the selection of SPs is genuinely based on food security, livelihood security and rural development indicators, the percentage of market share represented by SPs would undoubtedly be lower than the Secretariat figure. While applying these three criteria would not wholly exclude products that compete with imports, the selection of SPs is most likely to focus on domestically produced goods, and in which the country is relatively self-sufficient – as opposed to products for which it relies heavily on imports to meet domestic needs.
Studies found that, on average, the SPs selected only accounted for less than one-fifth of the value of total agricultural imports. Therefore, while some countries have expressed concern that SP flexibilities could exempt a considerable percentage of the agricultural trade from reform, available empirical evidence suggests these fears are unfounded. The area of ‘sensitive’ products may be a more significant cause for concern, as, in the absence of any objective selection criteria, the only way for Members to avoid abuse of this mechanism is to reduce the number of eligible products, or by agreeing to treat these products in a way that contributes to adequate market access improvements.

6.5 ... Guided by Indicators of Food Security, Livelihood Security and Rural Development

It is essential for countries to use relevant indicators to guide the self-designation process. This ensures that vested interests do not capture SP flexibilities, or influenced by short-term mercantilist considerations. One option would be to select SPs from a fixed number of agreed indicators with specific thresholds. One proposal is that a product can qualify as an SP if it meets more than [x%] of domestic consumption through domestic production or when the product contributes at least [y%] of the total nutritional value (dietary and calorific requirement) of the population. Another option, proposed by the G-33, established a non-exhaustive and non-cumulative list of indicators of the three criteria. While these indicators would not automatically determine which product qualifies as an SP, they would guide countries in the self-designation process.

From a sustainable development perspective, a ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach based on a small and fixed number of indicators with uniform thresholds is unlikely to deal adequately with food and livelihood security and rural development, given the diversity of situations between African countries.

The Sri Lankan example is a relevant one. Sri Lanka potatoes are not a critical source of livelihood at a national level; however, in the Uva province, they represent the primary source of agricultural employment. In this region, 86 per cent of the population works in smallholder agriculture, and immediate alternative employment opportunities are scarce. The domestic production might not survive increased competition resulting from further trade liberalisation. However, if uniform thresholds are established – such as the requirement that a product must account for at least x per cent of agricultural employment to qualify as an SP – potatoes are likely to be excluded because this product does not represent a significant source of employment at the national level.

Table 10 Summary of possible indicators identified for the selection of potential SPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification of beneficiaries</th>
<th>Identification of relevant products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of persons/households below the national poverty line</strong>, including distributions between rural and urban poverty; <strong>Number of persons/households with income insufficient to cover basic needs</strong> (i.e., food, shelter, health, clothes, education, etc.); <strong>Measures of household expenditures</strong>; <strong>International measures of poverty such as the World Bank’s poverty line of 1.05 US$ per person per day</strong></td>
<td><strong>National basket of basic food reflecting local preferences</strong>; <strong>The share of a particular product in total national or regional consumption as reflected by its contribution to the calorie intake of the population</strong>; <strong>The contribution of particular products to the poverty and food requirements that can also be taken into account</strong>; <strong>The share of income spent on a particular product</strong>; <strong>Ratio of self-sufficiency on particular products</strong>; <strong>Import penetration, import and net balance derived from a particular product (indicates the capacity of a country to finance food security and development programmes)</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consideration of regional specific cases, particularly those adversely affected with the phenomenon of land abandonment, transport infrastructure, and or natural resources</strong> (e.g., fertile land, water, etc.) and disadvantaged regions</td>
<td><strong>Product highly subsidised through domestic as well as export subsidies</strong>; <strong>Assessment of the level of tariffs and the existence of other measures currently available for a particular product, and how these may be affected in the negotiation of international commitments</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on the ICTSD country case studies

In this context, an illustrative list of indicators – combined with the numerical limit discussed above – establishes a reasonable middle ground between flexibility and predictability. After the modality stage, once countries have agreed on the maximum...
number of products designated as SPs and the treatment applied to them, CFTA countries can present their national lists of SPs for recognition as part of their schedules of commitments. This way, countries can justify the inclusion of particular products in their SP lists by showing that they comply with one or more of the indicators provided on the illustrative list. It is reassuring their trading partners that the selection process is not an arbitrary one, but rather that it genuinely builds on the concept of food security, livelihood security and rural development.

7. Conclusion
While necessary, SPs and SSM are just one part of the equation to mitigate adverse impacts. Governments must improve knowledge, innovation and produce the skilled workforce, adaptable to the demands of an integrated African continent and the fast pace of globalisation while at the same time utilising social policies for those who lose their jobs to increased competition.
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