



INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR
TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT

BRIDGES

Weekly Trade News Digest

February 22, 1999

Volume 3, N°7

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Biosafety Talks Stalled
- U.S. Blocks Section 301 Panel Request
- U.S. Offers Country-of Origin Label To Resolve Beef Dispute
- EU Blasted For Alternative To Independent Legal-Aid Centre
- TRIPs Council Moves Slowly on Review of Life Patenting Exemption
- GMO Cotton: Monsanto Fails To Round-up EU Approval For Seed
- S Africa: U.S. Pursues More Trade; Agreement With EU Hung Up Over A Wine By Any Other Name. . .
- No Move on WTO Document Derstriction
- In Brief
- WTO In Brief
- Events & Resources

BIOSAFETY TALKS STALLED

Negotiators from 174 countries made little headway last week toward agreement on a biosafety protocol regulating the transfer and handling of genetically modified organisms (GMOs). As Bridges Weekly Trade News Digest went to press a split between developed and developing nations over GMO trade was seriously jeopardising the conclusion of agreement. Negotiations are taking place in Cartagena, Colombia and the agreed text of the protocol was to be submitted for approval by an extraordinary Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diverstiy (CBD), due to meet 22-23 February.

It was agreed in 1995 that an international protocol on biosafety was needed to complement the CBD, adopted at UNCED in 1992. At present there are no binding international agreements addressing situations where GMOs cross national borders. (See BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest, Vol. 3, No 3, 25 January 1999.)

An official with Mexico's Pulsar Group, one of the world's leading seed producers, said the Cartagena talks had "been converted into negotiations over international trade, not about safeguarding biodiversity." Indeed, North-South divisions over GMOs get to the heart of South fears and suspicions over the power and presence of multinational firms in trade policy, and the ramifications for food security and developing countries' pharmaceutical sectors.

"Biotech companies are very keen to push genetically engineered organisms and products on the

South. But the threats posed by the technology to the environment, health and livelihoods of farmers are too high in the midst of great uncertainties and absence of regulatory rules," according to Chee Yoke Ling, an environmental lawyer and member of the Independent Group of Scientific and Legal Experts on Biosafety. The Independent Group provided scientific and legal support to developing country negotiators at the Cartagena talks.

Leading non-governmental organisations meeting in a parallel session called for a moratorium on GMOs "until the risks posed to human health and biological and cultural diversity by the consumption and release of GMOs are assessed, and until it is clear how they affect the economies of developing countries," according to a statement by an international group of 36 NGOs. The NGOs criticised the Cartagena talks for restricting civil society participation.

The EU issued a statement accusing the U.S., Australia, and Canada of "favouring positions that would result in a protocol without any environmental credibility," and which would result in a protocol with an unfair balance of obligations between the parties of export and the parties of import, and these [countries of import] are mostly developing countries." The EU position was echoed by a number of developing countries.

Major issues still not agreed to at press time were over whether the protocol should be limited only to GMOs that would be planted in the environment, or extended to GMO derivatives including pharmaceuticals, vaccines and processed food. Negotiators were also yet to agree on the final wording around advanced informed agreement (AIA) between countries shipping and receiving bioengineered organisms.

"Focus of Biosafety Protocol Should Be On Deliberate Release of LMOs, U.S. Says," INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENT REPORT, 17 Feb. 1999; "UN talks on GM trade make little headway," FINANCIAL TIMES, 19 Feb. 1999; "U.S. strives to head off curbs on genetic-altered products," INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 15 Feb. 1999; "L'avenir du commerce des produits génétiquement modifiés se joue à Carthagène," LE MONDE, 17 Feb. 1999; "Clashes over genetically modified organisms threaten biodiversity pact, AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE, 19 Feb. 1999.

U.S. BLOCKS SECTION 301 PANEL REQUEST

The U.S. last week rejected an EU request to establish a dispute settlement panel to determine whether Section 301 of the U.S. 1974 Trade Act violates international trade rules. Section 301 is the mechanism used by the U.S. to establish unilateral trade sanctions. (See BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest Vol 3, No 1-2, 18 January 1999.)

The EU complaint against 301 was brought in the context of the on-going dispute between the EU and U.S. over bananas. The EU vowed to make its second (binding) request for a panel at a special session of the WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) in March.

The latest chapter in the EU-U.S. banana dispute has centred around whether the U.S. could seek retaliation against the EU for alleged failure to comply with the WTO ruling against its banana import regime before a DSB panel on EU compliance has finished its work (decision due by April 12). St. Lucia and Dominica, India, Brazil, Japan, Switzerland, Canada, Egypt, and Indonesia last

month spoke out forcefully against DSB consideration of the U.S. retaliation request until the panel on EU compliance issued a ruling. These members noted concern over the long-term institutional implications of considering the U.S. 301-sanctions request: the members said the "unilateralism" with which the U.S. was proceeding undermined the WTO foundation of decision by consensus.

The EU maintains that Section 301 violates the Articles 3, 21, 22 and 23 of the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU), which inter alia hold that solutions to trade disputes should not infringe on members' benefits under the WTO. The EU argues as well that Section 301 violates Article XVI:4 of the Marrakech Agreement (which established the WTO), which requires members' laws to conform to WTO rules. The EU also maintains that Section 301 violates the General Agreement on Tariffs & Trade (GATT) with respect to most-favoured-nation treatment, import-export fees, quantitative restrictions and concessions schedules (Articles I, II, III, VIII, and XI).

The U.S. countered that the EU argument against Section 301 was "inaccurate" and was merely an attempt to divert attention away from the fact that the EU has failed to comply with the WTO ruling against its banana import regime. Earlier this month, Japan warned that it would bring its own complaint against Section 301 if the U.S. seeks to impose sanctions against it in trade disagreements over steel and auto parts.

"EU to make second WTO panel request on Section 301 in March," *INSIDE US TRADE*, 19 Feb. 1999; "EU Seeks WTO ruling on US sanctions law," *FINANCIAL TIMES*, 18 Feb. 1999; "Japan opposes the return of Super 301 trade law," *JOURNAL OF COMMERCE*, 5 Feb. 1999; "EU asks for WTO panel on US Super 301 legislation," *AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE*, 18 Feb. 1999; "EU move to probe US trade law blocked for now," *REUTERS*, 18 Feb. 1999.

U.S. OFFERS COUNTRY-OF ORIGIN LABEL TO RESOLVE BEEF DISPUTE

The U.S. last week proposed a resolution to the EU-U.S. dispute over an EU ban on hormone-treated beef, offering to label U.S. beef exports with its country-of-origin. The EU was unmoved by the offer, noting that the U.S. did not include information regarding the presence of growth hormones, the central issue of the ban.

In a letter to the EU 11 February the U.S. said, "This beef labelling proposal will allow consumers to recognise U.S.-sourced beef. Therefore, consumers can choose whether to purchase the product. By labelling U.S. beef and beef products with those U.S. labels already approved by the Commission, the EU will have the necessary product identification to allow for consumer awareness and choice. We would be willing to take these voluntary measures to facilitate the EU's removal of the import ban."

EU officials said the U.S. offer was unacceptable in its current form and that any label would have to include information regarding the presence of hormones. EU officials did however welcome the apparent willingness to negotiate in the beef dispute displayed by the labelling offer.

The WTO Appellate Body in February 1998 ruled that the EU ban on beef treated with growth hormones was not based on adequate scientific evidence and so violates international trade rules. The EU has until May 1999 to lift the ban or provide scientific justification for it. Earlier this month the EU proposed three options for resolving the dispute, including one which called for the EU to

lift the ban on hormone treated beef imports with the caveat that hormone treated beef must be clearly labelled stating that the product has been treated with hormones. (See BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest Vol. 3, No 6, 15 February 1999.) U.S. officials said their country-of-origin labelling offer was sent to EU officials prior to receiving notice of the three options from the EU.

"US proposes beef label plan to EU, EU reacts coolly," DOW JONES, 16 Feb. 1999; "EU says US beef proposal is unacceptable;" "US proposes labelling to end EU beef trade dispute," REUTERS, 16 Feb. 1999; "L'OMC face à la guerre des hormones," LE FIGARO, 16 Feb. 1999; "EU still milling options in US hormone beef dispute," AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE, 18 Feb. 1999; "Text: U.S. Letter on Hormone Dispute," INSIDE US TRADE, 19 Feb. 1999.

EU BLASTED FOR ALTERNATIVE TO INDEPENDENT LEGAL-AID CENTRE

The EU came under fire last week for allegedly trying to sabotage a proposed independent centre providing legal advice and support for poor countries at the WTO. The planned Advisory Centre on WTO Law would provide legal support to developing countries to defend their positions in trade disputes. An estimated US\$15 million is needed to start Centre operations, to be funded by developed and developing WTO Members. Fees for using the Centre would be based on developing Members' ability to pay. Centre supporters note that the Centre is needed to provide equal access to justice at the WTO level.

The EU last week proposed that instead of the independent centre, WTO Members should move to strengthen the ability of the WTO to provide legal advice to developing countries when support is needed. A number of Members criticised the EU proposal, noting that the WTO Secretariat was required to be neutral in WTO matters and that keeping the legal centre within the realm of the WTO would compromise the impartiality of the WTO.

Critics charged the EU with attempting to undermine the independent Centre out of fear the Centre could help developing countries defend a challenge against the EU's Common Agriculture Policy, or against social and environmental clauses developed countries such as the EU and U.S. would like included in WTO agreements.

Bangladesh, Colombia, Hong Kong, Norway, the Philippines, South Africa and Venezuela are among the developing countries pushing for the independent Advisory Centre on WTO Law. The Netherlands, Sweden and the UK are among industrialised countries supporting the Centre.

"EU: Brussels accused of sabotage," FINANCIAL TIMES, 17 Feb. 1999; "Trade: More consultations on DG selection," SUNS, 18 Feb. 1999; "Rich men's rules," FINANCIAL TIMES, 18 Feb. 1999.

TRIPS COUNCIL MOVES SLOWLY ON REVIEW OF LIFE PATENTING EXEMPTION

Meeting on 17 February, the TRIPs Council once again turned its attention to the review of Article 27.3 (b) of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, which allows certain plant and animal inventions to be exempt from patent protection. (See also BRIDGES Between Trade and Sustainable Development, Vol. 2, No. 8, p. 3).

The approach to the issue within the TRIPs Council continues to focus on "information-gathering," and input so far has almost exclusively consisted of replies to a list of questions on how plant and animal inventions are handled in domestic laws. Bulgaria, Canada, the Czech Republic, the EU and several of its members, Hungary, Japan, the U.S. and Zambia have so far submitted this information. Several other Members, as well as FAO and the secretariat of the CBD have said that they will also submit information. The WTO secretariat is expected to prepare a summary of the responses received for the next meeting of the TRIPs Council, in April.

Despite the gentle pace of the review so far, it is well known that proponents of removing all exceptions to patenting requirements (U.S. and European industry for instance), and supporters of extending the exception to all life forms are lurking in the wings prepared to push their point of view forwards. Some observers believe that the 1999 review will consist solely of the information-gathering exercise underway, with negotiation of the real issues carried over into the round of trade negotiations due to be launched at the Third WTO Ministerial at the end of this year.

The TRIPs Council last week also discussed other subjects including: geographical indications, "non-violation" complaints, how countries are applying the "mailbox" and exclusive marketing rights provisions of the TRIPs Agreement (Arts. 70.8 and 70.9), and incentives for technology transfer to least developed countries as required under Article 66.2 of the Agreement. The TRIPs Council also elected its new Chair for 1999: Ambassador Carlos Pérez del Castillo of Uruguay thus replaces Hungary's Ambassador, István Major.

"TRIPS Council 17 February 1999 - US, Japan submit proposal on geographical indications," WTO BACKGROUND NOTE, 22 Feb. 1999; ICTSD Internal Files.

GMO COTTON: MONSANTO FAILS TO ROUND-UP EU APPROVAL FOR SEED

On 12 February the European Union rejected an application for the sale of two varieties of genetically-engineered (GMO) cotton seeds despite the approval by an EU panel of scientific experts. The GMO cotton - produced by the U.S. multinational Monsanto Co. failed to get the required majority from EU members for approval. The two varieties include one resistant to herbicides (Round-up Ready) and the other resistant to insecticides (Bollgard).

The application for sale of the two cotton seeds now goes to the EU Council of Environmental Ministers, where a unanimous vote is required to block the sale of the seeds. Environment ministers are expected to delay that vote until June: it is reported that at present there is not enough support among environment ministers to approve the application. Of the 15 EU members, only Greece and Spain grow cotton, which together account for about five percent of world cotton production.

Last year the EU Scientific Committee on Plants found that the GMO cotton posed no significant health risk. Last year, EU ministers rejected the application for sale of GMO tomato and corn seeds, which also had the backing of EU scientists. Despite the scientific approval, observers note that EU consumers' mistrust of the scientific evidence makes acceptance of GMO products on the EU market very difficult.

"EU states preliminarily reject cotton seeds, despite green light from science panel," INTERNATIONAL TRADE REPORTER, 17 Feb. 1999; "GM Crops: Genetically modified trade wars," FINANCIAL TIMES, 18 Feb. 1999; "EU postpones decision about Monsanto cotton," WALL STREET JOURNAL, 16 Feb. 1999.

S AFRICA: U.S. PURSUES MORE TRADE; AGREEMENT WITH EU HUNG UP OVER A WINE BY ANY OTHER NAME...

Meeting in Cape Town, South Africa last week, the US and S. Africa announced the establishment of a bilateral council on trade and investment aimed at increasing bilateral trade between the two countries. As part of the agreement, the US and S. Africa will establish a bilateral mechanism for dealing with trade disputes. For example, the dispute mechanism would address issues such as the US complaint that S. Africa's attempts to import unpatented pharmaceuticals violates S. Africa's obligations under the WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights.

The bilateral council is one more step in U.S. efforts to increase trade relations with sub-Saharan Africa. The African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) is currently working its way through the U.S. Congress. The bill promotes trade, investment, and increased development in Africa, and aims to de-emphasise aid as the only means of cash flow from the U.S. to the region. Before passing the House International Relations Committee on 11 February by a vote of 24-8 on its way to a second House committee for approval, a workers' rights amendment was added to the bill, specifying that countries receiving benefits under AGOA must have in place or be working to ensure the protection of "internationally recognised worker rights." A similar provision calling for environmental protection tied to trade benefits was defeated.

Meanwhile, opponents to the bill call its impact insignificant to overall U.S.-sub-Saharan trade. Critics also question whether the bill, with its emphasis on increased access for African textiles, is really necessary considering that the U.S. is required to eliminate by 2005 textile and apparel quotas under the WTO Agreement on Textiles and Clothing. Other critics to AGOA, led by Representative Jesse Jackson call the AGOA bill a form of neo-colonialism with respect to the economic reforms it specifies as a contingency for receiving benefits.

In other news, an EU-S. African trade agreement agreed to earlier this month has been held up by a disagreement over "legal language." The disagreement is thought to be centred around the volatile issue of phasing out S. Africa's use of the terms "sherry" and "port," within the five-member South African Development Community. Spain and Portugal are reported to have reservations over the timelines around eliminating S. Africa's use of the terms and over a provision allowing duty-free access for a certain amount of S. African spirits on the EU market. (See BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest Vol. 3, No 5, 8 February 1999.)

"South Africa, US Reach Trade Agreement," PANAFRICAN NEWS AGENCY, 18 Feb. 1999; "Does the African initiative matter?" JOURNAL OF COMMERCE, 16 Feb. 1999; "S Africa's Mbeki: 'Legal Language' holding up EU Trade Pact," DOW JONES, 16 Feb. 1999; "Africa bill clears International Relations, held up in Ways & Means," INSIDE US TRADE, Feb. 12, 1999.

NO MOVE ON WTO DOCUMENT DERESTRICTION

India and Mexico blocked discussion last week of a Chair's proposal on document derestriction. At the 16-17 February meeting of the WTO General Council, members also discussed the European request for interpretation of articles 21.5 and 22.6 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding in the context of the ongoing banana dispute, (see "Dispute Settlement Review Moves Ahead," BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest, Vol. 3, No. 6, 15 February, 1999) and the appointment of a new WTO Director-General, on which no decision was reached. The deadline for WTO Members to appoint someone to the top post has now been extended to 12 March.

In the context of document derestriction, India cited concerns about the access of parties to a dispute to documents that the Secretariat prepares for panels, and Mexico said that WTO Members were not properly consulted about document derestriction. The proposal, already submitted to the December 1998 General Council meeting (see BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest, Vol. 2, No 48, 14 December, 1998), would amend current practice through circulating Secretariat background notes as unrestricted, unless the relevant WTO body decides that the note initially be considered as restricted. Minutes of meetings would be derestricted after three months, instead of the current six, but working documents (including meeting agendas) would continue to be restricted until the adoption of the relevant report. The proposal also advocated circulating as unrestricted the 'Findings and Conclusions' portion of dispute settlement panel reports as soon as it is available in all three WTO languages. India objected to discussing changes to panel report circulation in the General Council, arguing that such changes should be considered as part of the ongoing review of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

Document derestriction is part of a wider discussion on how to improve transparency of the WTO. No changes to current practice have yet been made, and the discussion is being pushed towards the back burner as WTO Members focus on preparations for the Third Ministerial later this year. Some observers are however saying that document derestriction could become part of the larger negotiation package in the run-up to the third WTO Ministerial. The issue is expected to figure on the General Council's agenda when it meets next on 14 April.

"India, Mexico block proposal to release more WTO documents," INTERNATIONAL TRADE REPORTER, 17 Feb. 1999; "New deadline for election of WTO Director General," IPS, 22 Feb. 1999; ICTSD Internal Files.

IN BRIEF

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) last week put into effect its first anticorruption agreement. The agreement - agreed to by 29 of the world's largest industrialised economies, criminalises bribes to government officials outside a person's home country. The agreement also discontinues the practice of allowing bribes to be deducted from taxes as legitimate business expenses. "OECD begins antibribery efforts," WALL STREET JOURNAL, 15 Feb. 1999.

A report released by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) last week said that trade liberalisation in Bangladesh has raised average income but has also helped increase the gap between rich and poor in that country. The report said that the poorest 20 percent of households have seen no

improvement in their standard of living, while the richest 20 percent have improved their standard of living considerably. "Free trade widens rich-poor gap in Bangladesh," REUTERS, 15 Feb. 1999.

An U.S. forest products company has brought a NAFTA Chapter 11 suit against the Canadian government, alleging that Canada has discriminatorily applied the U.S.-Canadian softwood lumber quota agreement. NAFTA Chapter 11 allows an investor to seek compensation if a government acts to directly or indirectly expropriate an investment in that country. Canadian officials promised to keep details around the case transparent in response to complaints that previous Chapter 11 cases have been kept secret. "ANOTHER U.S. FIRM SUES OTTAWA UNDER NAFTA," GLOBE & MAIL, 16 Feb. 1999.

WTO IN BRIEF

WTO Director-General Renato Ruggiero met with nearly 50 civil society representatives in Brussels on 18 February for an informal exchange of views on various issues relating to the multilateral trade system. Participants' questions focussed to a large extent on the forthcoming High Level Symposia. This meeting took place as part of Ruggiero's ongoing efforts to improve WTO-civil society relations. ICTSD Internal Files.

Having learned from the MAI debacle, Japan's Foreign Ministry last week announced it would meet with environmental, labour and consumer rights NGOs in advance of the Third WTO Ministerial in November. The Foreign Ministry hopes to foster co-operation with NGOs, which government officials said would be key to the success of the next round of global trade talks. A hearing is scheduled for March 9. "Ministry to hear from NGOs," ASAHI SHIMBUN, 17 February 1999.

EU Trade Commissioner Sir Leon Brittan last week called for a "World Trade Organisation Accession Initiative" with the goal of bringing more than 30 countries into the WTO before the Third WTO Ministerial in November. Sir Leon noted the accession process, "will consist of requiring less from [developing countries] as a condition for membership than [until now] and speeding up the process for them by having a uniform approach to their accession, which would reduce the time needed to examine each application." "EU urges WTO to add new members before Seattle Ministerial in November," INTERNATIONAL TRADE REPORTER, 17 Feb. 1999.

EVENTS & RESOURCES

• EVENTS

For a more complete list of events in coming months, please refer to ICTSD's web calendar at: <http://www.ictsd.org/html/calendar.htm>

WTO Meetings

3 March 1999: Dispute Settlement Body. For information contact Nuch Nazeer, WTO, (41-22) 739-5393.

15-16 March 1999: Council for Trade in Services. For information contact Nuch Nazeer, as above.

17-19 March 1999: Textiles Monitoring Body. For information contact Luis Ople, WTO, (41-22) 739-5374.

19 March 1999: Dispute Settlement Body. For information contact Nuch Nazeer, as above.

22-23 March 1999: Working Group on the Relationship between Trade and Investment. For information contact Luis Ople, as above.

25-26 March 1999: Committee on Agriculture. For information contact Peter Ungphakorn, WTO, (41-22) 739-5412.

Other Events

4 March 1999, WTO-NGO BRIEFING. This briefing will take place from 3 - 4.30 p.m. and will cover recent meetings of the Dispute Settlement Body, meetings of the Special Session of the General Council, the Committee on Trade and Environment of 18-19 February, and the High-Level Symposia on Trade and Development and on Trade and Environment. The WTO Secretariat will be represented by Gabrielle Marceau, from the Legal Affairs Division, Jorge Vigano from the Trade and Environment Division and Claude Trolliet, from the External Relations Division. The briefing will take place at the Geneva Executive Centre, Conference Room 2, 11-13 Chemin des Anémones (Chatelaine). For information, contact Dagmar Timmer at ICTSD, (41-22) 917-8352 or at dtimmer@ictsd.ch

5 March 1999: THE CAP REFORM/AGENDA 2000, THE AGRICULTURE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT, AND THE NEXT WTO ROUND. This Public Conference is hosted by the Association européenne de formation paysanne et rurale (European Training Association for Farming and Rural Affairs). Venue : Salle Benelux, Eurovillage, Bd Charlemagne 80, Brussels (Metro Schuman). For information contact the AEFP at Rue Stevin 115, 1000 Bruxelles, Belgium, tel: (32-2) 230-3694, fax: 230-9697. With the support of the European Commission (DG VI - AII-1).

19 March 1999: COMPETING COMPETITION LAWS: DO WE NEED A GLOBAL STANDARD? This programme will be presented by the New England Centre for International Law & Policy at the New England School of Law (American Society of International Law Regional Meeting). Eleanor Fox of New York University will give an introduction to "The Tension between National Laws and 'Global' Trade." For information contact Michael P. Scharf, New England School of Law, tel: (1-617) 457-3009; fax: 422-7453, e-mail: mscharf@fac.nesl.edu, web: <http://www.asil.org/schmtg.htm>

28 June-2 July 1999: ADVANCED STUDY COURSE 1999, EUROPEAN COMMISSION ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE PROGRAMME: "LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: MAINTAINING ACCOUNTABILITY WITHIN A FLEXIBLE REGIME." This course will be held in London, United Kingdom. Accommodation and tuition fees are paid for by the European Commission. Interested persons may request the application form from the Responsible Scientist, Foundation for International Environmental Law and Development, SOAS, University of London, 46-47 Russell Square, London, WC1B 4JP, United Kingdom, tel: (44-171) 637-7950, fax: 637-7951, e-mail: cd2@soas.ac.uk, web: <http://www.field.org.uk> The deadline for applications is 16th April 1999.

- RESOURCES

TRADE, ENVIRONMENT AND THE WTO: A FRAMEWORK FOR MOVING FORWARD. By Gary P. Sampson. A publication of the Overseas Development Council, available on the Internet at www.odc.org. The author is Visiting Academic in the International Relations Department at the London School of Economics, and former Director of the WTO's Trade and Environment Division. The analysis and proposals in this paper will be extended in a Policy Essay to be published towards the end of this year. For information contact Linda Cotton at Overseas Development Council, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20010, tel: (1-202) 234-8701 ext. 236.

LOGGING BURMA'S FRONTIER FORESTS: RESOURCES AND THE REGIME <http://www.wri.org/wri/ffi/burma/> Using satellite data, sophisticated computer mapping, and data collected on the ground, this report focuses on the environmental implications of the increasing logging activity in Burma and on the political and economic forces behind this logging.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION SERVICE <http://www.wri.org/wri/sdis/> The new Sustainable Development Information Service (SDIS) helps users identify and locate the best available information and in many cases provides direct access to a variety of information sources, including directories of information, data and maps, state of environment reports, environmental indicators and treaties. SDIS was developed by the World Resources Institute (WRI) in collaboration with partners at the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED).

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE: THE TRIPS AGREEMENT. Edited by Carlos M. Correa and Abdulqawi A. Yusuf (Sept. 1998). Comprised of chapters contributed by a distinguished panel of experts, this book offers a framework for understanding the background, principles and complex provisions of the TRIPS Agreement. It highlights the context in which the TRIPS Agreement was elaborated and adopted and the way to interpret and apply it. Published by Kluwer Law International, 496 pp. ISBN/ISSN: 904110707X Price: NLG 295.00/USD 159.00/GBP 100.00. Kluwer Law International, P.O. Box 85889, 2508 CN The Hague, The Netherlands, fax: (31-70) 308-1515.

BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest© is published by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development with support from the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy. Editor: Caroline Dommen, ICTSD, Geneva Executive Center, 13 ch. des Anémones, 1219 Geneva, Switzerland; email: cdommen@ictsd.ch; tel: (41-22) 917 8497; fax: (41-22) 917 8093. Executive Director: Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz, address as above, email: rmelendez@ictsd.ch.

Excerpts from BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest© may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Comments and suggestions are welcome and should be directed to the editor.

To subscribe send email to: majordomo@igc.org. Leave the subject line blank. In the body of the message say: subscribe tradedev. BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest© can be found at the ICTSD web page: <http://www.ictsd.org>