



ICTSD

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR
TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT

BRIDGES

Weekly Trade News Digest

16 April 2002

Volume 6, Number 14

BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest is also available online and is updated every week. To subscribe to **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**, please visit the ICTSD website at

<http://www.ictsd.org/subscribe>

If you require any assistance setting up your **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest** subscription, please contact Hugo Cameron, Editor, by email at: hcameron@ictsd.ch, or by telephone at: (41-22) 917-8336.

CONTENTS

WTO: MARKET ACCESS NEGOTIATORS STUCK OVER HOW & WHEN TO STRUCTURE TALKS	2
WITH DEADLINE QUICKLY APPROACHING, CTD SPECIAL SESSION TRIES TO MOVE AHEAD	4
BIODIVERSITY CONVENTION EXPECTED TO ADOPT GUIDELINES ON ACCESS TO GENETIC RESOURCES	6
OXFAM REPORT HIGHLIGHTS HYPOCRISIES IN GLOBAL TRADING SYSTEM	8
Dispute Settlement Update	10
EC PAPER ON DSU REFORM ADVOCATES TRANSPARENCY	10
PANEL REPORT IN US-INDIA AUTO CASE ADOPTED	11
US-STEEL: CONSULTATIONS END WITHOUT RESULT, PANEL ON HORIZON	12
In Brief	13
NGOS CONDEMN G-8 FOR SUBORDINATING ENVIRONMENT TO CORPORATE INTEREST	13
INDONESIA PLANS TO IMPOSE LOG EXPORT BAN	14
AFRICA NEEDS SPEEDY ACTION ON MONTERREY GOALS ACCORDING TO WORLD BANK REPORT	15
DAKAR MEETING AIMS TO ATTRACT FUNDING FOR NEPAD	15
US PROPOSALS ON LABOUR, ENVIRONMENT, INVESTMENT DELAYED IN UPCOMING US-CHILE TALKS	16
LOCAL US OFFICIALS TELL SENATE 'NO' TO INVESTOR-STATE PROVISIONS	16
Events & Resources	17
EVENTS	17
RESOURCES	22

WTO: MARKET ACCESS NEGOTIATORS STUCK OVER HOW & WHEN TO STRUCTURE TALKS

Delegates meeting on 10-11 April in the WTO's Negotiating Group on non- agricultural Market Access remained at an impasse with regards to establishing a target date to agree on modalities for trade liberalisation talks on industrial goods. Some developing countries, notably India and Kenya, are resisting efforts to establish a deadline to agree on negotiating modalities. A previous Chair's proposal had suggested Members could agree on modalities by 31 March 2003 (see BRIDGES Weekly, 9 April 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-04-09/story1.htm>), in line with a similar March deadline for agriculture and services modalities.

The Doha mandate in non-agricultural market access

WTO negotiations were launched last November in Doha, Qatar, and the Doha Ministerial Declaration in para. 16 outlines the mandate for the reduction or elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers for non- agricultural products. The para. also singles out products of export interest to developing countries and less than full reciprocity in reduction commitments for developing countries and least-developed countries (LDCs). It further stipulates that modalities to be agreed "will include appropriate studies and capacity-building measures to assist LDCs participate effectively in the negotiations.

Modalities lay out the framework for how negotiations will proceed, and can include numerical targets, formulas, sector-by-sector, and request/offer approaches. Because they structure how and which tariffs will be targeted for reductions, they can have a significant impact the outcome of negotiations. The single undertaking negotiations, of which non-agricultural market access is a part, are scheduled to conclude on 1 January 2005.

10-11 April Negotiating Group

At the 10-11 April meeting, a group of developing countries, including India, Egypt, the Philippines, and Kenya (on behalf of the Africa Group of WTO Members), rejected as unacceptable a compromise date floated by the Negotiating Group Chair, which targeted 30 April 2003 to agree on negotiating modalities [the Chair's April 2003 date was a compromise based on a previously proposed target of 31 March]. A number of these countries said that there should be no benchmark at all on market access since there was none specified in the Doha Declaration, and that more time was needed to consider the implications of using different types of modalities. China also opposed the Chair's proposal, arguing that it was difficult for developing countries to adhere to tight deadlines in a variety of negotiating groups.

Another group of developing countries, including Mexico, Brazil and Chile, advocated a more flexible approach to the market access negotiations timing. They said that Members could possibly set an informal deadline for the modalities decision, which would reflect the built-in flexibility in the Doha mandate.

Sources indicated that developing country opposition to a target date reflects a reluctance to endorse a "very ambitious" agenda on industrial market access. In particular, one developing country source said, African countries are not interested in new liberalisation efforts as they have carried out many unilateral reforms as part of adjustment programs dictated by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. The source also said that it does not make sense to establish a target date for the modalities decision without having assessed whether technical assistance and capacity building have been sufficient for countries to participate in the negotiations.

For their part, industrialised country Members view a March 2003 deadline as reasonable given that the Doha declaration foresees an end to the overall WTO negotiations on 1 January 2005. While they expressed disappointment with the Chair's proposal of an April 2003 deadline, they did not rule it out. Developed countries are concerned that if the date to agree on modalities is pushed too late in the year, it will leave them little time to confer with their capitals on what next steps to take in market access before the next Ministerial Conference in mid- 2003, and would present a serious obstacle to finishing negotiations by 2005.

During 2002, the group is scheduled to meet on 11-12 July, 12 September, 4-6 Nov, and 2-3 December. According to sources, the first two meetings are scheduled to focus on discussion of tariff and non- tariff barriers. The November meeting would discuss possible modalities for the market access negotiations.

The Chair's 11 April proposal also included scheduling a stocktaking session in December 2002 and three meetings in 2003: 19-21 February, 19- 21 March 19-21, and 23-25 April. All 2003 meetings would focus on modalities, starting with review of possible modalities based on a paper prepared by the Chair.

Since Chair Amb. Pierre-Louise Girard of Switzerland -- who was formally appointed as Chair of the Group at the 10-11 April meeting -- was unable to broker a consensus around his proposal, sources said he would continue consultations in this area in an attempt to reach agreement in time for the meeting of the Trade Negotiations Committee on 24 April.

Other business

Responding to the Doha mandate call for 'appropriate studies and capacity-building measures,' the Secretariat is organising a seminar on market access, scheduled for 29-31 May. On the agenda for discussion are tariffs, non-tariff barriers, and databases to be used in the market access talks.

On the agenda item of observer status of international intergovernmental organisations, the Market Access Negotiating Group, like other negotiating WTO fora, decided that this was a matter to be decided upon by the Trade Negotiations Committee, the body responsible for coordinating the negotiations.

Environmental goods

While the issue of environmental goods did not come up in the Negotiating Group session, one diplomat said there was a chance that the Market Access Negotiating Group could consider an analysis of environmental goods as a category, but that major definitional problems remained. "It would be a little tricky to define what could be classified as an environmental good, as it's a cross-sectoral issue," the source explained, "but the real trick is to get other key Members involved." He referred to sectoral classification in environmental goods already identified at the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation forum (APEC) as one potential reference point. Another delegate said that this is an area where the WTO Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE) might be able to provide guidance.

At a 22 March meeting of the special session of the CTE, there was general agreement among Members that the CTE would 'keep track' of negotiations on environmental goods in the Negotiating Group on non- agricultural Market Access. Reduction or elimination of tariff and non- tariff barriers on environmental goods is part of the Environment mandate under paragraph 31(iii) of the Doha Declaration, but it remains unclear how Members will ultimately address this area.

"WTO Members fight over industrial market access deadline," *INSIDE US TRADE*, 12 April 2002; ICTSD Internal Files.

WITH DEADLINE QUICKLY APPROACHING, CTD SPECIAL SESSION TRIES TO MOVE AHEAD

The WTO Committee on Trade and Development's special session (CTD-SS) on special and differential treatment (S&D) met for the second time on 9 April, with the intention of focusing on the identification of S&D provisions that Members consider should be made mandatory, and to consider Members' inputs on the legal and practical implications of making non-mandatory S&D provisions mandatory. In practice however, this meeting, like the previous CTD-SS on 5 March (see *BRIDGES Weekly*, 5 March 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-03-05/story2.htm>), focused primarily on procedural items. One topic that saw discussion was the relationship between a provision being mandatory in nature, and its effectiveness (or more aptly, its potential to still be ineffective despite being mandatory).

CTD-SS tasked with ambitious agenda

One element coming out of Doha, which trade sources noted as being one of the more ambitious elements of the agenda, is the mandate given to the CTD with regards to S&D. Outlined in para. 44 of the Doha Ministerial Declaration (WT/MIN(01) DEC/W/1), this negotiating mandate states "[...] all special and differential treatment provisions shall be reviewed with a view to strengthening them and making them more precise, effective and

operational." Further, the Doha mandate endorses para. 12 of the Decision on Implementation (WT/MIN(01)/W/10), which lays out some of the framework and the timeline of the S&D review. Based on para. 12 of the Decision, the CTD must "report to the General Council with clear recommendations for a decision by July 2002."

However, barring one submission from India at the 9 April session (see below), Members will only start looking at the numerous S&D provisions in the WTO agreements at the third session -- scheduled for 16 May 2002. Based on the currently available schedule, this gives Members four more formal meetings to complete the review and come to consensus on a set of recommendations.

Procedure for moving ahead

While sources indicate that the contentious items that came up at the first session were not dealt with further (i.e. whether the CTD-SS is in fact a negotiating body and what would be the method of reporting to the General Council), the Committee did move ahead such that from the third session onwards, they would proceed agreement by agreement, on a 'Member-proposal basis'. Further to that, the Secretariat (under direction of the Chair) will give Members guidance as to which S&D provisions or which Agreements will be the subject of the reviews in the formal sessions.

For the 16 May CTD-SS, Members are to submit their proposals for the following agreements: Agriculture, Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS), Textiles (ATC), Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT), TRIMs (investment measures), Antidumping (Article XI of GATT 94), and the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU). The following meeting will see proposals on, inter alia, the GATT 1994, TRIPs (intellectual property rights), the Trade Policy Review Mechanism, and a number of the 'Understandings' of GATT 1994.

One developing country delegate noted that this 'member-proposal', agreement-by-agreement process will be "extremely tedious" and "likely prevent any substantial progress on the items". Based on such a heavy agenda, they said, "it becomes extremely difficult to get into specifics." Furthermore, in light of the crosscutting nature of S&D, the delegate stated a preference for a more systemic approach to the issue -- one more in line with what might live up to the term 'Development Agenda' -- such as the proposed Framework Agreement on S&D (WT/GC/W/442) put forth by a number of developing country Members in the lead-up to the Doha Ministerial (see BRIDGES Monthly, September 2001, <http://www.ictsd.org/monthly/bridges/BRIDGES5-7.pdf>). Commenting on the overall progress of the S&D issue, the delegate held that while there was a sense that everyone was "talking the same language," there did not appear to be a willingness to translate that into action.

India submits first substantive proposal

India was the first and only country to submit proposed S&D changes at this session (entailing mainly a change of the word 'should' to 'shall'). It proposed two changes to the SPS agreement -- one relating to Article 10.2 (extended timelines for SPS regulation

compliance), and the other to Article 10.4 (facilitating the participation of developing country Members in standard setting organisations). As part of the former request to amend Art. 10.2, they further requested an amendment to the Decision on Implementation (para. 3.1) which relates to that SPS article.

Two others elements of the Indian proposal deal with the DSU -- Articles 4.10 (giving developing country Members special attention during consultations) & 21.2 (regarding follow up to implementation of dispute settlement rulings). Another part of the proposal deals with the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures, relating to Article 3.5 (special attention to developing country Members' applications for non- automatic import licenses).

One Quad source welcomed the Indian proposal, saying that the paper would require further review before comments could be made available. Another informed source reported that the US took particular issue with the proposal to amend the Decision on Implementation. Further, the US questioned whether the DSU items should be dealt with in the Dispute Settlement Body Special Session rather than the CTD-SS.

Mandatory vs. effective

Many comments were made regarding the difference in nature between making a provision mandatory versus making it effective. Some developing country Members (including Paraguay and China) said that the problem with S&D was more often one of implementation by developed countries rather than one of wording. Others (including Indonesia, Pakistan, Venezuela, St Lucia, Cuba, Egypt) said that making a provision mandatory was not enough, and that it had to be made effective and operational.

Prior to its deadline of July 2002 to "report to the General Council with clear recommendations for a decision by July 2002", the CTD-SS is scheduled to meet on 16 May, 14 June, 2 July, and 17 July.

ICTSD Internal Files.

BIODIVERSITY CONVENTION EXPECTED TO ADOPT GUIDELINES ON ACCESS TO GENETIC RESOURCES

The Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) at their sixth Conference (COP-6) on 7-19 April in The Hague, The Netherlands, are expected to adopt the first-ever international guidelines on access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing. Discussions on the guidelines are still underway at the Conference, with some of the debates mirroring those at past meetings of the WTO Council for Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs).

As BRIDGES Weekly went to press, negotiations were still underway in the contact group set up by the Parties at COP-6 to finalise the "Draft Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of their Utilization" -- adopted by the CBD Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-sharing in October 2001. The voluntary Guidelines aim to facilitate access to genetic resources on 'mutually agreed terms' and on the basis of the country of origin's 'prior informed consent'. While countries managed to agree on some of the outstanding points, such as the inclusion of products and derivatives of genetic resources in the context of prior informed consent and mutually agreed terms, some issues remain to be resolved, including the use of terms, such as Access to Genetic Resources, Benefit-Sharing and Commercialisation.

Several countries highlighted the close link between the draft guidelines and related discussions in the TRIPs Council, in particular ongoing discussions on the review of Article 27.3(b) (patentability of life forms). In line with its position at the TRIPs Council (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 21 March 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/02-03-21/story4.htm>), India -- supported, inter alia, by Colombia, Jamaica and Peru -- stressed that the guidelines should encourage countries to require the disclosure of the country of origin of the genetic resources, and evidence of benefit-sharing and prior informed consent of traditional knowledge holders in patent applications, which India proposed could also be integrated in Article 29 (conditions on patent applicants) of the TRIPs Agreement. India, along with a number of other countries, furthermore called on COP-6 to renew the Parties' request for observer status for the CBD secretariat in the TRIPs Council.

Several countries highlighted the crucial timing for completing work on the draft guidelines given the recent adoption of the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (PGRFA) -- the first binding international instrument dealing specifically with the conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA --, ongoing discussions at the TRIPs Council and the World Intellectual Property Organization, and the need for a strong signal from the CBD to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Some countries, including Ethiopia and the Philippines, called for an internationally binding instrument on access and benefit sharing, but others, such as Malaysia, stressed that the guidelines were voluntary and should not be seen as a substitute for national legislation.

The call for a legally binding Protocol on access and benefit-sharing was echoed by the NGO caucus, which also strongly supported the inclusion of disclosure requirements in patent applications and called on the Parties to make a clear statement against patents on life. In their joint statement to COP-6, NGOs stressed "corporate-led globalisation and the economic models imposed by it" as a fundamental underlying cause of biodiversity loss, singling out the WTO as "the main driving force imposing this economic model of corporate control upon countries". They expressed concern that the results of the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference in Doha could undermine the implementation of the CBD and urged Parties to "stand up to the challenge and protect their Convention against the WTO and other forms of corporate-led globalisation".

Delegates at COP-6 will continue their negotiations until the end of this week, with a high-level segment scheduled for 17-18 April, where ministers and other senior officials will aim to finalise the draft Ministerial Declaration. Immediately following COP-6, governments will convene for the third Intergovernmental Committee on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (ICCP-3) on 22-26 April in The Hague. BRIDGES Weekly and BRIDGES Trade BioRes will report on the outcomes of the two meetings in forthcoming issues. For a more detailed analysis of trade-related aspects of discussions at COP-6 and ICCP-3, including agriculture, forestry, biotech labelling and intellectual property rights, see the 4 April issue of BRIDGES Trade BioRes (available at <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/02-04-04/index.htm>).

For daily coverage of the meetings, see IISD Linkages at <http://www.iisd.ca/>.

ENB, Vol. 9 No. 229-235, 8 April - 16 April; "Biodiversity is not for sale, nor is it free; it is priceless," ECO, 8 April 2002; ICTSD Internal Files.

OXFAM REPORT HIGHLIGHTS HYPOCRISIES IN GLOBAL TRADING SYSTEM

On 11 April, Oxfam International (OI) released a new 272-page report, entitled "'Rigged Rules and Double Standards'" as part of the launch of its new "Make Trade Fair" campaign -- slated to run over the next 3 years in 144 countries. Using a combination of qualitative and quantitative analyses, the report's authors describe what they see as some of the hypocrisies in international trade rules and the double standards employed by industrialised countries. While much of the substance of the report echoes 'progressive' critiques against the international economic system, some of OI's traditional non-governmental partners see the report as marking a departure from the diverse positions of many of its autonomous regional organisations. Notably, they say that the OI critique broadly adopts an approach that promotes trade, via the current multilateral trading system, as a motor for economic development and poverty alleviation.

The report estimates that protectionist trade policies in rich economies such as the European Union (EU), the US, Canada, and Japan cost poor countries \$US100 billion annually -- twice the amount they receive in aid. It concludes that in order for "well-managed trade" to lift millions of people out of poverty, a rebalancing of trade is required to redistribute opportunities in favour of the poor. Such goals, it states, require "action at the national level, new forms of international cooperation, and a new architecture of governance at the WTO."

Where is trade falling short?

Some of the key areas that the report looks to in support of its claims include the lack of developing country market access, the impact of developed country agricultural

subsidies, hasty IMF/WB liberalisation policies which lack sufficient regard for social implications, profiteering from falling commodity prices, and over-powered transnational companies using employment and investment policies that work against poverty alleviation. It further states that many of the WTO rules on intellectual property (TRIPs), investment (TRIMs), and services (GATS) are "part of the problem."

Quantifying the gap between principles and practice

In an attempt to quantify the gap between the free-trade principles espoused by rich nations and their 'actual protectionist policies', OI comes up with a 'Double Standards Index' (DSI). The DSI measures ten dimensions of rich-country trade policies including average tariffs, the size of tariffs on two key developing country exports (agriculture and textiles), and restrictions on imports from the least developed countries. Once computed, the DSI points to the EU as the worst 'offender' -- just barely beating out the US.

Responses vary

Responses to the report have been both supportive and critical from the various sides of the trade/poverty debate. While WTO Director-General Mike Moore "welcomed" the report and agreed with some of the recommendations, he rejected much of the analysis, citing "omissions and errors." Responding to the many criticisms laid against the WTO, Moore said that, "[m]any of the points raised[...] including the need for land redistribution, greater development funding, infrastructure development and guidelines for multinational corporations are outside the mandate of the WTO." He further stated that some criticisms, such as those alleging that the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) will force public service privatisation, are "simply untrue".

Within the civil society movement, the Oxfam report is causing a number of ripples. US-based 'Food First' issued a scathing press release, stating "Oxfam's report contradicts its own stated mission that ending poverty requires a global citizen's movement for economic and social justice." One NGO source raised concerns that OI was now simply "towing the neoliberal line," and pointed to comments by the report's lead author, Kevin Watkins, that "trade can deliver much more [for poor countries] than aid or debt relief." This view, the source continued, echoes the "neoliberal" prescriptions emanating from the World Economic Forum, the UN Conference on Financing for Development, and what they speculate will likely come out of the upcoming World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD).

Within Oxfam International (OI) -- which is comprised of 12 autonomous regional organisations (who came together in 1995 to create OI) -- sources close to one of the regional organisations indicated there was a fair amount of disagreement over the basic perspective taken on trade for the campaign (and the report). This source noted that in fact, the fundamental position taken in the report is similar to those taken by some members of the Oxfam family in the lead-up to the Seattle WTO Ministerial Conference in 1999 -- and thus is not such a radical departure from some of the currents within Oxfam International.

One source familiar with the debate notes, however, that the report holds quite strongly to many of the criticisms that most Oxfam organisations have always lodged against the international economic regime. They cite those criticisms lodged against the World Bank, the IMF, and the various criticisms lodged against the WTO (including the call for new intellectual property rights rules, true safeguarding of governmental authority with respect to public services, as well as a general call to "democratise the WTO"), as well as those against 'over- powered' transnational corporations.

The full version of the report, as well as a 20-page executive summary, can be found at <http://www.oxfam.org/> or <http://www.maketradefair.com/>.

"New Faith in Free Trade: In Break With Allies, Oxfam Backs Globalisation," WASHINGTON POST, 11 April, 2002; "New OXFAM Campaign Contradicts Developing Country Demands For WTO Reform," FOOD FIRST, 11 April, 2002; "Moore Welcomes Oxfam Report But Cities Omissions and Errors," WTO PRESS RELEASE, 11 April, 2002; "Oxfam Highlights Double Standards of Rich Nations," TERRAVIVA UN JOURNAL, 12 April 2002; ICTSD Internal Files.

Dispute Settlement Update

EC PAPER ON DSU REFORM ADVOCATES TRANSPARENCY

In a paper to be discussed at a 16 April special (negotiating) session of the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB), the EC has proposed several amendments to the WTO's Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) as part of negotiations "on improvements and clarifications" of the DSU as mandated by the Doha Declaration in paragraph 30. The EC proposal (TN/DS/W/1, searchable at the WTO website, http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_search.asp) suggests setting out clear provisions to define the framework and conditions for allowing so- called amicus curiae ('friend-of-the-court') briefs -- i.e. unsolicited submissions by non-parties of the dispute at issue -- in WTO dispute settlement cases. The paper also explores the option of providing parties to a dispute with the flexibility to open up panel hearings to the public upon mutual consent. The EC paper also proposes amendments to the DSU on the process of selecting panellists, on the so- called 'sequencing' issue on retaliation (see BRIDGES Weekly, 19 March 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-03-19/wtoinbrief.htm>), and on further clarifications and modifications of the DSU.

The EC proposal on regulating amicus curiae submissions is mainly drawn from an 8 November 2000 WTO Appellate Body (AB) decision (WT/DS135/9) on an "additional procedure to deal with any written briefs received by the Appellate Body from persons other than a party or a third party" to the EC-Asbestos dispute. This procedure set out rigorous criteria for the application for leave as well as to file an effective amicus curiae submission with the AB for the purposes of the asbestos case only. The EC adopted this

two-stage approach set out in the AB's decision as well as most of the criteria developed by it.

At that time, the AB's case-specific "additional procedure" led to a vehement outcry by most WTO Members, spearheaded by India and Pakistan, accusing the AB of overreaching its authority. The EC, the US, New Zealand and Switzerland had been the only other Members to support the decision of the AB (see BRIDGES Monthly, Year 4 No. 9, p.1, viewable at <http://www.ictsd.org/monthly/archive.htm>).

At press time, key delegations previously involved in the DSU reform debate, such as the US and India, had not yet issued official responses to the EC proposal. However, in a 15 March letter to US Trade Representative (USTR) Robert Zoellick, US Senator Max Baucus called on the USTR to "pursue reforms to the DSU that...enhance the rights of non- government interested parties to participate meaningfully in such [DSU] proceedings." On amicus curiae submissions, however, Baucus stated that he was not convinced that "the two-step process for seeking leave on an ad hoc basis before filing amicus briefs as proposed by the EU" would be the best approach to the issue.

"Dispute Settlement: Sen. Baucus Calls Dispute Resolution Reform Most Important' U.S. Objective in WTO Talks," WTO REPORTER, 16 April 2002; ICTSD Internal Files.

PANEL REPORT IN US-INDIA AUTO CASE ADOPTED

On 5 April, India was unable to convince the WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) to reject the adoption of the panel report on India's measures affecting the automotive sector (WT/DS146/R and Corr.1, WT/DS175/R and Corr.1). Arguing that the panel had overreached its competence and made inappropriate findings on how India should implement its obligations, India tried in an unprecedented effort to have the DSB only partly adopt the panel report. However, the attempt was inhibited by the EC, which reminded Members that the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) provided that both panel and Appellate Body (AB) reports were to be unconditionally adopted by the DSB unless the DSB decides by consensus not to do so (DSU Articles 16.4 and 17.14).

The WTO panel found in the complaint brought by the US and the EC that India's law requiring auto producers to use locally produced auto parts in manufacture and automobile exports was in violation of WTO rules. Although India has already revoked the rule, the panel also found that the contracts originally signed between the Indian government and car manufacturers established under the old law would still impose WTO- incompatible performance requirements on foreign automobiles.

Arguing that the panel's jurisdiction was limited to ruling on measures that were in place at the time of the WTO complaint, India proposed that the DSB suspend adoption of the findings and conclusions for one month, in order to enable Members to analyse the systemic implications of the panel's findings.

The US, although it voiced understanding for India's concerns, did not support the Indian effort, but recommended that the DSB adopt the report. In contrast, the EC backed the panel ruling, saying that only the complete termination of all local content and export requirements contained in the contracts would lead to India's full compliance with the findings and conclusions in the report.

Although India had originally appealed the panel report, India formally withdrew its appeal on 14 March. Consequently, with the report's 5 April adoption by the DSB, the findings and conclusions set out therein became legally effective.

"India Seeks To Limit Impact Of WTO Ruling Against Auto Regime," *INSIDE US TRADE*, 12 April 2002.

US-STEEL: CONSULTATIONS END WITHOUT RESULT, PANEL ON HORIZON

In the looming trade spat between the US and six other WTO Members on additional tariffs of up to 30 percent on steel imports imposed by the US (see *BRIDGES Weekly*, 20 December 2001, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/01-12-20/story2.htm>), the EC, Japan, China, Korea, Norway and Switzerland declared in a 12 April joint statement that they were intending to proceed to request a WTO panel if the US failed to withdraw its "WTO incompatible safeguards [on certain steel imports] without delay." Further, the group denounced the US' "systematic abuse" of safeguards instruments, hinting at the fact that all US safeguards previously brought to WTO Dispute Settlement were deemed to contravene the WTO Agreements by the Appellate Body (AB).

The six WTO Members that had requested consultations with the US under the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) issued the 13 April communiqué at the end of a series of talks jointly held between the group of the complainants and the US. In an interview given after the 12-13 April consultations, an EC official stated that the US "didn't say anything on the legal issues which was new" and that it had refused to admit the WTO incompatibility of its new steel safeguards. The discussion, which both the EC and the US called "constructive," did not deliver any solutions which could potentially settle the dispute prior to the establishment of a trade panel, sources reported. The EC, which was the first Member to request formal dispute settlement consultations on 7 March, will be in a position to ask for the establishment of a panel in early May. In the event the US blocks the EC's request, a second request, which could not be staved off again, could lead to the establishment of a panel in mid-May.

Several US safeguard procedures have in the past been subject to adverse WTO rulings, including UK-Hot Rolled Lead and Carbon Steel (WT/DS138/AB/R), Japan-Hot Rolled Steel (WT/DS184/R) and Korea-Welded Carbon Quality Line Pipe (WT/DS202/R).

In parallel to the DSU proceedings, the coalition of six countries together with Australia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Malaysia and New Zealand, further requested consultations under the WTO Safeguards Agreement which would potentially allow Members hit by the US trade

measures to ask for appropriate compensation and -- in case no agreement is reached -- to retaliate through the suspension of "substantially equivalent concessions or other obligations" (Article 8.2). The Members challenging the US measures at the Committee on Safeguards could impose the trade sanctions 90 days after the 20 March US safeguard was put in place, provided that the safeguard was not taken as "a result of an absolute increase in imports" and that the US measure does not conform to WTO rules. In contrast, proceedings under the DSB can take up to two years to complete.

Leading European industry groups such as the Federal Union of German Industries (BDI) or the Confederation of British Industries (CBI), however, "do not believe that the [European] Commission should impose sanctions on American products before the WTO dispute settlement panel has ruled in July," a BDI spokesperson stated. According to the lobby group, EC retaliations against the US would not go without a response by the Americans and would "set a very bad example" leading to other countries imposing similar measures in other disputes.

Nevertheless, the EC has already reacted to the US trade restrictions on steel by unilaterally adopting on 27 March its own trade restrictions on steel so as to prevent floods of steel imports being diverted into the EC by virtue of the US action. On imports surmounting the recent level of imported steel, the EC is applying tariffs varying from 14.9 percent to 26 percent as provisional safeguard measures to 15 steel products. The measures are limited to a half-year term and will effectively exclude most developing countries from their coverage, with the exception of 14 developing country Members, including Argentina, Brazil and China (see European Commission Regulation (EC) No 560/2002 of 27 March 2002, viewable at http://europa.eu.int/comm/trade/pdf/steelreg_en.pdf).

"Steel: Six WTO Members Call For Termination Of US Steel Tariffs As Dispute Talks End," WTO REPORTER, 15 April 2002; "Steel: Fearing Trade War, EU Industry Groups Lobby States To Reject EC Steel Retaliation," WTO REPORTER, 15 April 2002; "Steel: US Holds Talks With Six Countries On Steel Tariffs; Little Progress Reported," WTO REPORTER, 12 April 2002; "EU Adopts Temporary Measures To Guard Against Floods Of Steel Imports Resulting From US Protectionism," EU PRESS RELEASE, 27 March 2002.

In Brief

NGOS CONDEMN G-8 FOR SUBORDINATING ENVIRONMENT TO CORPORATE INTEREST

During a two day G-8 meeting last weekend hosted by Canada's Environment Minister David Anderson in Banff, Canada, environment ministers of the eight major industrial democracies worked on identifying an agenda for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), focusing mainly on how to involve the private sector in the

pursuit of sustainable development. Environmental NGOs strongly criticised the meeting for not including the climate change issue and the Kyoto Protocol on the official agenda, accusing the ministers of subordinating the world's environment to corporate globalisation. Regarding the draft Ministerial Statement under discussion at the meeting (see <http://www.canadians.org/>), the Council of Canadians criticised Ministers for allegedly "supporting the corporate trade agenda of the WTO and forcing this onto countries around the world at the WSSD". Anderson stressed the important role of the private sector, arguing that "the growing focus on trade, international financing, aid effectiveness, and private sector investment as the engines of economic growth needed to address poverty reduction, which is now seen as the key to sustainable development." Anderson further argued that there were plenty of other chances to discuss the Kyoto Protocol, but failed to settle speculations by both NGOs and the EU that Canada is wavering to support a ratification of the Kyoto Protocol following pressure on the government by the Canadian energy industry to follow the US and withdraw from the Kyoto Protocol.

The G-8 countries are comprised of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, the UK and the US. The meeting was a prelude to the G-8 Summit, which will take place in Alberta, Canada, in June.

"Canada angrily denies G8 plans to harm environment," REUTERS, 12 April 2002; "G8 starts environment talks, under fire on Kyoto," REUTERS, 15 April 2002; "G8 Environment Ministers sell out to global trade agenda," COUNCIL OF CANADIANS, 12 April 2002.

INDONESIA PLANS TO IMPOSE LOG EXPORT BAN

On 12 April, a senior Indonesian trade and industry ministry official announced that Indonesia was planning to impose a permanent ban on exports of logs to protect its dwindling tropical forests. The move follows a temporary ban placed on exports of logs for wood chips that was put in place in October 2001 but expired this month. Director General of Exports, Sudar SA, said that the government would first extend the temporary ban while discussing permanent measures with the International Monetary Fund, which has a \$US5 billion loan programme with Indonesia that is contingent upon a series of economic reforms being implemented across all sectors. In 1980, Indonesia banned exports of logs but later replaced it with a 200 percent export tax aimed at protecting local industry and encouraging exports of higher value wood products. However, in accordance with an agreement signed with the IMF in 1998, the taxes were reduced to 10 percent by the end of 2000, which environmentalists claim has contributed to increases in illegal logging. In related news, on 12 April, Greenpeace activists boarded a ship carrying Brazilian mahogany to the Port of Miami as part of a campaign to pressure the US government to halt illegal shipments of the valuable hardwood, the trade of which was recently outlawed by the Brazilian government in an effort to protect the Amazon jungle from deforestation.

"Indonesia planning permanent log export ban," REUTERS, 15 April 2002. "Greenpeace strikes in Miami against mahogany trade," REUTERS, 15 April 2002.

AFRICA NEEDS SPEEDY ACTION ON MONTERREY GOALS ACCORDING TO WORLD BANK REPORT

In its Annual Report on social and economic conditions in Africa released on 9 April, the World Bank said the spread of HIV/AIDS, shortages in funding and trade opportunities, and weak commodity prices in the region threaten to undo gains of recent years. "African Development Indicators 2002" calls upon donor nations to deliver quickly upon promises made on last month's International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, Mexico. According to the Report, without greater access to the world's wealthiest consumer markets, many African countries will fail to secure any sustainable advantage for their people, many of whom are facing increasingly dire prospects. The Bank applauded donor pledges to boost aid to countries implementing sound policies, noting that the dramatic decline in aid flows to Sub-Saharan countries included these countries as well. "They are keeping their side of the global bargain. They now need rich countries to deliver speedily on theirs," according to Callisto Madavo of the Bank. The report says that social indicators in the region reflect the hardships of a fast-growing population, while social services and economies cannot keep up. It adds that sub-Saharan African economies will need to grow an average of 7 percent a year to halve poverty by 2015.

For further information on the Report, visit:

http://publications.worldbank.org/ecommerce/catalog/product? item_id=866058.

"Making Monterrey Work For Africa: New study highlights dwindling aid flows, mounting challenges," WORLD BANK PRESS RELEASE, 10 April 2002.

DAKAR MEETING AIMS TO ATTRACT FUNDING FOR NEPAD

African countries opened a three-day meeting in Dakar, Senegal on 15 April in hopes of garnering massive international financial support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). The revival plan is expected to cost \$US64 billion yearly, more than the combined gross domestic products of the continent's 30 smallest economies. Regarding the meeting as a natural follow-up to the Monterrey, Mexico meeting on Financing for Development, UN Development Programme Associate Administrator Zephirin Diabre said that it also spelt out the key role to be played by the private sector in financing development. His views were echoed by Senegalese President Abdoulaye Wade, who invited the world's private sector "to come and invest massively in Africa." Participants will prepare proposals for the Group of Eight summit in Canada in June. G-8 members have expressed support for NEPAD but stressed the need for reform in order to attract more investment. In this regard, Canada's Prime Minister Jean Chretien, during his visit to the African continent last week, pointed to "good governance, respect of human rights, territorial discipline, peace and security, openness and elimination of corruption".

In response, UN Economic Commission for Africa Executive Secretary K.Y. Amoako called NEPAD "a framework for effective partnership" based on principles, including a view of extreme poverty as a serious human rights violation, the belief that African stability would enhance international peace and security, the need for donors to rally around Africa's agenda and the idea that Africa and donors must commit to mechanisms for monitoring the results of investment.

"AFRICA: Leaders Meet In Dakar, Seek Funds For NEPAD": UNWIRE, 15 April 2002.

US PROPOSALS ON LABOUR, ENVIRONMENT, INVESTMENT DELAYED IN UPCOMING US-CHILE TALKS

In negotiations on the US-Chile free trade agreement scheduled to begin in Santiago, Chile this week, the US has delayed tabling its proposals on labour, environment, and investment. Instead, the talks are likely to focus more on agriculture issues, including market access for some of Chile's exports. One element influencing this shift in focus has been continuing disagreements in the US Senate over investor-to-state dispute settlement provisions. Specifically, the US has been unable to define prohibitions against indirect expropriation of investment and obligations to provide investors 'fair and equitable treatment'. These two areas parallel the controversial elements of the investor-to-state provisions in the NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreements); namely paras. 1105 -- 'unfair and inequitable treatment' and 1110 -- 'measures tantamount to expropriation of reasonably expected profits'.

"U.S. Puts Off Labor, Environment and Investment in Chile Talks," INSIDE US TRADE, 12 April 2002.

LOCAL US OFFICIALS TELL SENATE 'NO' TO INVESTOR-STATE PROVISIONS

Elected officials from a range of US government levels are urging the US Senate to alter the pending 'trade promotion authority' legislation (formerly 'fast-track') so that investor-to-state disputes under future trade agreements do not encroach on local autonomy, nor provide foreign investors with rights to compensation that are beyond those provided to domestic investors. The US Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Attorneys General, and the National Association of Counties have all lodged their concerns with various senators with regard to the 'investor protection' language in the "Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2001" (H.R. 3005). In a 21 March letter to Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle, the Conference of Mayors noted that "the language on 'investor protections' in H.R. 3005 is so broad and open-ended that it would allow trade officials to include investor protection standards in future trade agreements that go beyond US law and that effectively grant foreign investors greater rights than US citizens enjoy [...]". The officials highlighted in particular the expansive anti-expropriation protections (to be adjudicated by international tribunals) as well as the chilling effect such suits can have on the autonomy of local governments. Business groups, however, are lobbying on the

opposite side of the debate. The National Association of Manufacturers stated its opposition to such measures in a 4 April letter to the US Trade Representative -- saying, inter alia, that it would be "dismayed" if additional changes were made to H.R. 3005 to lower standards on definitions of expropriation or to interject government involvement in screening claims or reviewing arbitration decisions.

"State Officials Push For Fast-Track Amendments On Investment," INSIDE US TRADE, 12 April 2002.

Events & Resources

EVENTS

For a more comprehensive list of events in trade and sustainable development, please refer to ICTSD's web calendar at: <http://www.ictsd.org/cal/index.htm>.

Coming up this week: 16-25 April 2002

7-19 April, The Hague, Netherlands: THE 6TH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY (COP 6). For further information contact the CBD Secretariat, tel: (514) 288 2220; fax: 288 6588; email: secretariat@biodiv.org; Internet: <http://www.biodiv.org/meetings/cop-06.asp>.

15-19 April, Paris, France: 17th SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES. Organised as a joint session by the FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, the session will, inter alia, address working principles for Risk Analysis. For further information contact the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat; fax: 5705 4593; email: codex@fao.org; Internet: http://www.codexalimentarius.net/ccgp17/gp02_01e.htm.

17 April, Brussels, Belgium: FROM RIO TO DOHA TO JOHANNESBURG: COUNTERBALANCING THE WTO WITH STRONG ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RULES. This public hearing, convened by Friends of the Earth Europe (FoEE), will address two specific cross-cutting issues: Environmental Governance and Alternatives to Trade and Investment Liberalisation. The event aims to foster a dialogue among EU officials and civil society representatives from the North and South on controversial WTO matters and discussions on positive alternatives in light of future WTO negotiations and the WSSD in Johannesburg. For further information contact: FoEE; email: alexandra.wandel@foeeurope.org; Internet: <http://www.foeeurope.org/>.

17-19 April, Washington DC, USA: CERES 2002 CONFERENCE. The theme of this year's conference is "The Future of Wealth on Earth: Opportunities and Risks for Investors, Corporations, and Activists in a Changing Global Climate." The conference will focus on the growing environmental and social responsibilities of corporations and

investors in the area of globalisation. For further information contact: Sarah Raposa; tel: (1-617) 247-0700; email: raposa@ceres.org; Internet: <http://www.ceres.org/conference/2002/overview.htm>.

18 April, Brussels, Belgium: UPDATE ON TRADE POLICY DIALOGUE AND THE STATE OF PLAY IN THE WTO. Chaired by Commissioner Pascal Lamy, the agenda includes discussion of negotiations under the Doha Development Agenda, Trade policy dialogue with civil society, and sustainable development and trade. For further information visit: http://europa.eu.int/comm/trade/index_en.htm.

20 April, Brussels, Belgium: PUSHING TNCs TO COMMIT TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENT: IS ETHICAL INVESTMENT, GOOD CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP, AND ACCOUNTABILITY FROM TNCs THE ANSWER?. Organised by the International Coalition for Development Action (ICDA) with presentations by the New Economics Foundation, United Nations Environment Programme division on the Global Compact, Christian Aid UK and Public Services International. The aim of this seminar is to raise public awareness of the role of transnational companies, to provide information on the issue area to membership and partners and to promote mutual knowledge and coordination among civil society organisations. For further information contact ICDA at: tel: (32-3) 230-0430; fax: (32-3) 230-5237; email: ekbensah@icda.be; Internet: <http://www.icda.be/ffdevelopment/tncseminar/>.

22-23 April, Singapore: ASIA BIO-FUELS 2002 CONFERENCE. The conference will address what it takes to develop successful bio-fuels projects in Asia. Highlights include detailed case studies from Asian projects, analysis of the economic and social benefits available from bio-fuels application, understanding market structure for ethanol and new production, distribution and use, and evaluation of technology options for fast track project implementation. The conference will lay the foundations necessary for exchange of information and experience and reveal the concerns and issues that challenge the speed of development. For further information contact: tel: (65) 732-1970; fax: (65) 733- 5087; email: juliana.lim@ibcasia.com.sg; Internet: <http://www.ibc-asia.com/biofuels.htm>.

22-26 April, The Hague, The Netherlands: THIRD MEETING OF THE INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY (ICCP-3). For further information contact the CBD Secretariat, Montreal, Quebec, Canada; tel: (1-514) 288 2220; fax: 288-6588; email: secretariat@biodiv.org; Internet: <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.asp? wg=ICCP-03>.

25 April, The Hague, Netherlands: FTAA: CHALLENGE OR PITFALL?. At the event, the strategic issues and the structure and procedure of the FTAA will be discussed as well as its implication for South America and the European Union. For further information contact: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', 2597 VH The Hague, Netherlands; tel: (31-70) 3245384; fax: 3282002; email: info@clingendael.nl; Internet: <http://www.clingendael.nl/>.

WTO Events

An updated list of forthcoming WTO meetings is posted at: http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/meets.doc. Please bear in mind that dates and times of WTO meetings are often changed, and that the WTO does not always announce the important informal meetings of the different bodies. Unless otherwise indicated, all WTO meetings are held at the WTO, Centre William Rappard, rue de Lausanne 154, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland. For further information on WTO events contact: WTO Information and Media Relations Division, Geneva; tel: (41-22) 739- 5007; fax: 739-5458; email: enquiries@wto.org.

16 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO SPECIAL SESSION OF THE DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BODY. On reform of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

16-17 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO WORKING GROUP ON TRADE AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY.

17 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BODY.

18-19 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO WORKING GROUP ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRADE AND INVESTMENT.

19 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COMMITTEE ON RULES OF ORIGIN.

21-25 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO GENEVA WEEK. For non-resident trade missions.

22-23 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COMMITTEE ON ANTI-DUMPING PRACTICES-WORKING GROUP ON IMPLEMENTATION.

22 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT- SEMINAR ON E-COMMERCE.

22 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO SYMPOSIUM ON TRADE AND COMPETITION POLICY.

23-24 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO WORKING GROUP ON THE INTERACTION BETWEEN TRADE AND COMPETITION POLICY.

29 April-1 May, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO SYMPOSIUM: THE DOHA DEVELOPMENT AGENDA AND BEYOND. Note that other non-governmental side events will be taking place through 2 May. For further details visit: http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dda_e/symp_devagenda_02_e.htm.

Other Forthcoming Events

25-26 April, Geneva, Switzerland: TRADE, INVESTMENT AND COMPETITION. The Trade Information Project, the joint effort of IATP, FOEI, and CIEL, will sponsor this seminar for NGOs. For further information contact: Trade Information Project, B.P. 21 160a Route de Florissant CH- 1231 Conches, Geneva Switzerland; tel: (079) 668-5402; fax: (41-22) 789- 0500; email: tipproject@bluemail.ch.

29 April-2 May, Bangkok, Thailand: TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD-MID-TERM REVIEW. The meeting will be attended by representatives of member States of UNCTAD and intergovernmental organisations and non- governmental organisations that have status with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. In addition to reviewing the implementation of the Bangkok Programme of Action, the Mid-term Review will provide an opportunity for member countries to engage in an interactive dialogue and exchange of views on major developments in the world economy and their impact on development. For further information visit: <http://www.unctad.org/en/special/mid42002no.htm>.

30 April-2 May, Nairobi, Kenya: OWNERSHIP AND PARTNERSHIP IN AFRICA'S DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY. Organised by the North-South Institute, the conference will feature leading African experts on issues related to the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD). Participants will discuss issues such as financing for development, aid reform in Africa, aid coordination and donor reform, and other poverty reduction strategies in light of the UN Millennium Development Goals. For further information contact: Lois L. Ross, Coordinator of Communications and Publications, The North-South Institute, 55 Murray Street, Suite 200, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada k1N 5M3; tel: (1-613) 241-3535 ext. 235; fax: (1-613) 241-7435; email: lross@nsi-ins.ca or nsi@nsi-ins.ca; Internet: <http://www.nsi-ins.ca/ensi/events/africa.html>.

1 May, Geneva, Switzerland: LESSONS LEARNED FROM RELATIONS BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CIVIL SOCIETY. Organised by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, who will serve as the moderator. The workshop is designed to stimulate discussion of issues relevant to civil society groups' relationship with the WTO and its Members. The panellists will discuss lessons learned from international organisations that have institutionalised their relations with civil society, focusing primarily on the World Bank Group and United Nations. Their experiences will provide a framework for future discussions regarding the WTO. For further information contact: Maria Carlo; tel: (1-202) 939-2306; email: marcarlo@ceip.org.

9 May, London, UK: DOES CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY NEED A TREATY?. Entitled "Lessons from Thor and Cape and the Case for a Corporate Accountability Convention, the talk will feature Halina Ward, Director, Corporate Responsibility for Environment and Development, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and Matt Phillips, Senior Campaigner Friends of the Earth. For further information contact: BIICL Charles Clore House, 17 Russell Square, London, UK WC1B 5JP; tel: (020-7) 862-5151; fax: 862-5152; email: info@biicl.org; Internet: <http://www.biicl.org/>.

20 May, Shimonoseki, Japan: 54TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION. The Scientific Committee and Commission Committees and Working Groups will be meeting at the same venue. For further information contact: IWC Secretariat; tel: (44-12-2) 323-3971; email: secretariat@iwcoffice.org; Internet: <http://www.iwcoffice.org/>.

5-14 June, Bonn, Germany: 16TH SESSION OF THE UN FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE (UNFCCC) SUBSIDIARY BODIES. For further information contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: (49-228) 815-1000; fax: (49-228) 815- 1999; email: secretariat@unfccc.int; Internet: <http://www.unfccc.int/>.

10-11 June, Interlaken, Switzerland: INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON AGRICULTURE AND BIODIVERSITY. Sponsored by Pro Natura and Friends of the Earth, the international specialists will address the role of agriculture on the disappearance of plant and animal species from the planet. For further information visit: http://www.pronatura.ch/content/index_fr.php?lang=FR.

15-16 June, The Hague, Netherlands: INTEGRATED ASSESSMENT OF TRADE-RELATED POLICIES-COURSE OFFERING. The course is a pre-conference offering at IAIA'02, the 22nd Annual Conference of the International Association of Impact Assessment and is open to all. The course will provide participants with an introduction to the principles, practices and methods of integrated assessment on trade negotiations and different environmental regimes to deal with trade negotiations. Case study examples of environmental impacts of trade liberalisation and policies for sustainable management in developing and developed countries will be presented. The deadline for registration is 19 April. To register, either contact Kelly at info@iaia.org or print the registration form from <http://www.iaia.org/> and fax to (1-701) 297-7917.

14-19 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WORLD CIVIL SOCIETY FORUM. The forum will encompass different areas of the international arena (the environment, health, human rights, humanitarian rights, education, peace, security, information technology, etc.) and will allow, in each of these areas, the promotion of cooperation. The Forum will pay particular attention to those organisations in developing countries and of indigenous populations. It will also allow international organisations and interested specialized agencies to present their activities. For further information contact: World Civil Society Forum, 31 Chemin William Rappard, 1293 Bellevue/Geneva, Switzerland; fax: (41- 22) 959-8851; email: forum@mandint.org; Internet: <http://www.mandint.org/forum/>.

1-2 October, Dubai, United Arab Emirates: ANNUAL MEETING OF THE IMF/WORLD BANK GROUP. For further information visit: <http://www.imf.org/external/am/index.htm>.

23 October-1 November, New Delhi, India: EIGHTH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE UN-FCCC. For further information contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: (49-228) 815-1000; fax: (49-228) 815-1999; email: secretariat@unfccc.int; Internet: <http://www.unfccc.int/>.

RESOURCES

If you have a relevant resource (books, papers, bulletins, etc.) you would like to see announced in this section, please forward a copy for review by the BRIDGES staff to Hugo Cameron, hcameron@ictsd.ch. Submissions of publications to ICTSD's documentation centre would also be welcome (contact Matteo Rizzolli, mrizzolli@ictsd.ch).

DIRTY EXPORTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION: DO STANDARDS MATTER TO TRADE? By John S. Wilson, Tsunehiro Otsuki, and Mirvat Sewadeh, published by Trade, Development Research Group, 21 March, 2002. How to address the link between environmental regulation and trade was an important part of discussions at the WTO Ministerial in Doha, Qatar in November 2001. Trade ministers agreed to launch negotiations on trade and the environment, specifically clarification of WTO rules. Wilson, Otsuki, and Sewadeh address an important part of the background context for deciding whether or how to link trade agreements to the environment from a developing country perspective. The authors ask whether environmental regulations affect exports of pollution-intensive or "dirty" goods in 24 countries between 1994 and 1998. For the full text, visit <http://econ.worldbank.org/view.php?type=5&id=13167>. The authors may be contacted at jswilson@worldbank.org, totsuki@worldbank.org, or msewadeh@worldbank.org.

FROM URUGUAY TO DOHA: AGRICULTURAL TRADE NEGOTIATIONS AT THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION. By Thomas C. Beierle, published by Resources for the Future, March 2002. This paper examines current agricultural trade negotiations at the WTO, with particular attention to the relationship between liberalisation and developing countries' economic growth and food security. Agriculture remains one of the most highly protected arenas of international trade. Although the 1994 Uruguay Round of trade talks succeeded in bringing agriculture into the rules-based trading system, the author argues it did little to actually reduce agricultural trade protection. This paper describes how three important actors in the agricultural trading system -- the US, the EU, and developing countries -- are positioning themselves in the current talks to deal with the unfinished business from the Uruguay Round. For the full paper, visit http://www.rff.org/disc_papers/PDF_files/0213.pdf.

"Economic growth and greenhouse gas emissions," by Alberto Ansuategi and Marta Escapa, in *ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS*, 2002. Recent empirical research has examined the relationship between certain indicators of environmental degradation and income, concluding that in some cases an inverted U-shaped relationship, which has been called an environmental Kuznets curve, exists between these variables. The paper finds that this relationship does not hold for greenhouse gas emissions. This paper explores the effect that the presence of intergenerational spillovers have on the emissions-income relationship. Using a numerically calibrated overlapping generations model of climate-economy interactions, it concludes that: (1) the intertemporal responsibility of the regulatory agency, (2) the institutional capacity to make intergenerational transfers, and

(3) the presence of intergenerationally lagged impact of emissions constitute important determinants of the relationship between economic growth and greenhouse gas emissions.

Electronic Resources

YAHOO wto_forum GROUP. Created by Yahoo!, 15 April 2002. Group members are able to exchange messages, store photos and files, coordinate events and more. There are also hundreds of links for news, consultants, law firms, articles, NGOs. There will be a weekly newsletter with short briefs on current trade news. For more information, visit <http://groups.yahoo.com/>.

A searchable archive of **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**© can be accessed at: http://www.newsbulletin.org/bulletins/WhichBulletin.cfm?Bulletin_ID=14&SID=.

BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest© is published by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), <http://www.ictsd.org/>. Electronic distribution is carried out by the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP).

Contributors to this issue are Alison Banks, Heike Baumuller, David Primack, Alex Werth, and Melissa Wilcox. This edition of **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest** was edited by Hugo Cameron, hcameron@ictsd.ch. Managing Editor is Andrew Crosby. The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz, rmelendez@ictsd.ch. ICTSD is an independent, not-for-profit organisation based at: 13, ch. des Anémones, 1219 Geneva, Switzerland, tel: (41-22) 917-8492; fax: 917-8093. Excerpts from **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**© may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and should be directed to the Editor or the Director.

BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest is made possible in 2001 - 2002 through the generous support of the Government of the United Kingdom (DFID). Additional support is provided by ICTSD's core donors: the Governments of Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden; Christian Aid (UK), MISEREOR, NOVIB (NL), Oxfam (UK) and the Swiss Coalition of Development Organisations (Switzerland). The **Weekly** also benefits from support for the **BRIDGES** series of publications including: the Rockefeller Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and Swiss Development Cooperation.

ISSN 1563-003X