



INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR  
TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE  
DEVELOPMENT

# **BRIDGES**

## Weekly Trade News Digest

12 June 2002

Volume 6, Number 22

**BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest** is also available online and is updated every week. To subscribe to **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**, please contact Hugo Cameron, Editor, by email at: [hcameron@ictsd.ch](mailto:hcameron@ictsd.ch), or by telephone at: (41-22) 917-8336.

### Table of Contents

FINAL WSSD PREP MEETING BREAKS DOWN OVER TRADE AND FINANCE.....	2
'RIGHT TO FOOD' PUSHES FAO CLOSER TO TRADE DEBATE.....	4
WTO ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE ZEROES IN ON SCOPE OF NEGOTIATIONS.....	7
SERVICES: NO PROGRESS ON HORIZONTAL ISSUES AS MEMBERS PREPARE FOR REQUEST/OFFER .....	10
WTO TECH TRANSFER GROUP SETTING UP WORK PROGRAMME....	13
<i>In Brief</i> .....	15
ZIMBABWE BECOMES FIRST COUNTRY TO INVOKE DECLARATION ON TRIPS AND PUBLIC HEALTH .....	15
NICARAGUAN GROUPS EXPOSE GMOS IN FOOD AID SHIPMENT ....	16
<i>WTO In Brief</i> .....	17
CANADA INITIATES ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF NEW WTO NEGOTIATIONS .....	17
EC UPS ANTE IN US STEEL DISPUTE .....	17
<i>Events &amp; Resources</i> .....	18
EVENTS .....	18
RESOURCES .....	23

## **FINAL WSSD PREP MEETING BREAKS DOWN OVER TRADE AND FINANCE**

Delegates at the fourth and last official preparatory meeting (PrepCom IV, 27 May - 7 June, Bali, Indonesia) for the forthcoming World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD, 26 August - 1 September) fell far short of their intended goal to finalise the Plan of Implementation for WSSD, with issues related to trade and finance, globalisation and the relationship between multilateral environmental agreements and WTO rules proving to be some of the biggest stumbling blocks (see *BRIDGES Weekly*, 4 June 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-06-04/story1.htm>). Many civil society groups, however, welcomed delegates' failure to finalise the text, saying that an unfinished text was better than a bad deal.

### **Trade and finance discussions move behind closed doors**

In an effort to broker agreement on the remaining bracketed (i.e. unresolved) sections of the Plan of Implementation, negotiations for most of the second week were conducted in a 'Friends of the Chair' contact group in which the so-called "Vienna rules" were applied. These procedures held that only one person spoke on behalf of each interest and/or regional group, including, inter alia, the US, EU, and G-77/China. New Zealand and Switzerland alternated, as did Canada and Australia. This format was introduced following strong protest from New Zealand, Switzerland, Canada and Australia who had reportedly not been invited to some sessions. NGOs were not permitted to attend these meetings. Discussions on section V (Globalisation) and trade and finance issues in section IX (Implementation) were held in a separate group involving the US, EU and G-77/China and other countries, which was also closed to NGOs.

### **Trade and finance discussions end in deadlock**

Several attempts were made to find compromise language on trade and finance in the Implementation section, including a facilitator's text put forward by chair of the contact group on trade and finance John Ash on 5 June, a compromise text prepared jointly by EU and G-77/China ministers on 6 June and a text compiled by Mohammed Valli Moosa (South Africa) on 7 June. While the Moosa text was tentatively accepted by the G-77/China and supported by Mexico, Norway and New Zealand, the EU objected to the provision on subsidies, favouring language to "encourage reform of subsidies" rather than "to reduce or phase out, as appropriate". For its part, the US rejected the Moosa text as it was, proposing over a dozen amendments. The G-77/China, however, refused to enter into further negotiations, arguing that the text already represented the bottom line and that they were not prepared to make any more concessions. Following the

collapse of the talks, discussions in the lead-up to and at WSSD will be based on the 5 June facilitator's text.

NGOs largely blamed the intransigent position of the US, Australia and Canada - in particular their refusal to move beyond the agreed language of Doha and Monterrey -- for the failure to reach a compromise, with some describing these three countries as the "Axis of Environmental Evil". Others also speculated that developing countries held out for so long because they had considerably more bargaining power in the WSSD context than during negotiations in Doha and Monterrey. That is, developing countries had little to gain from an agreement that imposed additional environment-related obligations and conditions on how to use ODA and conduct trade, but did not provide additional financial support and/or increased trading opportunities. Some furthermore noted that the lack of progress reflected the difficulties in integrating the three pillars of sustainable development, with little coordination between those dealing with trade (Doha), finance (Monterrey) and environment/foreign affairs (PrepCom IV).

#### One small gain on fisheries

Civil society groups claimed one small victory in the area of trade and environment when delegates agreed to "eliminate subsidies that contribute to illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and to over- capacity". As some pointed out, this language goes far beyond the mandate on fisheries subsidies agreed at Doha which simply instructs WTO Members to begin negotiations with the "aim to clarify and improve WTO disciplines on fisheries subsidies". These negotiations are currently underway in the WTO Negotiating Group on Rules (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 16 May 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/02-05-16/story1.htm>).

#### Some movement on WTO-MEA relationship

While delegates succeeded in finalising the use of the contentious term 'coherence' in most paragraphs of section X on an "Institutional Framework for Sustainable Development" (see BRIDGES Weekly, 4 June 2002, referenced above), they failed to agree on a formulation in the context of the relationship between multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and WTO rules. In the end, various options remained in the text, including coherence, complementarity, coordination, no hierarchy and mutual supportiveness between the rules of the multilateral trading system and MEAs. Delegates did, however, agree on a formulation with regard to the Convention on Biological Diversity and agreements related to trade and intellectual property rights, settling on "enhancing synergy and mutual supportiveness". The MEA-WTO issue will again be taken up in Johannesburg as part of the implementation text and is also expected to be proposed as an element in the political declaration by the EU.

Where to go from here?

Informal talks on trade and finance issues are expected to be held in New York in July. Also, a pre-summit meeting -- most likely symbolic rather than substantive -- has been scheduled for the end of June in Brazil to muster political support for WSSD (see *BRIDGES Weekly*, 4 June 2002, referenced above). In addition, PrepCom Chair Emil Salim (Indonesia) was nominated to conduct further informal consultations in the lead-up to WSSD, including preparing elements for a political declaration to be released later this month.

With less than three months to go until WSSD, much work remains to be done to resolve the last outstanding issues. In the final plenary, the EU, supported by Mexico, stressed the importance of a "substantial chapter on globalisation" while G-77/China named new and additional financing and increased market access in their list of priorities for WSSD. Some suggested that the current impasse might be resolved by taking the trade and finance provisions out of the implementation document and moving them into the political declaration. One observer also suggested that countries should not try and cover all trade and finance issues, but rather restrict themselves to their key priorities, focusing in particular on the relevant provisions in Agenda 21 that have not yet been implemented.

In the lead-up to WSSD, civil society groups are likely to use the current deadlock to step up their efforts to raise awareness amongst delegates and the general public regarding the 'limits' of globalisation. As several NGO sources noted, PrepCom IV has highlighted a growing awareness among the sustainable development community that the "blind pursuit" of trade liberalisation needed to be checked. A number of sources agreed that the added value of WSSD and its influence on related discussions in other fora, including the WTO, might not lie in the details of the texts to be adopted in Johannesburg, but rather in encouraging the questioning of the underlying paradigms of globalisation and the legitimisation of anti-globalisation concerns through the intergovernmental process of WSSD.

Documents of the meeting are available at <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org>.

ICTSD reporting; ENB Vol. 22 No. 41, 10 June 2002.

### **'RIGHT TO FOOD' PUSHES FAO CLOSER TO TRADE DEBATE**

'Right To Food' Pushes FAO Closer To Trade Debate

As BRIDGES Weekly went to press, representatives of some 180 nations and the EU were convening in Rome at the 10-13 June World Food Summit - Five Years Later (WFS-FYL) held by the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). At the meeting, FAO members are committed to reversing current trends away from effective poverty and hunger reduction and to remobilise their political will to halve the number of hungry people by 2015 as formulated at the original WFS in 1996. As a first step to agreeing on possible measures to implement this ambitious goal, heads of delegations have created an Intergovernmental Working Group mandated to establish a "set of voluntary guidelines" for realisation of the right to adequate food as stipulated in the 1996 Rome Declaration. The Summit is also attended by other intergovernmental organisations as well as by non-governmental organisations (NGOs). The latter are holding a parallel NGO/Civil Society Organisations (CSO) Forum on Food Sovereignty from 9-13 June.

#### Breaking news...US interests on biotech prevail

Much to the disappointment of many NGOs attending the parallel forum on Food Sovereignty, the FAO summit on 11 June formally endorsed biotechnology as a way to addressing hunger, while failing to make mention of the role of organic foods. The US had been heavily pushing biotechnology as a solution to world hunger. According to the meeting's Declaration, already approved before the end of the summit, "We are committed to study, share and facilitate the responsible use of biotechnology in addressing development needs." The Declaration also advocates the advancement of "research into new technologies, including biotechnology," adding: "The introduction of tried and tested new technologies including biotechnology should be accomplished in a safe manner and adapted to local conditions to help improve agricultural productivity in developing countries." One source commented that the notion of biotechnology -- an issue firmly contested by the EU -- had also been supported by the G-77 (a coalition of some 130 poorer countries).

Responding to the Declaration's support for biotech, president of the NGO Forum Sergio Marelli expressed his outrage, saying, "It is incomprehensible. It shows the influence of nations, led by the US, upholding the interests of multinationals involved in biotechnology." He said the Forum would respond to the summit by means of a strongly worded statement.

#### No Code of Conduct, but at least "voluntary guidelines"

After hefty negotiations in the lead-up to the WFS-FYL, FAO Members on the morning of 10 June adopted the Declaration -- entitled "International Alliance Against Hunger" -- wherein they invited the FAO Council "to establish...an Intergovernmental Working Group...in the context of the WFS follow-up, to

elaborate, in a period of two years, a set of voluntary guidelines to support Members States' efforts to achieve the progressive realisation of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security" (paragraph 10 of the Declaration's operational section). This new element in the final Document was pushed through by Members such as Germany which have repeatedly called for taking a rights-based approach towards food security by means of a Code of Conduct outlining actual steps to be taken by FAO Members to meet their international obligations on food security. Originally, the idea of a Code of Conduct had been proposed by NGOs such as Food First Information and Action Network (FIAN) and the World Alliance for Nutrition and Human Rights (WANAHR). After the adoption of the Declaration, a FIAN representative called the language in paragraph number 10 "a major breakthrough," especially taking into account the clear two-year deadline.

At an NGO briefing on 10 June, German Minister for Consumer Protection, Agriculture and Nutrition, Renate Kuenast, called para. 10 of the Declaration "a move in the right direction," but warned against expecting too much from a future Code of Conduct on the right to food. Nevertheless, she expressed her satisfaction that the passage had finally -- after difficult negotiations with the US -- been incorporated in the final document. Nevertheless, it was indicated that the US would issue a commentary statement on the Declaration which would outline the Washington's interpretations of and reservations to the final document.

"A further organisation working on the trade issue"

Addressing the WFS-WTO relationship, Minister Kuenast called the WFS- FYL Declaration a "logical complement to the Doha paper" in addition to the Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development and the expected outcomes of the approaching World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). Regarding international agricultural trade in particular, Kuenast pointed to the fact that the FAO would now have the possibility to address -- through the newly created Working Group on right to food - - agricultural non-trade concerns such as food security and rural development. Moreover, as the Working Group could also focus on how poorer countries should develop their national markets to ensure food security, FAO's work could potentially increase political momentum on inscribing a 'Development Box' in the current WTO Agreement on Agriculture (AoA), Kuenast stated. The Minister further announced that the German Agriculture Ministry had already earmarked a sum of EUR 700,000 to be used for the setup of the Working Group on right to food.

...but further clear improvements yet to be delivered

Delegates and observers consider the outcomes of the following three days of negotiations and discussions the main determinants on which the "success" of the Summit could be measured. Coming together in closed meetings, multistakeholder dialogues and various FAO side events, donor countries together with intergovernmental organisations, NGOs, the private sector and other stakeholders now need to determine their contributions to the newly established "FAO Trust Fund for Food Security and Food Safety and other voluntary instruments" which is aimed at accelerating food production and improving food access in specially disadvantaged developing countries, at ensuring food safety with respect to animal and plant pests and diseases, and preparing investment projects and South-South cooperation.

African delegates stressed the importance of the meeting of the Heads of State and Government Implementation Committee (HSIC) Committee of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). On 11 June, the HSIC adopted detailed implementation programmes developed by the NEPAD Steering Committee on areas such as agricultural development, infrastructure, health and education, governance, market access and capital flows. As an African source stated, "African Members are not looking for another occasion to push for more ODA [official development aid] but to create new platforms to bring up issues relevant for Africa."

Addressing the degree of importance attached by developed countries to the process, African delegates in particular voiced their disappointment in the fact that the major food donor countries such as the US, Canada, Japan and the EU had so far not sent their heads of states, but only their deputies or representatives on the ministerial level.

BRIDGES Weekly will report further on the outcomes of both the WFS-FYL as well as of the NGO/CSO Forum on Food Sovereignty in its next issue.

Further information on both events can be found at:  
<http://www.fao.org/worldfoodsummit/english/index.html> and  
<http://www.forumfoodsovereignty.org/>.

ICTSD reporting; "Biotechnology to Combat Hunger," IPS, 11 June 2002.

### **WTO ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE ZEROES IN ON SCOPE OF NEGOTIATIONS**

The WTO's Committee on Trade and Environment met on 11-12 June in a special (negotiating) session where Members focused on the scope of negotiations outlined in paragraph 31(i), (ii) and (iii) of the Doha Declaration (see BRIDGES Weekly, 26 March 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-03-26/story1.htm>).



Discussion centred around proposals from Australia, Argentina and Switzerland the US and New Zealand.

### Background

In paragraph 31 of the Doha Ministerial Declaration, Members agreed to negotiations, "without prejudging the outcome", on: (i) The relationship between existing WTO rules and specific trade obligations set out in multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). The negotiations shall be limited in scope to the applicability of such existing WTO rules as among parties to the MEA in question. The negotiations shall not prejudice the WTO rights of any Member that is not a party to the MEA in question"; (ii) Procedures for regular information exchange between MEA secretariats and the relevant WTO committees, and the criteria for the granting of observer status; (iii) The reduction, or, as appropriate, elimination of tariff and non- tariff barriers to environmental goods and services.

During informal consultations on 3 May, Members agreed, inter alia, to a "flexible/gradual phased" work programme that included a fourth session in 2002 on multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and to begin negotiations by examining closely the Doha mandate. There was also some movement forward on the question of observership, though this question remains unresolved (see BRIDGES Weekly, 7 May 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-05-07/story3.htm>).

### 31(i) WTO-MEA relationship

Members addressed three submissions on para. 31(i) negotiations on the WTO-MEA relationship. These came from Australia, Argentina and Switzerland.

In its paper, Australia suggested three phases for negotiations, consisting of identification of the most relevant MEAs with specific trade obligations, an examination phase, and action if necessary (TN/TE/W/4; all CTE submissions are searchable at <http://docsonline.wto.org>).

Argentina argued for a narrow interpretation of the Doha WTO-MEA language, advocating a study phase to define the negotiation mandate precisely. The Argentinean submission noted, for instance, that the language "specific trade obligations" should exclude all MEA non- mandatory trade measures, non-trade obligations and non-specific trade obligations. This contrasts with an earlier paper from the EC (TN/TE/W/1) that advocated for a broad interpretation of 31(i), particularly with regard to 'specific trade obligations'.



In its submission, Switzerland (TN/TE/W/4) said that there was a need to define the different categories of specific trade obligations set out (or explicitly provided for) in MEAs. According to the Swiss, this would require a detailed analysis of these categories to establish the distinction between specific trade obligations and non-specific trade obligations. The Swiss, supported by the Czech Republic, favoured an interpretative decision on the WTO-MEA question, arguing that the solution should not simply be left to dispute panels; nor should GATT Article XX (environmental exceptions) be amended.

There was some resistance by the US, Mexico and Bolivia with regard to establishing a definition to determine which MEAs should be addressed. The EC, Chile and Japan supported including regional MEAs in the discussion, with the EC and Japan further stating that they should not be limited only to those MEAs currently in force, as argued by Argentina in its submission.

Delegates broadly agreed that the outcome of the negotiations should have no impact on WTO Members who were non-parties to MEAs.

#### 31(ii): MEA-WTO info exchange, observer status

There was relatively little disagreement among Members on the question of information exchange. Some countries, including Canada, Indonesia, Mexico and Switzerland, supported the idea of institutionalising information sessions. This was also reflected in a US proposal (TN/TE/W/5), that further advocated providing access to restricted documents by MEA secretariats and the development of specific guidelines for MEA characteristics for granting of observer status.

Regarding the thorny issue of observer status, a number of developing countries (Brazil, Cuba, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan and Thailand) said that this is being addressed at the General Council level, while the Trade Negotiations Committee is looking at whether organisations who have observer status in regular WTO bodies should also have it in special sessions. As such, they said, it was not the place of the CTE special session to rule on the question.

Despite these sentiments, Switzerland, Korea and Norway told the Committee that the CTE special session had a mandate to look at this issue; Switzerland said it was imperative that MEAs be granted observer status in order that the CTE special session could carry out its work. Currently, eight observership requests are pending, including from the ACP group, IMF, OECD, UNEP, and four MEAs.

#### Paragraph 31(iii): reduction of barriers to environmental goods and services

At the last meeting of the CTE special session in March (see related link, above), Members agreed that paragraph 31(iii) should be implemented in the context of the market access and services negotiations but that the CTE could contribute by examining what constituted environmental goods and services. To this effect, New Zealand presented a paper (TN/E/W/6) clarifying the concept of environmental goods that received broad support among the Membership. Only the EU said that in this category could also be included goods that were produced in an environmentally friendly fashion and goods that were environmentally sound (easy to recycle).

However, Malaysia, India, Korea, New Zealand were uncomfortable with this reference to production methods.

Planning of the MEA information session

The CTE meets in regular mode on 13-14 June for an information session with secretariats from relevant multilateral environmental agreements. Following this, it will focus on Doha Declaration paragraph 32 (ii) on the relevant provisions of the agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), paragraph 33 on technical assistance, capacity building and environmental reviews, and paragraph 51 on identifying and debating developmental and environmental aspects of the negotiations, in order to help achieve the objective of having sustainable development appropriately reflected.

BRIDGES Weekly will report further on the CTE session in its next issue.

ICTSD reporting.

### **SERVICES: NO PROGRESS ON HORIZONTAL ISSUES AS MEMBERS PREPARE FOR REQUEST/OFFER**

>From 3-7 June, Members convened at the WTO Council for Trade in Services (CTS) and its subsidiary bodies for a short one-week services cluster to advance discussions on sectoral proposals as well as on horizontal issues such as assessment of services liberalisation, credits for autonomous liberalisation, the development of an emergency safeguard measure (ESM) and the development of disciplines for domestic regulation. As expected by observers, Members did not make much progress on the horizontal discussions, because they were busy at their capitals and missions preparing for bilateral sessions, which commence in early July after initial requests have been tabled.

Horizontal issues

As Members failed to adopt the recent Chair's negotiating text on autonomous liberalisation at a 29 May informal special (negotiating) session of the Services Council (see BRIDGES Weekly, 4 June 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-06-04/story2.htm>), the related debate was not resumed during the 5-6 June formal negotiations as "just too many controversies remained," sources commented. In particular, Members are divided on three points: firstly, whether commitments made by acceding countries could be eligible for credits; secondly, whether developing country Members as well as developed countries could request credit from trading partners; and thirdly, whether or not credits should only be given in the services sector or, for example, in goods as well. Sources reported that the CTS Chair, Chile's Ambassador Alejandro Jara, did not indicate any date for issuing a revised draft but explained in his statement to the Council how he would undertake consultations with Members in an effort to overcome disagreement on the three contested issues.

Sources further reported that Pakistan tabled a new informal paper on assessment, building on the points raised in a previous joint submission by Cuba, Pakistan, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe (S/CSS/W/131). In this joint communication, Pakistan et al. argue that the CTS should carry out an assessment of services trade with a special focus on whether or not services trade liberalisation has so far achieved the objectives of Article IV of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) (Increasing Participation of Developing Countries).

#### Sectoral negotiations

In the 2-day CTS special session which concluded on 6 June, Members further addressed new negotiating proposals by Cuba -- one on tourism and travel-related services (TN/S/W/1) and another on telecoms (TN/S/W/2) -- together with four March proposals on environmental and financial services, as well as on energy and construction (S/CSS/W/142- 145). Members welcomed the new submissions and asked preliminary questions on certain points of the four earlier submissions, but did not enter into substantial discussions on any of the proposals.

Under the agenda items 'submission of initial requests', the CTS Chair presented some preliminary considerations on how to structure the multitude of bilateral negotiations to be conducted after the delivery of the initial requests in end-June. Further discussions on the issue are expected for the next services cluster from 22-26 July.

#### Subsidiary bodies

The Working Group on GATS Rules -- one of the four subsidiary bodies to the CTS -- met on 3 and 7 June to continue its discussions on the desirability and feasibility of inscribing an emergency safeguard measure (ESM) in the GATS as mandated by Article X as well as by the so-called Guidelines for services negotiations. Discussions mainly focused on a new informal paper tabled by Australia as well as an end-January EC communication (S/WPGR/W/38, searchable at [http://docsonline.wto.org/gen\\_search.asp](http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_search.asp)) on a modal ESM application.

In its submission, the EC considered the issue of whether it would be technically possible to develop a "uniform set of rules" applying to all four modes of service supply or whether a rather "mode-specific solution" was required. The EC argued that a cross-modal approach should not be precluded from the discussions, as it was often difficult to separate a safeguard under one mode from another mode. Furthermore, the paper identified several procedural aspects which could be tackled across the board, whereas other, rather normative elements, were considered to require a mode-specific approach.

Despite the EC's detailed analysis, a South American trade source contested the EC's good faith regarding an objective discussion on the workability of an ESM, stating that "the EC, by citing so many difficulties and systemic problems, does actually imply that an ESM is rather impossible!" According to observers of the negotiations, trading partner Uruguay critically commented on the EC's contribution to the ESM debate by highlighting provisions in several free trade agreements (FTAs) with EC participation as well as the EC treaties themselves which were all said to contain safeguard measures. "If a safeguard is possible in other EC trade agreements, why should it be such a problem in the GATS context then?" the source asked.

Australia, on the other hand, tabled an informal paper in which it mainly focused on procedural aspects of an ESM, but not on their feasibility, as in the EC submission. As sources reported, Australia proposed a two-model approach: under the first model, consensus amongst the WTO Membership was required prior to the application of a safeguard measure; the second model, so the source explained, outlined a procedure according to which a Member applying an ESM would be required to notify the safeguard measure as well as to consult with the Member affected by the ESM. It was reported that Members especially welcomed the second model, as it was seen as a productive contribution to the ESM discussion.

In parallel, the Working Group on Domestic Regulation (WPDR) met on 3 and 7 June to discuss, inter alia, whether Members should establish a timeframe for the negotiations on disciplines for domestic regulation under GATS Article VI:4. In a recent note, WPDR Chair Sergio Dos Santos, Brazil, proposed March 2003 as the

initial benchmark for the development of the basis and general shape of possible future disciplines. Sources, however, reported that Members such as the US and several developing countries had met the Chair's proposal with some resistance.

As paragraph 16 of the Doha Declaration provides that initial offers are to tabled by 31 March 2003, Members are under pressure to further develop ideas on future disciplines before that date so as to be able to address the issue of domestic regulation on the multilateral level. Otherwise, sources caution, the question on how to discipline regulatory elements could be left to the bilateral negotiations under the request/offer mechanism. The first requests need to be submitted by 30 June this year.

ICTSD reporting.

### **WTO TECH TRANSFER GROUP SETTING UP WORK PROGRAMME**

On 11 June, the WTO's Working Group on Trade and Transfer of Technology (WGTTT) met to further discuss a possible work programme for the body. At this second session, Members also heard presentations on country experiences from Brazil and China and had further discussions on two background pieces prepared by the WTO Secretariat surrounding the nexus of trade (and investment) and the process of technology transfer.

In paragraph 37 of the Doha Declaration, Members agreed to examine the relationship between trade and transfer of technology, and "of any possible recommendations on steps that might be taken within the mandate of the WTO to increase flows of technology to developing countries". In that regard, the General Council is tasked with reporting to the Fifth Ministerial Conference (in Cancun, Mexico, September 2003) "on progress in the examination".

Finding a suitable work programme

Two submissions had been received prior to this meeting on objectives for the body. The first, submitted by a collection of countries often referred to as the 'Like-Minded Group' (including Bangladesh, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritius, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zimbabwe) suggested that the work of the body be structured under five broad sub-headings, including: an examination of tech transfer-related provisions of WTO Agreements; analytical work; identification of areas of possible technical cooperation; areas where consensus building could be sought; and cooperation with other organisations (WT/WGTTT/W/2; still restricted).

The second, submitted by the EC, suggested that the work focus on a common understanding of the definition of technology transfer; an identification of various channels for transfer of technology; and the conditions under which these channels are most effective (WT/WGTT/1, searchable at <http://docsonline.wto.org>).

Chair Ambassador Stefan Johannesson of Iceland had compiled a draft work programme, however despite an informal consultation after the formal session, consensus was not yet within reach. Some key points of divergence, sources indicate, are whether the programme should include activities all the way to the Fifth Ministerial in September 2003 and whether greater detail on issues such as technical assistance should be included. Prefacing what one source speculates could become quite a showdown for the Working Group, the US made it clear that the body should merely be doing analytical work and should not be making any final recommendations to the General Council. The EC and Norway sought flexibility on the various issues, stating that Members should allow developing countries the opportunity to further discuss these items should they be so inclined. Chair Johannesson will hold further consultations on this matter.

#### Brazil and China share their experiences

The two countries detailing their experiences on trade and technology transfer at this session were Brazil and China. Inter alia, Brazil said that developed country subsidies on research and development were as distorting to technology development as agricultural subsidies to the agricultural sector, "if not more." Brazil was also adamant that strong intellectual property right (IPR) regimes were having a negative impact on technology transfer. Both the US and EU, openly in favour of strong IPR regimes, denied these claims.

China outlined some of its efforts to promote science, technology, research and development, and elucidated on how it was importing technology through licensing, investment and higher technology goods. The Chinese delegate also made mention of the impact of national security concerns in impeding some countries from transferring certain technologies.

#### Secretariat's notes on trade and technology transfer

At the 6 March informal session of the WGTTT (see 12 March 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-03-12/wtoinbrief.htm>), Members requested that the Secretariat produce a factual background document on the issues related to trade and transfer of technology that have been dealt with elsewhere. These two documents (WT/WGTTT/W/1 and /Add.1; still restricted) were discussed briefly at the first formal session on 16 April, but again saw airtime at this second session -- albeit only briefly.

Among the topics discussed was an item that many sources felt would be a major sticking point for the body's work -- i.e. whether intellectual property protection impedes technology transfer or supports it. A number of developing countries came out in support of the former position, with most developed countries supporting the latter.

The background note (WT/WGTTT/W1) begins by examining how new technologies are created and how they diffuse geographically. It moves to an examination of empirical evidence on the role of trade in technology diffusion internationally and then considers FDI from the perspective of how it leads to technology transfer. Empirical evidence of FDI's role in technology diffusion internationally is also reviewed. Finally, certain practical mechanisms for the transfer of technology (licensing, franchising and partnerships) are examined.

The Working Group on Trade and Transfer of Technology is scheduled to meet again on 10 October 2002.

ICTSD reporting.

### **In Brief**

#### **ZIMBABWE BECOMES FIRST COUNTRY TO INVOKE DECLARATION ON TRIPS AND PUBLIC HEALTH**

On 27 May, Zimbabwe became the first state to declare a national HIV/AIDS emergency -- thereby freeing itself from its obligations to respect relevant HIV/AIDS drugs patents under the WTO's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs). The six-month emergency declaration lifts all legal restrictions that block access to generic medicines. According to Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), a humanitarian medical aid agency, the move would slash the annual costs of treatment for a variety of AIDS drugs by nearly one fourth, from around USD 1,168 per person to just over USD 400 -- effectively doubling the number of patients that could be treated by available resources. In a country where one in five people are infected with the HIV virus and 2500 people die every week, the move marks the first instance of the invocation of the Doha Declaration on TRIPs and Public Health, which clarifies that WTO Members can waive patent obligations imposed by the TRIPs Agreement in times of public health crises which constitute 'a national emergency'. Some AIDS experts have questioned the move however, pointing to, *inter alia*, the short time period of the emergency, the lack of foreign exchange to order the needed drugs,



as well as the lack of qualified personnel to facilitate the delivery of the services required in the use of many HIV/AIDS drugs.

"Activists Applaud Zimbabwe Action On AIDS Drugs," REUTERS, 29 May 2002.  
"Question Mark Greet New Aids Directive" FINANCIAL GAZETTE (Harare), 30 May 2002.

### **NICARAGUAN GROUPS EXPOSE GMOS IN FOOD AID SHIPMENT**

On the week of 3-7 June, Nicaraguan groups alerted US lawmakers that food aid delivered to Nicaragua from the US by the World Food Programme (WFP) had been contaminated with genetically modified organisms (GMOs) unbeknownst to the recipient government, and further that the contamination was from a strain (StarLink) that was deemed unfit for human consumption by the US Environmental Protection Agency in 1998. Despite a 24 May WFP press release indicating that they "[do] NOT distribute food that is NOT acceptable for human consumption [...]", the agency was responsible for the distribution of tainted corn and soy flour as well as corn seeds. The food aid, which was being provided in order to alleviate hunger and malnutrition resulting from an El-Niño-induced drought, was donated by the US Agency for International Development [USAID] (corn and soy flour) and Germany (corn seeds). A USAID spokesperson said the agency could not ensure that food sent as aid had not been grown from genetically modified seeds because grain mills in the US do not normally separate traditional crops from genetically altered crops. A WFP spokesperson said the US donated about 50 percent of WFP food. In a related case, the Bolivian Forum on Environment and Development (FOBOMADE), a citizens group in Bolivia, announced on 10 June that a sample of USAID food aid had also tested positive for the presence of StarLink corn, as well as two other types of engineered corn not approved in the EU -- RoundUp Ready and BtXtra. This marks another case of GMO presence affecting food aid, with Zimbabwe having rejected a shipment of 10,000 tonnes of maize last month (see BRIDGES Weekly, 4 June 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-06-04/inbrief.htm>).

"Nicaraguans Say Food Aid Tainted", IPS, 9 June 2002; "Illegal Genetically Engineered StarLink Corn Contaminates Food Aid" GE FOOD ALERT Press Release, 10 June 2002.

## WTO In Brief

### CANADA INITIATES ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF NEW WTO NEGOTIATIONS

The Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) announced that the government would conduct a strategic environmental assessment of the new Doha Round of negotiations at the WTO. In a notice published on 8 June, the government indicated that the assessment was intended as part of its commitment to sustainable development, in its push to make trade and environmental policies mutually supportive. A special environmental assessment committee will be carrying out the review, with representatives from various relevant government agencies, including DFAIT, Environment Canada, and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. The government has also invited all interested parties including industry and the general public to submit comments on the likely and significant environmental impacts on Canada of the WTO negotiations. The deadline for these latter comments is 31 July 2002. For further information, visit <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/tna-nac/Consult1-e.asp#wto>.

Paragraph six of the Doha Ministerial Declaration takes "[...] note of the efforts by members to conduct national environmental assessments of trade policies on a voluntary basis," while paragraph 31 encourages the sharing of experience and expertise with members.

"Strategic Environmental Assessment Of The New World Trade Organization (WTO) Negotiations," DFAIT, 8 June 2002; "Canadian Government Initiates Assessment Of Doha Negotiations' Environmental Impact," WTO REPORTER, 11 June 2002.

### EC UPS ANTE IN US STEEL DISPUTE

Following a meeting of EU Foreign Ministers on 10 June, the EU approved retaliatory tariffs against a list of goods totalling USD 932 million against the US in response to steel safeguard tariffs imposed by Washington (see BRIDGES Weekly, 28 May 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-05-28/story3.htm>). The US is expected to take steps to ease the increasing tension with the EU. According to the EU, "a satisfactory US offer would have to include both exemptions for some EU steel products from the tariffs of up to 30 percent imposed by US President Bush in March, and compensation in the form of lower US duties on other goods." The US has already announced a list of 61 steel products exempted from the tariff measure. It is expected that more products will be listed by 3 July. At a meeting of the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) on 7

June, the US blocked China's request for the establishment of a panel in the steel dispute. This was the first such request under WTO rules by China. China had made the request in view of the injurious effects that the safeguard measure was having on its steel industry. China requested that the matter be placed on the agenda for the next regular DSB meeting on 24 June. This request by China is the second of eight expected requests on the same issue. Thus far, eight WTO Members have filed disputes with regard to the US safeguard measures on steel: Brazil, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, China, Korea, Japan and the EC. In the meantime, the EC is hoping to reach an agreement with the US on compensation and on possible products to be excluded from the safeguard measures.

"EU Ministers Set to Endorse Steel Sanctions Plan," REUTERS, 7 June 2002; "EU Hits Back At US Steel Tariffs," UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL, 10 June 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: 11-18 June

10-11 June, Interlaken, Switzerland: INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON AGRICULTURE AND BIODIVERSITY. Sponsored by Pro Natura and Friends of the Earth, specialists will address the role of agriculture in the disappearance of plant and animal species from the planet. For further information contact: Angie Rother, email: [angie.rother@pronatura.ch](mailto:angie.rother@pronatura.ch); Internet: <http://www.pronatura.ch/content/english/page1.html>.

10-13 June, Rome, Italy: WORLD FOOD SUMMIT: FIVE YEARS LATER. This meeting is meant to review progress toward ending hunger and to track the progress achieved since the 1996 World Food Summit. World leaders will be requested to outline the measures needed to achieve the goal, and make suggestions on how to accelerate progress. They are also expected to consider how to increase resources available for agricultural and rural development. For further information visit: <http://www.fao.org/worldfoodsummit>. For information on the 8-13 June NGO Forum on Food Sovereignty held back-to-back with the World food Summit, visit <http://www.forumfoodsovereignty.org/>.

12-14 June, Geneva, Switzerland: UNCTAD EXPERT MEETING ON EXPERIENCES WITH BILATERAL AND REGIONAL APPROACHES TO MULTILATERAL COOPERATION IN THE AREA OF LONG-TERM CROSS-BORDER INVESTMENT, PARTICULARLY FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT. For further information contact: UNCTAD secretariat, Intergovernmental Support Service, Palais des Nations, CH-1211 Geneva 10; fax: +41(0)22 917 0056; email: [correspondence@unctad.org](mailto:correspondence@unctad.org).

13-15 June 2002, Montreal, Canada: SUSTAINABLE JUSTICE 2002 - CONFERENCE ON IMPLEMENTING INTERNATIONAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT LAW: Organised by the Centre for International Sustainable Development Law (CISDL), the conference seeks to address issues related to the environment, economy, social justice, human rights, health and the inter-linkages among them. For further information contact: Centre for International Sustainable Development Law; tel: (1-514) 581-4984; fax: 39-8197; email: [conference@cisdl.org](mailto:conference@cisdl.org); Internet: <http://www.cisdl.org>.

14 June, Geneva, Switzerland: FROM RIO TO JOHANNESBURG - A REFLECTION ON THE INSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS OF WORLD TRADE. The Graduate Institute of Development Studies (IUED), in collaboration with the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), is organising an interdisciplinary scientific colloquium on the institutional foundations of current world trade, while considering their compatibility with sustainable development. The colloquium is aimed at researchers in the fields of social sciences as well as natural sciences. For further information contact: Catherine Minetti; tel: (41- 22) 906 59 43; fax: 906 59 47; Internet: [http://www.unige.ch/iued/new/information/conferences/conf\\_2002\\_06\\_14-15\\_riojoha.html](http://www.unige.ch/iued/new/information/conferences/conf_2002_06_14-15_riojoha.html).

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](mailto:info@iaia.org) or print the registration form from <http://www.iaia.org/> and fax to (1-701) 297-7917.

16-20 June 2002, Adelboden, Switzerland: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN MOUNTAIN REGIONS. As a contribution to the International Year of the

Mountains (IYM2002) and in preparation for the WSSD, the SARD-Mountains 2002 conference will provide outputs in the form of: a declaration on their role and tasks of sustainable mountain agriculture, indicators and key policy elements that foster SARD-Mountains; and an action plan comprising approaches and strategic elements to be considered in actions and projects as well as proposals for concrete actions and projects on national and international levels. For more information contact: CreaConsult Ltd.; tel: (41-26) 670-3419; e-mail: [info@sard-m2002.ch](mailto:info@sard-m2002.ch); Internet: <http://www.sard-m2002.ch/>. From IISD Linkages, <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/journal/>.

17-21 June, Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe: 9TH BIENNIAL CONFERENCE OF THE IASCP - THE COMMONS IN AN AGE OF GLOBALISATION. Organised by the International Association for the Study of Common Property, the conference theme is addressed from a broader perspective to include issues of governance, economic systems and hidden values, tourism and global ideology. For further information contact: Cass Trust, Zimbabwe; tel: (263) 4 303080; fax: 4 307720; email: [iascp@cass.org.zw](mailto:iascp@cass.org.zw); Internet: <http://www.iascp2002.org>.

17-21 June, Geneva, Switzerland: 6TH SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE FOR AN INTERNATIONAL LEGALLY BINDING INSTRUMENT FOR IMPLEMENTING INTERNATIONAL ACTION ON CERTAIN PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS (POPs INC). Organised by UNEP Chemicals. For further information contact: Mr. Jim Willis, UNEP Chemicals; tel: (41) (0)22 979-9111; fax: 797-3460; email: [jwillis@unep.ch](mailto:jwillis@unep.ch); Internet: <http://www.chem.unep.ch/pops>

#### WTO Events

An updated list of forthcoming WTO meetings is posted at: [http://www.wto.org/english/news\\_e/meets.pdf](http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/meets.pdf). 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.

10-12 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO TEXTILES MONITORING BODY.

11-12 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO SPECIAL SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT. On the agenda: planning of the 13-14 June MEA information session; consideration of paragraphs 31 (i), (ii) and (iii) of the Doha ministerial declaration: (TN/TE/S/1 by the Secretariat, TN/TE/W/1 by the EC, TN/TE/W/2 by Argentina). The summary report on the first meeting of the special session can be found in document TN/TE/R/1,

and the first statement by the chairperson to the trade negotiations committee in document TN/TE/1.

11 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO WORKING GROUP ON TRADE AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY. On the agenda: discussion of a submission by Bangladesh, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritius, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Uganda, And Zimbabwe (WT/WGTTT/W/2).

12 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COMMITTEE ON MARKET ACCESS.

13-14 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT. On the agenda: MEA information session; discussion of paragraph 32 of the Doha ministerial declaration, with particular attention to paragraph 32(ii) - the relevant provisions of the agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights; discussion of paragraph 33 of the Doha ministerial declaration on technical assistance, capacity building and environmental reviews; and discussion of paragraph 51 on identifying and debating developmental and environmental aspects of the negotiations, in order to help achieve the objective of having sustainable development appropriately reflected. The report of the last meeting held on 21 March 2002 is contained in WT/CTE/M/29.

13 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COUNCIL FOR TRADE IN GOODS.

14 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO SPECIAL SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT.

14 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BODY: SPECIAL SESSION ON STEEL SAFEGUARDS. A special session has been requested where Norway and Switzerland will present their first request for a panel on US steel safeguards while Japan and Korea will present a second request for a panel against the US.

17-19 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO SPECIAL SESSION OF NEGOTIATIONS ON AGRICULTURE: INFORMAL MEETING.

20 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO SPECIAL SESSION OF NEGOTIATIONS ON AGRICULTURE: FORMAL MEETING.

28 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: REGULAR MEETING.



### Other Forthcoming Events

14 June, Paris, France: BIODIVERSITÉ, FORÊTS, BIOSÉCURITÉ: QUELLES STRATEGIES POUR LES ONG À LA VEILLE DU SOMMET MONDIAL DU DÉVELOPPEMENT DURABLE? Organised by Solagral, Greenpeace and Les Amis de la Tarre. For further information contact: Lisa Dacosta; tel: +33 (0)1 43 94 73 46 [dacosta@solagral.asso.fr](mailto:dacosta@solagral.asso.fr).

21 June, Geneva, Switzerland: THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND INTERNATIONAL LAW: CAUGHT BETWEEN TRADE AND FOOD SAFETY? Organised by Faculty of Law, University of Geneva. For further information contact: Urs P. Thomas, Dept of Public International Law (INPUB), University of Geneva (Uni Mail); email: [urs.thomas@droit.unige.ch](mailto:urs.thomas@droit.unige.ch).

8-10 July, Bratislava, Slovakia: WORKSHOP ON IMPROVED INVESTMENT ANALYSIS TOOLS: LINKS TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. The Slovak Ministry of the Environment will host this international Workshop in cooperation with the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and the Slovak Cleaner Production Centre. For further information contact: Alexandra Lang, email: [langa@un.org](mailto:langa@un.org); Internet: <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/finance.htm>.

14-19 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WORLD CIVIL SOCIETY FORUM. The aim of the forum is to strengthen international cooperation between non- governmental organisations (NGOs) and the UN. For information contact: World Civil Society Forum; fax: (41-22) 959-8851; email [forum@mandint.org](mailto:forum@mandint.org); Internet: <http://www.worldcivilsociety.org/>.

18 July, Merida, Mexico: NORTH AMERICA REGIONAL SEMINAR ON THE FREE TRADE AREA OF THE AMERICAS. Hosted by the US, Mexico and Canada. The Seminar will be the first regional forum in North America for public discussion of the FTAA and will be divided into three panels, namely 'Market Access/Agriculture', 'Services/Investment' and 'Transparency & Civil Society Participation in the FTAA processes'. For further information visit the USTR's website, <http://www.ustr.gov/regions/whemisphere/ftaa.shtml> or the FTAA website, [http://www.ftaa-alca.org/alca\\_e.asp](http://www.ftaa-alca.org/alca_e.asp).

22-26 July, Guatemala City, Guatemala: CONTRIBUTION OF CRITERIA AND INDICATORS TO SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT: A WAY FORWARD. The conference is being organised as a follow-up to recommendations made by the Expert Meeting on Criteria and Indicators for



Sustainable Forest Management held in Rome in 2000. For further information contact: Glenda Lee, Coordinator, Local Organizing Committee; tel: (1-502) 379-9830; fax: 475- 4407; email: [cici2002@inab.gob.gt](mailto:cici2002@inab.gob.gt); Internet: <http://www.inab.gob.gt>.

24-25 October, Stellenbosch, South Africa: 4TH AFRICAN ANNUAL INVESTMENT CONFERENCE. Hosted by Africa Centre for Investment Analysis (ACIA). The conference will run under the theme "Essential Development Finance for the New African Union". It aims to provide key policy- related solutions in finance and investment relevant to promoting sustainable development in Africa. Participants at the conference will include African governments, governors of reserve banks, CEOs of major financial institutions, micro lending organisation and stock markets, investors, and NGOs. For further information contact: Lidia du Plessis, email: [lidia@acia.sun.ac.za](mailto:lidia@acia.sun.ac.za); Internet: <http://www.acia.sun.ac.za>.

## 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](mailto:hcameron@ictsd.ch). Submissions of publications to ICTSD's documentation centre would also be welcome (contact Matteo Rizzolli, [mrizzolli@ictsd.ch](mailto:mrizzolli@ictsd.ch)).

### ICTSD Publications

BRIDGES MONTHLY REVIEW. Published by ICTSD, Year 6, Number 4, May 2002. Lead story: "Stark Differences Emerge on the Value Added of the Johannesburg Summit". The new issue is available online at: <http://www.ictsd.org/monthly/index.htm>.

"The Social Clause And Sustainable Development," by Maryke Dessing. Published by ICTSD in SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND TRADE ISSUES: ICTSD RESOURCE PAPER. This paper aims to make a substantive contribution to the debate on the social clause by highlighting the links between labour standards, trade, the environment, and development. The sustainable development perspective, which covers both equity and environmental concerns, provides new and interesting avenues for action in this field. By reviewing and synthesising the relevant literature, the study seeks to help build bridges between the various issue areas and actors involved in the debate. The paper is available online at: <http://www.ictsd.org/pubs/respaper/SCpaper.pdf>. Hard copies can be ordered at: [mrizzolli@ictsd.ch](mailto:mrizzolli@ictsd.ch); tel (+41-22) 917-8498.

## Resources

INTERNATIONALLY-RECOGNISED CORE LABOUR STANDARDS IN HAITI: REPORT FOR THE WTO GENERAL COUNCIL REVIEW OF TRADE POLICIES OF HAITI. Published by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), June 2002. In the view of the ICFTU, determined measures are needed to comply with the commitments Haiti accepted at Singapore, Geneva, and Doha in the WTO Ministerial Declarations over 1996-2001, and in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work adopted in June 1998. Haiti has ratified both of the core ILO conventions protecting trade union rights. There are however serious restrictions on trade union rights, including freedom of association and the right to strike. Collective bargaining coverage is minimal, workers and trade union activists face serious intimidation and violence, and there is no protection against antiunion discrimination, which occurs on a regular basis. Child labour is a widespread occurrence and access to education is minimal. Haiti has ratified both the core ILO conventions on forced labour, although child forced domestic labour is a widespread and very serious problem. The report is available at: <http://www.icftu.org/www/pdf/haiticls2002inenglish.pdf>.

"Using Private-Public Linkages to Regulate Environmental Conflicts: The Case of International Construction Contracts", JOURNAL OF LAW AND SOCIETY, Vol. 29 No:1, 2002. pg 77-110. The article takes a pluralistic view of the trade-environment conflict by exploring one of the settings of this conflict: the lex constructionis - international construction law. It seeks to unravel the way in which the structural-cultural attributes of this legal domain have affected its environmental (in) sensitivity. For further information and to request copies of the paper, contact Oren Perez, Bar Ilan University at: [perezo@mail.biu.ac.il](mailto:perezo@mail.biu.ac.il).

GLOBAL TRENDS AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE. Edited by Paul Kennedy (Yale University), Dirk Messner (University of Duisburg) and Franz Nuscheler (University of Duisburg). 2002. The publication is a concise and practical guide that explains the key political, economic, ecological and social factors that shape the process of globalisation, and the way that they affect the lives of all people around the world. The publication is aimed at activists, civil servants, policy researchers, and anyone interested in getting involved in political action. For further information visit: [http://sef-bonn.org/sef/publications/trends/gt\\_gg/gt\\_gg.html](http://sef-bonn.org/sef/publications/trends/gt_gg/gt_gg.html).

## WTO Documents

COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT ENVIRONMENTAL DATABASE FOR 2001. Note by the WTO Secretariat to the CTE. 31 May 2002

(WT/CTE/EDB/1). This note constitutes a list of environment-related measures or provisions that were notified under the WTO agreements in 2001. Available at: [http://docsonline.wto.org/gen\\_search.asp](http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_search.asp).

NON-DISCRIMINATION, MOST-FAVOURLED-NATION TREATMENT AND NATIONAL TREATMENT. WTO Working Group on the Relationship between Trade and Investment. 4 June 2002 (WT/WGTI/W/118). The Note focuses on the ways in which the two main standards of non-discriminatory treatment -- most-favoured-nation treatment and national treatment -- have been applied in the GATT and the GATS and in international investment agreements, and reviews the discussions that have taken place in the Working Group on this issue. Available at: [http://docsonline.wto.org/gen\\_search.asp](http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_search.asp).

INCREASING TRADE & INVESTMENT. POLICIES, INSTITUTIONS AND DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE. Published by USAID. This paper argues that through greater openness and sound governance, low-income developing countries can gain access to global product and capital markets. According to the paper, the same measures encourage local investment and enterprise. Elements of successful reform programs include achieving macroeconomic stability, liberalising the trade regime, strengthening the role of the private sector in the economy, and establishing the rule of law. The key is to sustain the pace of reforms, and this is where development assistance can play a major role: nurturing support for reform, building market infrastructure to support private transactions, and assisting vulnerable segments of society through the transition. Available at: [http://www.dec.org/pdf\\_docs/PNACP020.pdf](http://www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNACP020.pdf).

#### Electronic Resources

INFOFINDER: A GLOBAL LINK TO RESEARCH ON AGRICULTURE, HUNGER, POVERTY AND THE ENVIRONMENT. Infofinder is a research engine that allows you to find digital information from the websites of all 16 Future Harvest Centers, the CGIAR, and FAO, which collaboratively developed this research tool. Available at: <http://infofinder.cgiar.org/>.

ENVIROWINDOWS. ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION FOR BUSINESSES AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES. EnviroWindows has the ambition to become the information "marketplace" for businesses, local authorities and their stakeholders. It facilitates consumer access to company information on products, best practices, use of natural resources, and corporate environmental performance. It helps local authorities to communicate with concerned citizens, professionals, policy makers and companies. Available at: <http://sd-online.ewindows.eu.org/>.

A searchable archive of **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**© can be accessed at:

[http://www.newsbulletin.org/bulletins/WhichBulletin.cfm?Bulletin\\_ID=14&SID=](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 of **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**© are Heike Baumuller, Victor Mosoti, Matteo Rizzolli, Mahesh Sugathan and Alex Werth. Technical support: Matteo Rizzolli. Assistant Editor: David Primack. Editor: Hugo Cameron, [hcameron@ictsd.ch](mailto:hcameron@ictsd.ch). Managing Editor is Andrew Crosby. The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz, [rmelendez@ictsd.ch](mailto: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