



ICTSD

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR
TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT

BRIDGES

Weekly Trade News Digest

7 May 2002

Volume 6, Number 17

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

<i>RULES NEGOTIATIONS: 'FRIENDS OF FISH' CALL FOR ALTERING SUBSIDIES DISCIPLINES</i>	2
<i>CANADA TO REVIEW ITC RULING AND INDIGENOUS BRIEF IN LUMBER DISPUTE</i>	3
<i>WTO MEMBERS MOVE CLOSER ON PROCEDURE FOR TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT NEGOTIATIONS</i>	5
<i>LITTLE MOVEMENT ON LABELLING AT BIOSAFETY MEETING</i>	7
<i>In Brief</i>	9
<i>NO BREAKTHROUGHS AT US-EU TALKS, BUT AGREEMENT TO KEEP TALKING</i>	9
<i>CIVIL SOCIETY GROUPS CALL FOR TRANSPARENCY IN GATS 'REQUEST-OFFER' PROCESS</i>	9
<i>WTO In Brief</i>	10
<i>MOORE HOLDS DIALOGUE WITH REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS, WORLD BANK AND NEPAD</i>	10
<i>SUBSIDIES COMMITTEE MEETING ENDS ON CONTENTIOUS NOTE OVER AGENDA</i>	11
<i>Events & Resources</i>	11
<i>EVENTS</i>	11
<i>RESOURCES</i>	15

RULES NEGOTIATIONS: 'FRIENDS OF FISH' CALL FOR ALTERING SUBSIDIES DISCIPLINES

At the second formal meeting of the WTO Negotiating Group on Rules on 6 May, WTO Members discussed a joint communication tabled by New Zealand and other fish exporting countries that aimed to tackle developmentally and ecologically harmful fisheries subsidies. On 7 May the Group discussed a range of communications tabled by Members on various antidumping and general subsidies issues.

The Negotiating Group on WTO Rules was established after Members agreed in Doha last November to negotiate on the Antidumping and Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM) Agreements together with rules on regional trade agreements in an effort to clarify and improve the respective disciplines and procedures (Doha Declaration paragraph 28). Para. 28 makes special mention of "disciplines on fisheries subsidies", which are further referred to in the negotiating mandate on trade and environment (para. 31). In addition, para. 28 provides that the rules negotiations shall take into account the special needs and interests of developing countries.

Fisheries subsidies called both trade and production distortive

The so-called 'Friends of Fish' -- Australia, Chile, Ecuador, Iceland, New Zealand, Peru, Philippines and the US -- put forward a communication at the Rules meeting (WTO document TN/RL/W/3, searchable at http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_search.asp) aimed at "providing some early direction to discussions" on fisheries subsidies. Stating that government transfers to the fisheries industry were boosting the "race for fish" in the fisheries sector, the submission asserts that overcapacity and trade distortions resulting from fisheries subsidisation would "impede the sustainable development of many countries with significant fisheries resources." The group of countries further argued that fisheries subsidies, unlike subsidised production in other sectors, would not only distort the competitiveness of traders in markets, but would also "distort access to shared fish stocks" and limit "productive access by other participants by depleting an exhaustible resource." As another damaging consequence, competition >from subsidised distant-water fishing fleets would be a disincentive for developing countries to establish their own fishing industries. As the current SCM provisions were mainly concerned with the effects of subsidies in markets but not with the trade and production distortions that subsidies in the fisheries sector can generate, the paper concluded that the SCM Agreement needed to be improved.

Norway, Barbados, Mexico, Malaysia and Thailand expressed support for the paper. As anticipated by trade sources, however, Japan and Korea vehemently rejected the 'Friends of Fish' paper, while questioning whether the WTO was the appropriate forum to address fisheries. One trade source said the EC occupied a middle ground position, as it took note of the points put forward but cautioned that Members needed to see how far the raised issues could really be tackled within the SCM framework. Canada objected to a sectoral approach, which it said could fragmentize the SCM Agreement. The issue of fisheries

subsidies is currently being discussed at the Group under the general "subsidies" topic (see BRIDGES Weekly, 23 April 2002, at <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-04-23/wtoinbrief.htm>).

General subsidies and antidumping

On 7 May, Members addressed general subsidies and antidumping-related topics. In its submission (TN/RL/W/4), India addressed the question of how to re-evaluate certain thresholds set out in the SCM and Antidumping Agreements to better protect developing countries from disproportionate use of countervailing and antidumping measures. Japan and Chile, on behalf of 13 countries (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Israel, Korea, Mexico, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey and Hong Kong/China), tabled a paper (TN/RL/W/6) outlining a list of 12 antidumping issues which, according to the submitters, needed further clarification and improvement. Brazil put forward a paper (TN/RL/W/7) calling for more special treatment for developing countries in the area of trade remedies. In a separate submission (TN/RL/W/5), Brazil suggested ways to strengthen SCM provisions on export credits which it regarded as "clearly insufficient in coverage." Canada tabled a paper (TN/RL/W/1) on improved trade rules disciplines (see BRIDGES Weekly, 12 March 2002, at <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-03-12/story4.htm>).

Sources reported that the US was rather defensive in its statements, stressing the need to maintain effective disciplines on unfair trade practices. Addressing antidumping, China, on the other hand, said that current rules had led to increased antidumping activity so that antidumping was now one of the biggest obstacles to trade, especially for developing countries. According to a WTO report released on 22 April, the US, along with Argentina and India, was one of the top three users of trade remedy measures.

Regional trade agreements

Australia issued a separate communication (TN/RL/W/2) on the treatment of regional trade agreements (RTAs), particularly with a view to defining the relationship between RTAs and WTO rules. The Group will discuss the communication together with "other issues" on 8 May, the last day of the three-day Rules Group session.

"Japan, Others Propose 12 Anti-Dumping Rules At WTO Talks," KYODO NEWS, 6 May 2002. ICTSD Internal Files.

CANADA TO REVIEW ITC RULING AND INDIGENOUS BRIEF IN LUMBER DISPUTE

Canada indicated last week that it would conduct a review of a 2 May decision by the US International Trade Commission (ITC), which ruled that US industry "is threatened with

material injury" by subsidised softwood lumber imported from Canada and sold in the US "at less than fair value". Canada is also expected this week to comment on the "amicus curiae" brief submitted by the Interior Alliance, a grouping of Canadian First Nations peoples, to the WTO panel that is currently considering a Canadian complaint against US duties on softwood lumber (see BRIDGES Weekly, 2 May 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-05-02/wtoinbrief.htm>).

Canada dismayed with ITC decision, claims partial victory

Canada reacted angrily to the ITC's decision, which will allow the US Department of Commerce to issue countervailing duties averaging 27 percent on imports of softwood lumber products from Canada. "The decision was not unexpected [...] but that doesn't make it less damaging," said Canada's International Trade Minister Pierre Pettigrew. After 23 May, Canadian firms exporting lumber such as pine, spruce and cedar from all provinces except those in Atlantic Canada will be required to make cash payments with each load of lumber crossing the border. Atlantic provinces were exempted, as most of their forests are privately owned.

While Canadian timber producers expressed their dismay with the decision, they said it was not a complete loss as the ITC had only concluded that there existed a "threat of material injury", but that US sawmills had not actually been harmed yet. Also, the ITC ruled that the preliminary average duty of 32 percent, which the US Department of Commerce had imposed last year as an interim measure, was not justified. As a result, Canadian producers will receive a rebate of around \$US1 billion in bonds already posted for wood shipments to the US between August 2001 and April 2002.

Canada asked to comment on Interior Alliance brief

As reported last week, the WTO softwood panel -- which was established at Canada's request to rule in the US-Canadian dispute over softwood lumber -- agreed on 30 April to receive an "amicus curiae" brief by the Canadian First Nations group Interior Alliance (see BRIDGES Weekly, 2 May 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-05-02/wtoinbrief.htm>). Also, in an unprecedented move, the panel has asked state parties -- including the US, Canada, the EU, Japan and India -- to comment on the brief by this week. While WTO panels are not obliged to take into account "amicus curiae" briefs, i.e. unsolicited submissions by non- parties of the dispute at issue, they can do so if they consider it appropriate.

While Interior Alliance backs the US claim that Canadian lumber is heavily subsidised, the group goes further, alleging that the non- recognition of Aboriginal land rights constitutes a subsidy under international trade law. That is, the group argues that the Canadian government's refusal to redistribute part of the revenue collected from the forest exploitation to indigenous peoples allows Canadian forest companies to sell their timber under market value and thereby provides a subsidy in addition to the artificially low stumpage rates. In its submission, the groups calls on the WTO panel to "maintain the present trade remedies necessary to restore fair competition and ensure that fundamental conditions for fair trade such as environmental protection and the recognition of

indigenous rights, especially Aboriginal Title, be respected and met by the Canadian government and Canadian forest companies in the future."

Background on the softwood lumber dispute

The Canada-US lumber dispute has been going on for almost 20 years, during which time US softwood lumber producers have repeatedly alleged that the stumpage fees -- a tax on each harvested tree -- levied by Canada's provincial governments are below market value and therefore constitute a subsidy to Canadian lumber producers. The US furthermore alleges that Canada allows its industry to illegally "dump" lumber in the US at artificially low prices. As a result, the US Department of Commerce on 9 August 2001 imposed preliminary countervailing duties amounting to 19.3 percent. Following a Canadian request filed on 25 October in which Canada alleges that the duty violates a series of provisions in the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM) and in the GATT, a WTO panel was set up on 5 December last year to resolve the dispute (see BRIDGES Weekly, 12 December 2001; <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/01-12-12/wtoinbrief.htm>). The panel is expected to report by 30 August this year. Canada has furthermore requested a binding panel to be established under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) to review the US' countervailing duty determination. A final panel report is expected by 31 December 2002. Canada supplies about one third of the US market for construction lumber, with 75 percent of lumber produced in British Columbia and Quebec.

Copies of the ITC report will be available after 6 June from the ITC by calling (1-202) 205-1209.

"Trade panel OKs lumber tariffs," AP, 2 May 2002; "Canadian firms say lumber ruling not total loss," REUTERS, 2 May 2002; Softwood lumber >from Canada threatens U.S. industry with injury says, ITC," ITC PRESS RELEASE, 2 May 2002; ICTSD Internal Files.

WTO MEMBERS MOVE CLOSER ON PROCEDURE FOR TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT NEGOTIATIONS

At a brief meeting on 3 May, the special (negotiating) session of the WTO Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE) met in informal mode in an attempt to move forward on procedural areas in advance of the next formal special session in mid-June. In what was deemed by some Members as a "positive" session, some rapprochement was made on the question of observer status, phases of work, and on number of meetings to be held this year.

Observers

In a statement welcomed by many delegates, Egypt suggested that the CTE special session might invite intergovernmental groups to attend as guests using the WTO's existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) provisions. The question of observership in all negotiating sessions is currently being held up by wider disagreement at the level of the Trade Negotiations Committee -- the body that oversees the overall negotiations mandated by the Doha Ministerial Declaration. At the TNC, Egypt's request to have the Arab League included as an observer is being resisted by the US and Israel (see BRIDGES Weekly, 2 May 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-05-02/story2.htm>).

Many Members believe it is crucial to include multilateral environmental agreement (MEA) secretariats and the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), inter alia, in the CTE negotiating sessions. One developed country delegate said they found Egypt's proposal encouraging, particularly from an environmental perspective, but only if it resulted in meaningful participation from MEAs. Appropriate terms of reference for MEA participation under a Memorandum of Understanding would have to be worked out, the source said. Chairperson Yolande Bik said that the CTE's need was special, and suggested that MEAs and UNEP could be invited as observers as special cases. Venezuela said MEAs should only be invited if they were prepared to supply scientific information.

This question will be discussed further at the next special session formal meeting, currently scheduled for 11-12 June.

Compromise on special session work programme

Arriving at something of a compromise on the special session's overall work agenda, Members agreed on what was termed a "flexible/gradual phased programme". Sources said this would begin with a preparatory 'study' mode and move to a 'proposals' stage later, though no dates were set. However, agreement still eludes delegates as to the nature of each of these phases. A number of developing countries (Brazil, Philippines, Malaysia, Kenya, Argentina, Venezuela) argued that the previous five years of study in the CTE could not be treated as appropriate preparation for the negotiations because the CTE work programme did not conform with the Doha negotiating mandate, and several of them said they had been unable to follow it adequately. The Philippines said it was not able to consider proposals at this stage.

Developed countries (US, Norway, EU, Canada, Japan, Australia) called for flexibility in the special session work programme. They said the study phase would naturally develop into negotiations, so no specific timetable should be set. They further indicated that countries should be free to submit any type of document -- including proposals -- during the study phase. At the last CTE special session on 22 March, the EC submitted a proposal that met with much condemnation from most other Members (see BRIDGES Weekly, 26 March 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-03-26/story1.htm>). Chairperson Biké took note of the divergences and said the gradual, phased and non-rigid approach would be adopted at the June session.

Fourth meeting added for 2002 -- information exchange with MEAs

In another compromise, Members agreed that a fourth special session meeting (in addition to March, June and October 2002) would be held in late November or early December 2002, though it would be limited to an information exchange with MEAs. Further details (i.e. which MEAs, how many of them, and how long the meeting will last) are to be discussed or decided at the June meeting. The EC had originally requested an additional special session, though this met with resistance from a number of developing countries (including Malaysia, India, Kenya, Philippines, and Mexico), who were concerned they would not have adequate resources to effectively participate in a fourth full meeting. At the informal special session, countries compromised on the understanding that the meeting would be short (Malaysia spoke of half a day), and that it would be informal, without any decisions taken. Developed countries and some developing countries (Brazil) said half a day might not be enough.

A number of other concerns were raised at the meeting, including the need to interpret the mandate, the need for capacity building during the negotiations as set out in the Doha Declaration (raised by Venezuela), Members' right to make contributions, and special and differential treatment (also raised by Venezuela).

Sources said it is not clear at this point whether a further informal session would be held before the next 12 June formal special session.

ICTSD Internal Files.

LITTLE MOVEMENT ON LABELLING AT BIOSAFETY MEETING

Little Movement On Labelling At Biosafety Meeting

Delegates at the third meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (ICCP-3) on 22-26 April in The Hague, The Netherlands, made little progress regarding documentation requirements for shipments of living modified organisms (LMOs), largely revisiting the debates that had taken place during the negotiations of the Protocol and at ICCP-2 in December 2000.

As mandated in Article 18 of the Protocol (handling, transport, packaging and identification), delegates discussed detailed requirements for documentation accompanying shipments of LMOs for use in food, feed and processing, which should be labelled as "may contain" LMOs and as not intended for release into the environment. Similar to previous discussions, many delegations -- in particular the EU, China, Japan, Mexico and other countries representing centres of origin and diversity -- supported the use of "unique identification" for documentation [i.e. a code identifying a transgenic plant line], citing the system used in the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and

Development (OECD) as a possible model. Others, however -- most notably some of the world's largest exporters of LMOs including the US, Australia and Argentina -- favoured information requirements that did not go beyond the negotiated text. Argentina, supported by Brazil and Uruguay, furthermore stated that documentation requirements should not prevent commodity trade.

Regarding LMOs for contained use and for intentional release into the environment, delegates ended their discussions by referring back to the original text as proposed by the technical expert group on handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs, bracketing paragraphs where there was no agreement. Thus, once the Protocol enters into force, LMOs for contained use will at the minimum be labelled as "LMOs", while LMOs for release will also require a brief description of the organism, including category, name, relevant traits including transgenic traits, and characteristics such as event(s) of transformation. It still remains to be decided whether documentation for LMOs to be released into the environment should also include a reference system of identification, such as unique identifiers, and "other requirements in accordance with the regulatory status of the LMO in the Party of import". As one source pointed out, the latter provision might be used by importing countries to justify the implementation of much higher standards or restrictions on the import of LMOs based on their national situation, which could potentially contravene the WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT).

The lack of progress at led many participants to speculate that the substantive decision-making necessary to resolve these and other contentious issues, such as compliance and liability, could only be achieved at a Meeting of the Parties (MOP), which will be held once the Protocol has entered into force (i.e. once the Protocol has been ratified by 50 Parties). As one source pointed out, the political strategy of leaving the most important and contentious items in brackets until after the Protocol enters into force might be that the Protocol will be ratified predominantly by developing and European countries, all strong advocates of the Protocol and strict regulations on liability, compliance and documentation requirements. The MOP would then decide on the bracketed text, and would most likely leave the strongest language. To date, 17 countries have ratified or acceded to the Protocol.

The documents of the meeting will be available on the website of the Convention on Biodiversity shortly (<http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.asp?wg=ICCP-03>). For daily coverage and an analysis, see IISD Linkages, <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/biodiv/iccp3/>.

For further background information on Labelling in the Biosafety Protocol and at the WTO, see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 4 April 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/02-04-04/story7.htm>.

ENB, Vol. 9, No. 244, 29 April 2002; ICTSD Internal Files.

In Brief

NO BREAKTHROUGHS AT US-EU TALKS, BUT AGREEMENT TO KEEP TALKING

US and European leaders met at a 2 May summit in the hope of staving off a looming trade war between the two largest economies in the WTO. While no tangible resolution of various trade frictions emerged from the summit itself, the leaders pledged to intensify efforts to address these. The areas of contention include the US' March 2002 imposition of a 30 percent safeguard tariff on various steel imports (see BRIDGES Weekly, 16 April 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-04-16/story5.htm#3>) and a \$US4 billion US 'Foreign Sales Corporation' (FSC) tax subsidy for exporters that the WTO has already ruled illegal (see BRIDGES Weekly, 16 January 2002, at <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-01-16/wtoinbrief#2.htm>). A further complication is the recent farm bill passed by the US House of Representatives that would result in an over-60 percent increase in agriculture spending and subsidies to US farmers. Sources see this latter issue as posing an even greater potential for disgruntlement in light of the Doha mandate -- which looks to, inter alia, negotiate "reductions of, with a view to phasing out, all forms of [agricultural] export subsidies; and substantial reductions in trade-distorting domestic support." Others close to the issues await reactions to the upcoming WTO ruling over the actual sanction value coming from the FSC dispute as a potential indication of how the two economic giants will move ahead with their grievances (see BRIDGES Weekly, 20 February 2002, at <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-02-20/wtoinbrief.htm#3>).

On the sidelines of the summit, US Trade Representative Robert Zoellick and EU Trade Commissioner Pascal Lamy met on 3 May at a retreat to discuss the "bigger picture" in international trade. Sources indicate one item likely to have seen airtime at the 3 May meeting is a strategy to help ensure the successful conclusion of the comprehensive new round of trade negotiations launched last November in Doha. At time of press, specific details of their discussions were not available.

"No Consensus Reached in U.S.-EU Trade Talks" AP, 2 May 2002; ICTSD Internal Files.

CIVIL SOCIETY GROUPS CALL FOR TRANSPARENCY IN GATS 'REQUEST-OFFER' PROCESS

In a 7 May open letter to EU Trade Commissioner Pascal Lamy and members of the EC's 133 Committee (the EU body dealing with trade negotiations), a group of over 90 civil society groups called for greater transparency and more assessment of the upcoming services negotiations at the WTO. The letter follows the recent leak of draft requests put forward by the EU under the auspices of the continuing negotiations on the WTO's General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) as mandated by paragraph 15 of the Doha Declaration (see BRIDGES Weekly, 23 April 2002, at

<http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-04-23/story3.htm>). The letter cites that the 'request-offer' process currently underway -- whereby WTO Members bilaterally exchange lists of services sectors they are interested in seeing liberalised, and conversely willing to liberalise themselves -- "has so far been undertaken entirely [...] under conditions of total opacity." The groups go on to demand the publishing of all EU requests to other WTO Members by 30 May. Furthermore, they asked that this process of transparency be institutionalised and that negotiations do not proceed until a "full evaluation and impact assessment" of the implications of the current and proposed GATS obligations are conducted. Copies of the letter and the leaked requests can be found at <http://www.gatswatch.org>.

"Open Protest Letter To EU Trade Commissioner Lamy And EU Member States," FRIENDS OF THE EARTH EUROPE, 7 May 2002; "Open Letter To Commissioner Lamy and EU Member States On EU General Agreement On Trade In Services (GATS) Requests," GATSWATCH, 7 May 2002.

WTO In Brief

MOORE HOLDS DIALOGUE WITH REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS, WORLD BANK AND NEPAD

On 3 May, WTO Director General Mike Moore organised an informal dialogue on the Doha agenda with the Heads and Representatives of six regional development banks (RDB), the World Bank and the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD). The meeting marks the first time that the WTO has hosted Heads of RDBs at its headquarters. As part of a wider strategy of enhanced trade-related technical assistance and capacity building launched after the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference in November last year, the dialogue explored ways of enhancing cooperation between the WTO and the RDBs and better coordinating the trade-related programmes, projects and other activities for developing and least-developed countries. The meeting was attended by Heads of the African Development Bank, the Arab Monetary Fund, the Asian Development Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Islamic Development Bank.

In related news, Moore and the Arab Monetary Fund Director-General Dr. Jassim Al-Mannai signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on 3 May to establish cooperation between the two institutions in an effort to provide technical assistance and capacity building to enhance Arab participation in the multilateral trading system and the trade negotiations. The signing is reportedly part of an Arab strategy to ensure that Arab interests, priorities and concerns are taken into account in the work of the WTO. Currently, 11 Arab countries are Members of the WTO, five others are in the process of accession and two other countries have submitted their application for Membership.

"WTO, Arab Monetary Fund To Cooperate On Trade-Related Technical Assistance And Capacity Building For Arab Countries"-WTO PRESS RELEASE, 3 May 2002; "Moore Convenes First Dialogue With Regional Banks On Doha Development Agenda" WTO PRESS RELEASE, 3 May 2002.

SUBSIDIES COMMITTEE MEETING ENDS ON CONTENTIOUS NOTE OVER AGENDA

A 3 May meeting of the WTO Committee on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM) saw disagreement over including a separate agenda item dealing with a transitional review mechanism for China. Under paragraph 18 of China's Protocol of Accession, the WTO is required to conduct an annual review of China's compliance with WTO Agreements for which Beijing is requested to provide information on relevant trade-related economic data as well as on WTO-relevant economic policies, laws and regulations. The requested information should be provided annually, except in those cases where China and the Members agree that it is no longer required for the review. Economic policies to be notified to the SCM Committee are pricing policies with respect to application of existing or any other price controls and the reason for their use and pricing mechanisms of China's state trading enterprises for exported products. China did not want this item included in the SCM agenda, as the review was scheduled for autumn and China wanted to avoid the impression that a regular -- rather than an annual review -- was being held. For its part, the Quad group (US, EU, Japan and Canada) want to include the agenda item as a preparatory exercise for the autumn review. At the beginning of the SCM Committee meeting, Chair Remo Moretta of Australia announced that after informal consultations he would put square brackets on the agenda item and that the meeting would be suspended on this item to be reconvened in the afternoon of 8 May.

The Committee reelected Prof. Okan Aktan as member of the Permanent Group of Experts and elected Ambassador Milan Hovorka (Czech Republic) as its new Chair.

The Committee will hold its next meeting on 29 October - 1 November 2002.

ICTSD Internal Files.

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/calendar>.

Coming up this week: 8-15 May

6-10 May, Canada: CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY WEEK 2002: BETTER BUSINESSES, BETTER WORLD. CSR Week 2002 is dedicated to highlighting good corporate citizenship, sustainable economic development, community investment, environmental stewardship and more-all in the context of corporate social responsibility. The aim of CSR Week 2002 is to raise awareness and understanding of CSR with Canadians. For further information contact: email: beaufort@conferenceboard.ca; Internet: http://www.conferenceboard.ca/ccbc/CSR_week/default.htm.

8-11 May, Austin, Texas, USA: 2002 ALL THINGS ORGANIC CONFERENCE AND TRADE SHOW. Organised by the Organic Trade Association (OTA), the event will reflect the global face of the organic industry while focusing on North American opportunities and challenge. An international pavilion featuring buyers and suppliers of organic products and services from around the world will be an integral part of the trade show portion. Among topics to be discussed at the conference portion of this event are the implications of full implementation of national organic standards, organic labelling and organic fibre use. For further information contact: Holly Givens; tel: (1-413) 774-7511; Internet: <http://www.ota.com/tradeshow>.

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>.

10-11 May, Helsinki, Finland: WORLD INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS RESEARCH CONFERENCE ON THE NEW ECONOMY IN DEVELOPMENT. The conference will review what is presently known about the impacts of the 'New Economy' as a result of globalisation and the revolution in information and communication technology. It seeks to attract contributions which analyse the impacts of the production and/or use of ICT on economic growth, productivity, income distribution and wages. For further information contact: fax: (35-896) 159-9333; email: ned@wider.unu.edu; Internet: <http://www.wider.unu.edu>.

13-14 May, London, UK: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE NEW ROUND: TRADE, INVESTMENT AND ENVIRONMENT AFTER DOHA AFFAIRS. Organised by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, the forth Chatham House conference will discuss the major issues arising from the Doha Declaration and look at what the new round will bring to the debate regarding multilateral environmental agreements, dispute settlement, institutional changes, investment and services, agriculture and fisheries, and the role and position of developing countries. The following speakers are expected to give keynote addresses at the meeting: Pacal Lamy, EU Trade Commissioner; Supachai Panitchpakdi, WTO

Director-General Designate; Rubens Ricupero, UNCTAD Secretary-General; Baroness Symons, Minister of State for Trade and Investment, UK; and Klaus Toepfer, UNEP Executive Director. For further information contact: Chatham House, London; tel: (44-20) 7957- 5700; fax: 7957-5710. Internet: <http://www.riia.org>.

13-15 May, Paris, France: OECD FORUM 2002. The OECD Forum is an international public conference offering business, labour and civil society the opportunity to discuss key issues with government ministers and leaders of international organisations. With the overarching theme of "Taking Care of the Fundamentals: Security, Equity, Education and Growth," the Forum will allow participants to shape the outcome of the OECD annual ministerial summit meeting to be held on 15-16 May 2002. For further information contact: OECD Forum; fax: (330-14) 430-6346; email: oe.cd.forum@oe.cd.org; Internet: <http://www1.oecd.org/forum2002/>. From IISD Linkages: <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/journal/>.

13-16 May, Paris, France: ANNUAL OECD MINISTERIAL COUNCIL MEETING. Ministers from both OECD and non-OECD countries will gather to discuss economic growth and stability and development issues. WTO Director- General Mike Moore will meet with trade ministers from several countries who will be attending the meeting and will update them and get their views on the current negotiations. For further information visit: <http://www.oecd.org/EN/document/0,,EN-document-0-nodirectorate-no-12-28131-0,00.html>.

13-17 May, Maracay, Venezuela: BIOSAFETY 3 - ADVANCED ISSUES ON BIOSAFETY: RISK MONITORING AND PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF BIOTECHNOLOGY. Organised by Centro Nacional de Investigaciones Agropecuarias/CENIAP (Maracay, Venezuela) and Centro Tecnológico Polar (Caracas, Venezuela). Postponed from 12-16 November 2001. For further information, contact: Dr. Efrain G. Salazar Yamarte; tel: (58-43) 471066; fax: 471066, 831421; email: efra63@hotmail.com; Internet: <http://www.icgeb.trieste.it/~bsafesrv/bsfn0011.htm>.

15 May, London, UK: DISPUTE RESOLUTION AND THE WTO CONSTITUTION. This conference is organised by the British Institute of International and Comparative Law, with cooperation from the Georgetown University Institute of International Economic Law and the London Forum for International Economic and Development Law. The conference will focus on WTO dispute settlement and its evolving jurisprudence. Conference panels will be on topics relating to subjects such as deference and sovereignty, reforms needed, relationship of the dispute settlement process to the diplomatic and negotiating activities of the WTO, and compliance problems. For further information contact: The British Institute of International and Comparative Law, Charles Clore House, 17 Russell Square, London, UK, WC1B 5JP; tel: (44-207) 862-5151; fax: 862- 5152; email: info@biicl.org; Internet: <http://www.biicl.org/>.

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.

6-8 May, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO RULES NEGOTIATING GROUP.

8 May, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COMMITTEE ON BUDGET, FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION.

13-15 May, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO GENERAL COUNCIL.

14 May, Geneva, Switzerland: COMMITTEE ON IMPORT LICENSING.

14-16 May, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO TEXTILES MONITORING BODY.

16 May, Geneva, Switzerland: SPECIAL SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT.

Other Forthcoming Events

19-20 June, Maastricht, Netherlands: ACCUMULATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS. The seminar will focus on the most recent legal and policy concerns covering a number of issues related to the TRIPS regime and the enforcement of patent, trade mark, design and copyrights, as well as the accumulation of Intellectual and Industrial Property Rights and their interface with contract and technical protection mechanisms. Organised by the Amsterdam-Maastricht Summer University. For more information and application, visit: <http://www.amsu.edu/courses/law/law42002.htm> or contact: Mr. Ruggero Lala, Course Co-ordinator: ruggero.lala@amsu.edu.

21-22 June, Maastricht, Netherlands : THE WTO IN 2002: A NEW START?. The seminar will focus on a number of the most problematic issues, including transparency and democracy in WTO decision-making, the further liberalisation of trade in services, the relationship between trade and investment and the participation of developing country Members in the WTO system. Organised by the Amsterdam-Maastricht Summer University. For further information and application, visit: <http://www.amsu.edu/courses/law/law42002.htm> or contact: Mr. Ruggero Lala, Course Co-ordinator: ruggero.lala@amsu.edu.

24-25 June, Budapest, Hungary: COUNTRIES WITH ECONOMIES IN TRANSITION (CEIT). This two-day roundtable conference will be the fourth in a series of UNEP FI Regional Outreach events and will explore the relationships between sustainability, the financial sector and foreign direct investment. It will also provide an international forum for senior financial services sector officials, members of the business community,

representatives of governments and other stakeholders to explore how environmental factors affect corporate performance and ultimately shareholder value. United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiatives (UNEP FI). For further information on the CEIT event, please contact Ms. Niamh O' Sullivan, niamh.o.sullivan@unep.ch, or see <http://www.unepfi.net/ceit>.

24-25 June, Maastricht, Netherlands REGULATORY ISSUES OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS (GMOs). This course will address emerging legal problems and policy questions in relations to the most recent advancements in Biotechnologies. Organised by the Amsterdam-Maastricht Summer University. For more information contact: Mr. Ruggero Lala, Course Co-ordinator: ruggero.lala@amsu.edu; Internet: <http://www.amsu.edu/courses/law/law42002.htm>.

18 -2 September, Edinburgh, UK: GENETIC ENGINEERING AND THE INTRINSIC VALUE AND INTEGRITY OF ANIMALS AND PLANTS. The multidisciplinary workshop is meant to bring together different voices and concerns in respect to genetic engineering and its products. For further information contact Ifgene UK co-ordinator: David Heaf, Hafan, Cae Llwyd, Llanystumdwy, LL52 0SG, UK. tel/fax: (44-1766) 523-181; email: 101622.2773@compuserve.com; Internet: <http://www.anth.org/ifgene/2002.htm>.

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).

ESTIMATING THE POVERTY IMPACTS OF TRADE LIBERALIZATION. By Jeffrey J. Reimer. A World Bank Research Working Paper, 2 March 2002. As a new round of WTO negotiations is being launched with greater emphasis on developing country participation, a body of literature is emerging which quantifies how international trade affects the poor in developing countries. In this survey of the literature, Reimer summarises and classifies 35 trade and poverty studies into four methodological categories: cross-country regression, partial-equilibrium and cost-of-living analysis, general-equilibrium simulation, and micro-macro synthesis. For further information visit: <http://econ.worldbank.org/view.php?topic=19&type=5&id=12035>.

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE ARTICLES AND PROCEDURES OF THE ACP-EC- PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT: CO-OPERATION ON THE BASIS OF MUTUAL INTEREST AND IN THE SPIRIT OF INTERDEPENDENCE. By Joyce van Genderen-Naar, 2002. The book sets out to analyse the legal implications of the articles of the Cotonou Agreement. It examines, among other things, the role of civil society and other non-state actors and their complementarity vis-à-vis the other actors of the ACP-EU partnership. Ms van Genderen-Naar argues that EU cooperation with the ACP is not

based on EU charity, but on mutual interest between the two parties. The book also aims to explain the complex terminology used in the Cotonou Agreement and the institutional framework of the ACP-EU partnership. For further information, contact vangenderen@unicall.be.

POLITICS AND PARALLEL NEGOTIATIONS: ENVIRONMENT AND TRADE IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE. By John Audley and Edward Sherwin, published by Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2002. This paper makes the case for parallel negotiations during the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) negotiations that harness improved environmental protection to the engines of economic expansion. In order to refocus what has been a troubled process, Audley and Sherwin argue for an innovative, proactive environmental approach that meets the environmental concerns of developed and developing nations without sacrificing the growth needs of developing economies. The publication is available online at <http://www.ceip.org/files/Publications/wp25.asp> or can be ordered by contacting pubs@ceip.org.

EVERYTHING BUT DEVELOPMENT: THE DOHA WTO OUTCOME & PROCESS. In *THIRD WORLD RESURGENCE* 135/136 (Nov/Dec, 2001): 11-56. The cover story of this issue reports on and analyses the WTO Doha Ministerial Conference and its outcome. It focuses on the tactics employed by developed countries to secure a new round and what it terms a 'dishonest' attempt to portray it as a "Development Agenda". Finally, it provides some tentative analyses of the implications of the Doha Ministerial outcome for developing countries and of the battles ahead.

Paavo Eliste Per G. Fredriksson "Environmental regulations, transfers, and trade: theory and evidence" in: *JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT* 43 (2, 2002): pp. 234-250. This paper develops a theory of compensation of producers for the costs associated with environmental regulations. It argues that the existence of transfers can give counter-intuitive effects of environmental policy on both output and trade flows. In particular, the compensation obtained by producers neutralises the effect of environmental policy on output, and consequently on trade flows. This may help explain why previous empirical research has found weak evidence that environmental regulations affect trade patterns. The theory is tested using agricultural sector data. The evidence supports the hypothesis that environmental regulations and transfers are positively correlated.

Branislav Gosovic "Global intellectual hegemony and the international development agenda," in *COOPERATION SOUTH* 2 (2001): pp. 132-146. Globalisation has been promoted so strongly and extensively that it has become the unquestioned framework for homogenised thinking and analysis by policy, opinion and intellectual leaders in both North and South. This "global intellectual hegemony" has helped to stifle critique and alternative models, disarm and disempower developing countries in the international arena, and undermine the role of the United Nations. In this article, the author calls for relinking Southern brainpower and institutions to shape a "South platform" on global issues and relationships and on challenges facing the UN as "the instrument of democratic multilateralism."

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 Heike Baumuller, David Primack Matteo Rizzolli, Mahesh Sugathan and Alex Werth. 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