



ICTSD

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR
TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT

BRIDGES

Weekly Trade News Digest

20 June 2002

Volume 6, Number 23

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, or by telephone at: (41-22) 917-8336.

CONTENTS

CTE STILL STRUGGLING WITH MEA OBSERVER QUESTION	2
'DEVELOPMENT' AT WTO ENDEAVOURS TO MEET ITS DEADLINE	5
FOOD SUMMIT: NGOS STRESS PRIMACY OF FOOD SOVEREIGNTY OVER TRADE	8
CLIMATE CHANGE ROUND-UP	10
<i>In Brief</i>	12
EU FOREIGN MINISTERS ENDORSE MANDATE ON ACP NEGOTIATIONS	12
LATIN AMERICA'S BIGGEST ECONOMIES SIGN TRADE PACT	12
INCREASE IN PRIVATE CONSUMPTION TO REDUCE LDC POVERTY: UNCTAD	13
AFRICAN STATES SEEK CITES WAIVER FOR IVORY TRADE	14
<i>WTO In Brief</i>	14
INCOMING WTO D-G SUPACHAI WANTS CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MULTINATIONALS	14
COMPLAINTS OVER US STEEL TARIFFS INTEGRATED INTO SINGLE WTO PANEL	15
WTO PANEL RULES AGAINST RETROACTIVE DUTY REFUNDS IN SOFTWOOD LUMBER CASE	15
<i>On The Move</i>	16
STUART HARBINSON APPOINTED WTO CHIEF OF STAFF	16
<i>Events & Resources</i>	17
EVENTS	17
RESOURCES	21

CTE STILL STRUGGLING WITH MEA OBSERVER QUESTION

On 13-14 June, the WTO Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE) held its second session for 2002, including an information session with multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). Focusing on the CTE mandate from the Doha Declaration, Members addressed a wide variety of submissions on areas ranging from the MEA-WTO relationship, capacity building and environmental reviews to the interface between the WTO's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) and the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and market access. The question of how MEAs could be included as observers in the CTE's special session, which deals with the Doha negotiations on environment, continued to dog discussions around the MEA-WTO interface.

MEA info session

Building on a 19-20 March workshop on technical assistance and capacity building, MEA secretariats reported on their activities in these areas, as well as on enhancing information exchange between MEAs and the WTO. According to sources, a number of the MEA delegates expressed disappointment that they were still not able to participate in the CTE special session meetings, where talks are progressing on, *inter alia*, the relationship between WTO rules and specific trade obligations set out in MEAs (see BRIDGES Weekly, 12 June 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-06-12/story3.htm>).

Referring to a paper submitted to the CTE special session (TN/TE/S/2, available at http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_search.asp), some MEA representatives contrasted their lack of access to WTO negotiations on trade and environment with the fact that the WTO regularly attends the UN Environment Programme's (UNEP) Governing Council, as well as the main meetings of MEAs which contain trade-related measures. According to sources, UNEP Executive Director Klaus Toepfer declined an invitation to attend on the grounds that the meaningful negotiations were taking place in the special sessions, not in the regular CTE.

The issue of authorising other bodies as observers to negotiating sessions remains blocked at the General Council/Trade Negotiations Committee level. As a compromise to the observership impasse, the CTE had previously agreed to hold an additional special session in November that would be exclusively an MEA information session. Some observers remarked that this would still not constitute real negotiations, or go far enough given the Doha environment mandate, which also includes establishing procedures for regular information exchange between MEA Secretariats and the relevant WTO committees.

One developing country source noted his disappointment with the 13 June MEA session, saying that much of the information was repetitive, and that there had not been much progress to report, particularly in the area of technology transfer. He further noted a lack

of coordination between the chairs of the special and regular sessions. "We already have so many meetings to cover," he said, "we can't afford to lose time by duplicating work."

Capacity building and environmental reviews

Presentations were made by delegations from Canada, the EC, Mexico, Norway, Switzerland, the US and the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) on their capacity building and technical assistance activities to date. In addition to continued support for the efforts of UNEP (see *BRIDGES Weekly*, 26 March 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-03-26/inbrief.htm>), some countries called for better follow-up for these efforts. Mexico said that capacity building initiatives should be more country-specific, while the US recommended that the WTO identify specific aspects of capacity building, such as environmental assessments, environmentally sound technologies, and customs reforms on which to focus its efforts.

For its part, the EC presented its multi-year programme to conduct Sustainability Impact Assessments of the Doha negotiations. Informally, this paper (WT/CTE/W/208) met with much scepticism from a number of countries, highlighted by the fact that the EC had been previously unsuccessful in submitting it to the special session. Australia, together with Canada and the US, expressed concern over the EC paper, saying it showed a misunderstanding of the links between trade liberalisation and social and environmental issues. Canada asked how the EC could purport to assess countries outside of Europe. The EC responded by pointing out that the conclusions of its Impact Assessment were those of the consultants, not of the EC.

TRIPs-CBD debate stagnates

The focus of the discussion around para. 32 of the Doha Ministerial Declaration was on the interface between the TRIPs agreement and the CBD. On 10 June, the CBD Secretariat submitted a paper reviewing the provisions of TRIPs article 27.3(b) (protection of invention of plant varieties) and protection of traditional knowledge and folklore (WT/CTE/W/210). However, those attending the CTE said afterward that there was "no change" in the traditional positions of Members around this question. On the one hand, Brazil, India and Pakistan want this discussion to take place in the TRIPs Council, and have previously highlighted what they see as possible conflicts between the CBD and the TRIPs Agreement, suggesting these could be resolved through a revision of Article 27.3(b) or of Article 29 (on conditions on patent applicants). Such a revision would incorporate requirements that patent applicants disclose the source of genetic material and relevant traditional knowledge, and that they provide evidence of fair and equitable benefit-sharing and prior informed consent. Most developed countries, notably Canada, Switzerland and the US, view TRIPs and CBD as mutually supportive and resist revising the TRIPs Agreement. They further prefer this discussion to take place in the World Intellectual Property Organization.

CTE & CTD could collaborate on sustainable development

Some strong signals emerged from discussions around paragraph 51 of the Doha Declaration that the CTE and the Committee on Trade and Development (CTD) could collaborate in order to help achieve the objective of having sustainable development appropriately reflected in the negotiations. The EC, supported by Chile, proposed that the CTE hold a joint outreach event with the CTD to "break down the wall that currently exists," and suggested that civil society be allowed to participate and comment. Malaysia concurred with the EC, while Egypt said it would not be opposed, though they did not comment on the civil society aspect. The US, however, said that a joint CTE/CTD effort was premature and too burdensome. Chair Oguz Demiralp said he was in contact with the Chair of the CTD, but that the conditions were not right for a joint activity.

India paper on market access

A paper submitted by the Indian delegation on the effects of environmental measures on market access (WT/CTE/W/207) received enthusiastic feedback from most developing countries. The Quad (Canada, the EC, Japan and the US) said they were prepared to discuss it, but that not everything it contained was achievable. One Quad delegate said that much from India's paper could be addressed through the Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade.

MEA Secretariats in attendance for the information session included the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), UNEP-Chemicals, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the CBD, the Basel Convention on the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes, the International Tropical Timber Organization, the UN Forum on Forests, the UN Fish Stocks Agreement and the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

Other papers submitted to this CTE session included: Issues on Forestry Products, Trade and Environment -- submission by Japan (WTO/CTE/W/211); Labelling -- submission by the EC (WT/CTE/W/212); Enhancing Synergies and Mutual Supportiveness of MEAs and the WTO -- contribution by UNEP (WT/CTE/W/213); and MEA Session on Technical Assistance, Capacity Building and Enhancing Information Exchange -- input from the WTO, UNEP and MEA Secretariats (WT/CTE/W/209).

The next meeting of the CTE is scheduled for 8-9 October.

ICTSD reporting.

'DEVELOPMENT' AT WTO ENDEAVOURS TO MEET ITS DEADLINE

The body tasked by WTO Members to review the special and differential treatment (S&D) provisions in the WTO agreements -- which make up the core of 'development' at the WTO -- met informally on 10 June and formally on 14 June. The 10 June informal special session of the Committee on Trade and Development (CTD) met specifically to discuss proposals tabled at its 16 May session by the Africa Group and the Least-Developed Countries (LDCs) (see BRIDGES Weekly, 22 May 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-05-22/story1.htm>). The fourth formal session met on 14 June to discuss proposals on possible amendments to S&D language in the following agreements: GATT 1994, including a number of the 'Understandings' of GATT 1994; TRIPs (Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights); and the Trade Policy Review Mechanism. The CTD must report to the General Council by 31 July 2002 with recommendations on how to make S&D provisions more efficient and/or mandatory.

Proposal from Africa Group

The Africa Group proposal (TN/CTD/W/3; not as yet de-restricted) was tabled at the last formal CTD session on 16 May (see BRIDGES link above). It was presented in three parts: i) an examination of the form and meaning of S&D and some suggestions on possible methodologies of amendment; ii) a cross-cutting look at the principles and objectives of S&D in the WTO and related recommendations; and iii) agreement-by-agreement recommendations. Among other things, Part (ii) suggested that non-binding provisions be made binding, that transition periods be criteria-driven and perpetually extendible, that the approach to technical assistance be reconsidered, that S&D be enforceable under dispute procedures and that an S&D monitoring body be established to ensure compliance. Part (iii) contained proposed changes in a number of agreements, including, inter alia, GATT 1994, Balance-of-Payments, Agriculture, Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, Technical Barriers to Trade, etc. On whether to make the envisaged changes via interpretive statements or amendments to the Agreements themselves, the proposal supported both options depending on the nature of the change required.

Proposal from the LDCs

The heart of the LDC proposal (TN/CTD/W/4; not as yet de-restricted) was contained in the section 'Measures Required To Strengthen S&D'. Like the Africa Group proposal, it espoused a general framework approach that, inter alia, proposed the re-affirmation of development as the primary goal of the multilateral trading system, the strengthening of this development-principle supremacy in the four major areas of the WTO (goods, services, intellectual property, and dispute settlement), and providing developing and least-developed countries recourse to financial resources in order to exercise their rights (including their S&D rights). It also highlighted the need for addressing supply-side constraints via exemptions or relaxations of obligations for developing countries and obligations for developed countries to assist in this area. The agreement-by-agreement

section made recommendations for, inter alia, the establishment of an annual special session on LDCs in the General Council, the legal binding of duty-and quota-free access for LDCs, realistic and flexible rules of origin requirements and an exemption from the Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs).

Reactions

A number of developing country delegates spoke in favour of the papers, including Lesotho, Egypt, Nigeria, India, Senegal, Haiti and Indonesia. Thailand also spoke in favour, however it noted that it did not feel that the CTD should be overseeing the work of other committees. The Quad countries of the US, EC, Canada, and Japan said that they saw value in some of the suggestions, although they did not agree on some of the premises upon which the proposals were based (such as wholesale changes of 'should' to 'shall' or unconditional extension of transition times). While a number of countries, including Norway and the US, made statements about their aversion to a 'two-tiered' system, they seemed interested in delving further into discussions over the principles and objectives of S&D. Pakistan, in response to Norway's comment, said that while the WTO should be striving for a single-tier system, it was questionable whether this was realistic, and pointed to the recently released UNCTAD Trade and Development Report, which makes the case for meaningful S&D (see <http://www.unctad.org/en/pub/ps1tdr02.en.htm>).

The Quad also seemed amenable to some kind of monitoring mechanism, as per the Africa Group suggestion. Sources in attendance noted, however, that vast differences remained over how such a mechanism might work (via the subsidiary bodies reporting to the CTD or by the CTD itself). Also in their comments on these proposals, the Quad Members repeated their calls for an in-depth paper on utilisation (i.e. how often, and which existing S&D provisions had been used to date). While some developing countries gave lukewarm support to this proposal, they cautioned against it delaying the work of looking ahead -- as opposed to looking in the past -- on S&D. One developing country delegate indicated his belief that the utilisation discussion was merely a stalling tactic and meant to divert attention from meaningful review. If anything, the delegate continued, the lack of usage of existing S&D provisions point to deeper problems vis-à-vis their operational nature.

The latest proposals

Three new proposals were available for discussion at the 14 June informal session. One from Paraguay dated 16 May 2002 on the 'Enabling Clause' (TN/CTD/W/5 searchable at <http://docsonline.wto.org>); one from Thailand (Import Licensing, Art. 3.5 (a)(iv)); and one from St. Lucia (Art. XVIII:Section C of GATT 1994). As the latter two were only tabled at the meeting itself, the Paraguayan proposal was the focus of the first half of the session.

Paraguay felt that a number of the Art. I (MFN) waivers for Generalised Systems of Preferences (GSPs) had been used to grant discriminatory preferences to certain developing countries. As such, they were incompatible with the 1979 Enabling Clause --

which stipulates, inter alia, that S&D should not be applied in a way that raises barriers or creates difficulties for other developing countries.

The discussions on this centred on the 'discriminatory' effects of certain GSP schemes (preferential trading arrangements). The diversity of perspectives coming from the South emerged quite heavily on this issue -- with a stark divide between those who agreed that preferential treatment must be applied on an MFN basis (e.g. Philippines, Thailand, Argentina, India, etc.) and those who felt that the same treatment could not be accorded equally to all due to differing levels of development (e.g. Uganda, Kenya, Cuba, Nigeria, Zimbabwe, Jamaica, Pakistan). In general, however, most developing countries were supportive of the core observation, embodied in para. 10 of the proposal, which said that the "rules laid down in both the GSPs and Enabling Clause are frequently infringed by criteria for granting these schemes." Further, they observed that the criteria are not relevant to trade; usually driven by other objectives (primarily political); and are arbitrary, unilateral, and discriminatory. Many OECD countries grant 'GSP-plus' preferences to countries that comply with certain labour/human rights, environmental standards, or campaigns against drug trafficking.

Negotiating forum?

Chair Ransford Smith (Jamaica) commented on the question of whether the CTD special sessions constituted a negotiating forum or not at both the 10 June and 14 June meetings (see BRIDGES Weekly, 4 June 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-06-04/wtoinbrief.htm>). Initially, he reported that despite the prevalent divergences, all Members shared the view that the mandate of the special session derives from the both the Doha Ministerial Declaration and the Implementation Decision and that there is agreement on a work programme and the relevant time-frames. Recognising the two prevailing opinions on the issue of symbol usage on CTD special session documents, he indicated that the symbol 'TN' (i.e. 'trade negotiations') would be maintained and that there would be a note that this is without prejudice to whether this is a negotiating group.

The future winds blow...

Near the end of the 10 June session, Chair Smith suggested that four items be prepared by the Secretariat. Starting with a non-paper (i.e. unofficial document) on the principles and objectives of S&D, he went on to suggest a second non-paper on the systemic institutional proposals (i.e. monitoring, legal options for amendments, etc.), as well as a factual check-list of the various proposals made in the special session thus far. Finally, he requested that the Secretariat revise its background document on utilisation of existing S&D provisions. At the 14 June session, Members did agree to the request to revise the utilisation document.

Chair Smith also indicated that there would be further informal consultations on procedural issues so as to decide how to go about reporting "with clear recommendations for action" to the General Council by the 31 July 2002 deadline -- outlined by Members at the Doha Ministerial Conference last November (see BRIDGES Weekly, 15 November 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/01-11-15/story1.htm>). One such informal was held on

18 June 2002, however at press time no information was available (see next week's edition for details).

The next formal meetings of the special session of the CTD are scheduled for 2 and 17 July. Another informal session will also be held on the afternoon of 27 June 2002.

ICTSD reporting.

FOOD SUMMIT: NGOS STRESS PRIMACY OF FOOD SOVEREIGNTY OVER TRADE

Described by one press source as a "low-impact conference", the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation's (FAO) World Food Summit: five years later (10-13 June, Rome, Italy) ended last week with deep divisions over how to achieve the goal set at the 1996 Food Summit of halving the number of hungry people by 2015. In their final statement, civil society groups sharply criticised the outcomes of the Summit as "more of the same failed medicine", calling on governments to shift their focus from trade liberalisation to achieving food sovereignty. Their campaign is set to continue at the upcoming World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD), to be held on 26 August - 4 September in Johannesburg, South Africa.

North versus South

The North-South divisions apparent at the food summit closely mirrored those at the fourth WSSD preparatory meeting (PrepCom IV) on 27 May - 7 June in Bali, Indonesia (see BRIDGES Weekly, 4 June 2002; <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-06-04/story1.htm>). In particular, industrialised countries, including the US and EU, emphasised the need for domestic reform in developing countries, with European Commissioner for Development and Humanitarian Aid, Poul Nielson, arguing that conflicts were at the root of most hunger crises and that these could not be solved by increased funding.

For their part, developing countries stressed the need for greater access to industrialised countries' markets, in particular through the reduction of farm subsidies in wealthy nations which they said distorted global commodity markets and made it impossible for producers in developing countries to compete. Agricultural subsidies had also been highlighted as one of the major obstacles at PrepCom IV, with South Africa's Environmental Affairs and Tourism Minister Valli Moosa arguing that with improved market access for agricultural products "one of the biggest obstacles to poverty" would be eradicated.

While the summit was attended by some 80 world leaders, it was marked by a noticeable lack of participation from Western governments, with top level officials from only two Western countries -- Italy as the host and Spain as the current President of the EU --

attending the event. As Britain's Overseas Development Secretary Clare Short put it, "I'm not sending a minister because I don't expect it to be an effective summit".

Civil society rejects summit declaration, calls for food sovereignty

In their political declaration adopted at the parallel NGO-CSO Forum for Food Sovereignty (8-13 June), civil society groups expressed their "collective disappointment in, and rejection of" the summit Declaration (see BRIDGES Weekly, 12 June 2002; <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-06-12/story2.htm>; also see NGO Declaration at <http://www.foodfirst.org/progs/global/food/finaldeclaration.html>). Current efforts to reduce hunger had not failed because of a lack of political will and resources, the statement argued, but rather because governments continued to pursue "policies that lead to hunger, policies that support economic liberalisation for the South and cultural homogeneity". NGOs also condemned the summit's endorsement of biotechnology as a means to fight hunger, saying, "The imposition of intensive, externally dependent models of production has destroyed the environments and livelihoods of our communities. Furthermore, it has created food insecurity and has put the focus on short-term productivity gains using harmful technologies such as GMOs."

Highlighting trade liberalisation as "the greatest force undermining livelihoods around the world", the NGOs called for a shift of focus to the "unifying concept of Food Sovereignty", i.e. "the primacy of people's and communities' rights to food and food production, over trade concerns", including the promotion of local markets and producers over production for export and food imports. This could be achieved by, inter alia, putting an end to the "neoliberal economic policies" imposed by the WTO and other multilateral and regional free trade agreements, and by removing agriculture from the WTO while working towards a Convention on Food Sovereignty.

Food sovereignty's emphasis on local production, which was also highlighted in the FAO declaration (para 4), contravenes the principle of free trade as promoted by WTO Members such as those in the Cairns Group of agriculture exporting countries. According to this group, food security concerns could be adequately addressed through food exports. In contrast, the so-called Friends of Multifunctionality -- comprising Members such as the EU, Japan, Korea, Mauritius, Norway and Switzerland -- take the view that non-trade concerns, for example rural development, food security and environment "cannot be adequately addressed without domestic agricultural production," as Ministers from 53 countries plus the EU's Agriculture Commissioner Franz Fischler reiterated at a Ministerial Conference on Non-Trade Concerns (NTC-IV) on 14 June in Rome, Italy. This coalition, which also comprises WTO newcomer China, announced that it would push for non-trade concerns to be part of the modalities currently being negotiated at the WTO (see BRIDGES Weekly, 3 April 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-04-03/story1.htm>).

Discussions set to continue at WSSD and WTO

Hopes now rest on WSSD to come up with concrete steps towards combating hunger as an integral part of sustainable development. In this context, one FAO official stressed the

need for agriculture and environment to be tackled together by looking at the entire supply chain from farmers to consumers. "You cannot save the planet if you cannot feed its peoples," the official pointed out. The FAO is likely to renew its calls for an "international Alliance against Hunger", which had received limited attention at WFS-FYL. The proposed alliance is part of the FAO's recently-launched "Anti-Hunger Programme", which estimates that it would require USD 24 billion to achieve the goal of halving the number of hungry people by 2015. This would include USD 7.8 billion to broaden market access for developing countries through, inter alia, infrastructure development and building supply-side capacity. Some, however, cautioned against too high expectations of WSSD, pointing to the deep divisions apparent at WFS-FYL and the lack of high-level attendance.

Discussions on reducing agricultural subsidies are also set to continue at the WTO as part of the ongoing negotiations launched at Doha in November 2001, including at the ongoing special session of the WTO Committee on Agriculture from 17-20 June. BRIDGES Weekly will report on the outcomes of this meeting in the forthcoming issue.

Additional Resources

Further information on WFS-FYL and the NGO forum can be found at <http://www.fao.org/worldfoodsummit/> and <http://www.forumfoodsovereignty.org/>.

The FAO "Anti-Hunger Programme" is available at <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/004/Y6684E/Y6684E00.HTM>.

"After Summit, Outlook for easing hunger stays poor," IPS, 14-17 June 2002; "South Africa says farm subsidies obstacle to UN summit," REUTERS, 11 June 2002; "Curtain falls on controversial UN food summit," REUTERS, 14 June 2002.

CLIMATE CHANGE ROUND-UP

Australia won't ratify Kyoto; Canada feels the heat

Australian Prime Minister John Howard signalled to the world on 5 June that Australia would not ratify the Kyoto Protocol to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), saying it was "not in Australia's interests" to do so. The reasoning behind the decision, he said, was that the "arrangements currently exclude -- and are likely under present settings to continue to exclude -- both developing countries and the US," and that Australia's ratification of the Protocol would cost it jobs and industry. As such, Australia looks set to join the US as one of the key non-ratifiers of a treaty that aims at reducing worldwide emissions of six greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming.

The Kyoto Protocol, signed in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997 was to have originally governed 39 countries. With the Bush administration deciding over the course of 2001 not to ratify and Australia now looking set to follow suit, attention is turning to Canada as the key industrialised country yet to endorse the treaty. A Canadian decision is expected by December 2002, when countries will convene for the 8th Conference of the Parties (COP-8). Canadian ratification is far from certain, however. At a meeting last week of the subsidiary bodies to the UNFCCC, Canada was successful in placing clean energy exports on the agenda for COP-8. This is viewed by many other parties as a Canadian attempt to re-open the original treaty. At the same meeting, Russia expressed its interest in Canada's proposal, which puts into doubt previous assumptions that Russia would support ratification. The Russian cabinet indicated its support for ratification on 11 April 2002. The Protocol has already been ratified by the EU (31 May 2002) and Japan (4 June 2002).

The four largest emitters of global greenhouse gases are the US, EU, Russia and Japan. For the Kyoto treaty to become international law, ratification is needed by at least 55 countries and by industrialised countries that emitted at least 55 per cent of the industrialised world's CO₂ in 1990. In spite of US (and likely Australian) rejection of Kyoto, the treaty will enter into force if it is ratified by at least the EU, Russia, Japan and either Canada or Poland. (See BRIDGES Weekly, 15 November 2001 at <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/01-11-15/inbrief.htm>). Welcoming Japan's ratification as "an essential step that puts global responsibility above short term economic considerations," Jennifer Morgan, Director of WWF's Climate Change Programme, urged Canada's leaders to follow suit, stating, "They should realise they risk being ostracised for remaining outside the Kyoto club unless Canada quickly ratifies the treaty."

Competitiveness and job losses: The bugbear for Australia and the US

Australia's apprehensions on ratifying the Kyoto Protocol are primarily due to competitiveness concerns. Industrialised countries that ratify the agreement must reduce emissions of carbon dioxide to an average of 5.2 percent below 1990 levels during the five-year period 2008 to 2012. Countries in the EU agreed to cut their emissions by eight percent. (See BRIDGES Weekly, 5 March 2002 at <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-03-05/inbrief.htm>). Australia had secured the right to increase its emissions to a limit of eight percent by 2012, but this allocation has failed to persuade the Howard government to support ratification. Australia's unique position as a net energy exporter among developed countries was highlighted by Howard, who disparaged "the idea that you can sign up to a protocol that would facilitate the export of dirty industries from this country into developing countries and thereby facilitate the flight of jobs from this country".

Gore slams Bush for refusing global climate report

On 8 June, former US Vice President Al Gore on the criticised US President George W. Bush for dismissing a 3 June report from the US Environmental Protection Agency that blames human activity as a root cause for global warming (see <http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/global/climate/02060601.htm>). Bush said he would

continue to press for voluntary efforts and financial incentives for US companies to reduce emissions.

Gore, the 2000 Democratic Party presidential nominee and a well-known supporter of environmental protection, said the president had given in to special interests that run the Republican Party and rejected the report rather than accept it and do something about global warming. According to Gore, the Bush administration has put "lobbyists for the polluters in charge of policies" and put "the hungriest fox they could find" to guard government henhouses, Gore said. Republicans want to turn their back on the environment rather than embrace new technologies that can clean up the environment and create jobs, Gore said.

"Australia Backs Out of Climate Protocol," ENS, 6 June 2002; "Japan's Decision to Ratify Kyoto Climate Treaty Increases Pressure on Canada," WWF PRESS RELEASE, 4 June 2002; "Gore slams Bush For Refusing Global Climate Report," ENS, 10 June 2002.

In Brief

EU FOREIGN MINISTERS ENDORSE MANDATE ON ACP NEGOTIATIONS

On 17 June, EU Foreign Ministers endorsed a mandate for the European Commission to negotiate reciprocal, WTO-compliant 'Economic Partnership Agreements' with 76 countries of the ACP (Africa, Caribbean, Pacific) (see BRIDGES Weekly, 9 April 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-04-09/inbrief.htm#5>). The negotiations, coming under the Cotonou Agreement (see BRIDGES Weekly, 27 June 2000, <http://www.ictsd.org/html/weekly/story1.27-06-00.htm>), are set to run from September 2002 until January 2008 -- after which these new EPAs will replace the preferential access provided under the Lomé series of agreements. The goal of the deals, according to the EC, is to further regional integration to give investors a broader area in which to put money, give ACP countries better access to EU markets, and liberalise the economies of the ACP countries. A number of non-governmental organisations have expressed concern over whether the new agreements will truly help foster development for the ACP or simply open up markets for European firms. For further information, visit <http://europa.eu.int/comm/trade/bilateral/acp/pr020617.htm>.

"EU And Poor Nations Plan Trade Talks" EAST AFRICAN STANDARD (Nairobi) 19 June 2002.

LATIN AMERICA'S BIGGEST ECONOMIES SIGN TRADE PACT

On 12 June, Brazil and Mexico -- Latin America's two largest economies -- concluded a bilateral trade pact that the signatories hope will ultimately cover sectors representing

USD 30 billion in trade for the two countries. Industrial and agricultural sectors feature prominently in the agreement, with the gradual elimination of auto trade tariffs forming the core (other Mercosur members must still approve the auto-industry element). As noted by top Mexican negotiator Fernando de Mateo Venturini, "[w]hat we have established with Brazil is the foundation for a broad agreement between Mexico and Mercosur" (the southern cone trading bloc which in addition to Brazil, includes Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay). However, de Mateo Venturini would not comment on the current difficulties faced by Mercosur (including the Argentinean crisis, sharp recessions in Paraguay and Uruguay, and a general decline in trade between Mercosur partners).

"Brazil, Mexico Finalize Trade Deal on 790 Products," AP, 12 June 2002.

INCREASE IN PRIVATE CONSUMPTION TO REDUCE LDC POVERTY: UNCTAD

The number of people living on less than one dollar a day will reach 420 million by 2015, warns the UN Convention on Trade and Development's (UNCTAD) Least Developed Countries (LDCs) Report 2002. The report, released on 18 June, presents a new set of poverty estimates showing that extreme poverty, defined using the USD 1-a-day international poverty line, has doubled in LDCs over the past 30 years to 307 million. The report says that poverty in these countries could be dramatically cut down by doubling average household incomes. Noting the persistence and pervasiveness of extreme poverty in most LDCs, the report singles out commodity-export dependent LDCs as having the highest incidence of poverty, which it says is made worse by unsustainable external debt.

UNCTAD recommends a re-enhanced HIPC Initiative (Highly-Indebted Poor Countries), with accelerated debt relief and a new international commodity policy. The need for market access for developing countries into industrialised economies, and the potential for South-South co-operation through regional trade and investment and technical assistance are also highlighted. The report stresses the importance of LDCs familiarising themselves with their WTO rights and that technical assistance can enable them to do so. While the report states that WTO rights and obligations do not constrain many of the financial, fiscal and macroeconomic policies that enable faster capital accumulation, it points out that "WTO rules as they evolve must enable the adoption of those policies necessary to enable poor countries to break out of the poverty trap." The Report states the need to avoid "artificial and arbitrary time frames such as those regarding subsidies for the use of domestic goods."

"The Least Developed Countries Report 2002: Escaping The Poverty Trap," UNITED NATIONS, New York and Geneva, 2002, is available online at <http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/ldc02p2ch5.en.pdf>.

"Extreme Poverty In LDCs Will Worsen If Current Trends Persist, But Can Be Slashed By Doubling Average Household Incomes, Says New UNCTAD Report," UNCTAD

PRESS RELEASE, 18 June 2002; "African Poor Countries in poverty Trap," SOUTH AFRICAN PRESS ASSOCIATION, 19 June 2002.

AFRICAN STATES SEEK CITES WAIVER FOR IVORY TRADE

Four African states have requested the Convention for International Trade In Endangered Species (CITES) to lift a total ban on ivory trade. South Africa, Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe want to sell off their existing ivory stocks totalling some 70 tonnes, and be given annual quotas for selling elephant tusks. Zambia wants to sell its 17-tonne stock but has not asked for any future quota. Officials are sceptical of these countries obtaining the two-thirds majority required to change CITES rules, particularly as Kenya and India have been seeking to tighten rules to protect the African Elephant. Every year, Zimbabwe kills some of its elephants to prevent starvation among its elephant population. CITES reviews the different categories of protection, the so-called appendices, every two and a half years, with the next meeting scheduled for 3-15 November in Santiago, Chile. CITES last waived its ban on ivory sales in 1997 when it permitted Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe to cut stockpiles in one-time sales. CITES Secretary-General Willem Wijnstekers remarked in an interview that allowing yearly ivory quotas would enable the sale of collected ivory and did not imply that additional elephants would be killed. The controversy is fuelled by fears that poachers would again hunt down elephant populations in 31 African states. The World Conservation Union (IUCN) classifies the African and Indian elephants as "facing a very high risk of extinction in the wild in the near future."

"African States Seek Lifting Ban On Ivory Trade," ENS, 15 June 2002; "Proposed Ivory Sale May Harm Elephants," EARTH SCIENCES REPORTER, 18 June 2002.

WTO In Brief

INCOMING WTO D-G SUPACHAI WANTS CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MULTINATIONALS

Incoming WTO Director-General Supachai Panitchpakdi rattled many governments and international companies when he called on 8 June for a 'new code of conduct' for multinationals to clamp down their lobbying attempts aimed at influencing the multilateral trading system. The keynote speaker at the World Development Movement's annual conference in Central London, Supachai added that he was not getting support for his proposed code from "...countries around the world, particularly some advanced countries." He pointed out that while "...we are trying to put up new regimes, new agreements, new rules for countries to abide by, we don't seem to have any rules for the multinationals and transnational corporations to go by." A number of civil society groups have welcomed Supachai's proposal, though he has indicated it is still at an early stage. Kevin Watkins, senior policy adviser at Oxfam, commented, "any change from the

regime of [current WTO chief] Mike Moore, who ran the WTO as if it was a lobby group for big business, is welcomed." Barry Coates, Director of the World Development Movement, also welcomed the proposal as "...a step in the right direction," warning however that "...any code of conduct needs to be binding and fully enforceable, not voluntary." "We also need parallel measures in national capitals where much of the corporate influence over trade policy takes place," he added.

"WTO Chief Targets Multinationals," THE OBSERVER, 16 June 2002. "New WTO Chief Plans Rules To Limit Corporate Influence On Trade Negotiations," FRIENDS OF THE EARTH PRESS RELEASE, 11 June 2002.

COMPLAINTS OVER US STEEL TARIFFS INTEGRATED INTO SINGLE WTO PANEL

At a special session of the WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) on 14 June, Members decided to integrate three panels into one to determine the WTO compatibility of recent US emergency tariffs on steel imports. The DSB approved separate requests by Japan and South Korea for the establishment of a panel to seek third-party experts' judgment on whether the US steps violate WTO rules. The move follows the establishment of a similar panel on 3 June following a request from the EC. Norway and Switzerland also called for the establishment of panels over the US tariffs, but objection by the US forced their establishment to be postponed to the DSB regular session scheduled for 24 June, which will also see a second request from China. The Korean and Japanese requests were also initially rejected by the US at the 3 June meeting. The DSB decided at the 14 June meeting that the panel established on 3 June to examine the EC complaint would also do the same for complaints by Japan and Korea. Brazil also looks set to request the establishment of a panel following a failed meeting between Brazilian and US trade representatives on 13 June. Eight steel exporters have so far filed complaints at the WTO over the steel "safeguard" tariffs of up to 30 percent imposed by the US on 20 March (see BRIDGES Weekly, 16 April 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-04-16/story5.htm#3>).

"WTO Sets Up Dispute-Settlement Panels Over U.S. Steel Tariffs," JAPAN ECONOMIC NEWSWIRE VIA DOW JONES, 14 June 2002; "Brazil To Request WTO Panel Against US Steel Safeguards," DOW JONES, 14 June 2002.

WTO PANEL RULES AGAINST RETROACTIVE DUTY REFUNDS IN SOFTWOOD LUMBER CASE

In a report issued on 12 June, a WTO panel rejected a request by Canada that would have required the US to retroactively refund duties deemed illegal by the trade body, according to the US Trade Representative (USTR). The ruling emanates from a panel established on 21 August 2001 following a request by Canada. The measure at issue is Section 129(c) (1) of the US Uruguay Round Agreement Act (19 USC §3538(c)(1)). In situations in which the DSB has ruled that an antidumping or countervailing duty determination is inconsistent with the obligations of the US under the WTO Antidumping or Subsidies and

Countervailing Measures Agreements, section 129(c)(1) of the URAA requires that implementation of new DSB determination shall apply only to entries of imports that are entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the date on which the USTR directs the Department of Commerce to implement the new determination. Canada claimed that the measure was inconsistent with various provisions of the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding, the GATT 1994, the WTO Subsidies Agreement, the WTO Antidumping Agreement, and the Marrakesh Agreement. The USTR press release states that in rejecting the Canadian claim, the Panel agreed with the US that Canada had misinterpreted Section 129 (c) (1) and found that the measure did not breach any of the provisions that Canada cited.

This ruling could affect a number of cases involving imposition of anti- dumping and countervailing duties, including the current US-Canada dispute over softwood lumber trade. The WTO ruling implies that even if Canada ultimately is successful in having US duties on softwood lumber removed, Canadian firms still might not be reimbursed any of the millions of dollars in duties paid prior to final WTO decisions. According to the USTR press release, the case was part of Canada's broader strategy of contesting US antidumping and countervailing duty orders on softwood lumber. (see also BRIDGES Weekly, 5 March 2002 at <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-03-05/inbrief.htm#3>)

"WTO Denies Canada Lumber Duty Refund Request-USTR," REUTERS, 12 June 2002;
"WTO Panel Rejects Canadian Challenge To US Law," USTR PRESS RELEASE, 12 June 2002.

On The Move

STUART HARBINSON APPOINTED WTO CHIEF OF STAFF

Mr. Stuart Harbinson (Permanent Representative of Hong Kong) and current Chair of the WTO special sessions of negotiations on agriculture, has been appointed as Director of the office of the WTO Director-General by incoming WTO Director-General, Supachai Panitchpakdi. This move will make Harbinson the Chef de Cabinet, or Chief of Staff, and Supachai's chief advisor when he takes over the position from Mike Moore on 1 September 2002. Harbinson's appointment has been widely welcomed in trade circles. "It's an inspired choice," remarked one trade official, adding that he was "respected and liked by everyone." This had also helped him in his appointment as chair of the sensitive and difficult agricultural negotiations. Harbinson was acknowledged as playing a crucial role in ensuring the successful launch last November of the Doha round of global trade talks, when he was Chair of the WTO's ruling General Council. His new position as a WTO staff member may however mean that he may have to step down as chair of the special sessions on agriculture unless Members agree otherwise. As time constraints and opposition by developing countries to a WTO staff member chairing negotiations makes such an agreement unlikely, the negotiations could be slowed down unless a replacement

is found in a short period of time. Circulation of the names of likely candidates has not yet begun.

"International Economy: Relief As WTO Chief Picks 'Safe' Adviser," FINANCIAL TIMES, 13 June 2002; "Stuart Harbinson Leaving Agriculture Negotiations To Become New WTO DG Right Hand," GENEVA WATCH, 13 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: 18-25 June

17-21 June, Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe: 9TH BIENNIAL CONFERENCE OF THE IASCP - THE COMMONS IN AN AGE OF GLOBALISATION. 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; 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-6). Organised by UNEP Chemicals. For further information contact: Jim Willis, UNEP Chemicals; tel: (41) (0)22 979- 9111; fax: 797-3460; email: jwillis@unep.ch; Internet: <http://www.chem.unep.ch/pops>.

18 June, Ottawa, Ontario: THE COUNCIL OF THE COMMISSION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION OF NORTH AMERICA. The Montreal-based CEC was created by a NAFTA side agreement to promote cooperation among Canada, Mexico and the United States in the protection of the North American environment. The Council, its governing body, is composed of the environment ministers of the three countries and meets every year to review and direct the program activities of the CEC and, in the process, receive public input and advice from its public advisory committee and various stakeholders. For further information contact: Julie-Anne Bellefleur, tel: (1-613) 241-1414 Email: jabellef@ccemtl.org; Internet: <http://www.cec.org/calendar/details/index.cfm?varlan=english&ID=1694>.

19-20 June, Maastricht, Netherlands: SEMINAR: 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, trademark, 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 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.

20-21 June, Brussels, Belgium: JOINT SESSION OF THE ACP MINISTERS OF TRADE AND ACP MINISTERS OF FINANCE. The African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) group of countries' mandate for trade negotiations with the EU, due to begin in September, should be finalised during a meeting of ACP Finance Ministers. The final mandate will be approved at the ACP summit in Fiji, 18-19 July. The ACP mandate will also suggest a timetable for tariff reductions and a timetable for the negotiations themselves, which are scheduled to end by 2007. For further information contact: Internet: <http://www.acpsec.org>.

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 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.

21-25 June, Alberta, Canada: G6B THE PEOPLE'S SUMMIT. Organised by the International Society for Peace and Human Rights at the occasion of the Summit of the eight most industrialised democracies (G8) on 26-27 June. The meeting aims to offer a forum to generate and discuss ideas and solutions that will promote economic activities that are beneficial to people living in all parts of our world, but that also reflect full respect for human rights and the environment. For further information contact: Lynn Foster, tel: (1 403) 202 0638; email: fosterlf@shaw.ca; Internet: <http://www.peaceandhumanrights.org/#g6b>.

22-26 June, Kanaskis, Canada: G-8 SUMMIT. The summit will focus on strengthening global economic growth, building a new partnership for Africa's development (NEPAD) and fighting terrorism. In addition, leaders will review progress since their last meeting in areas related to global poverty reduction and Millennium Development Goals. For further information contact: John Klassen, Summit Management Team; tel: (1-613) 957-5555; fax: (1-613) 941-6900; email: pm@pm.gc.ca; Internet: <http://www.g8.gc.ca/>.

23-26 June, Göteborg, Sweden: TENTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE GREENING OF INDUSTRY NETWORK. The theme of this year's conference is "Corporate Social Responsibility-Governance for Sustainability." The conference will

provide a unique forum for dialogue and learning, presenting the latest in research and practice in the field, in a context of diverging and converging debate. For further information visit: <http://www.gin2002.miljo.chalmers.se/>.

24-25 June, Budapest, Hungary: COUNTRIES WITH ECONOMIES IN TRANSITION (CEIT) - UNEP FI Regional Outreach Event. This two-day roundtable conference will be the fourth in a series of UNEP Finance Initiative's 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 contact: Ms. Niamh O'Sullivan; email: niamh.o.sullivan@unep.ch; Internet: <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 biotechnology. Organised by the Amsterdam-Maastricht Summer University. For further information and application contact: Mr. Ruggero Lala, Course Co-ordinator; email: ruggero.lala@amsu.edu; Internet: <http://www.amsu.edu/courses/law/law42002.htm>.

24-27 June, Monterey, California, US: SECOND WORLD CONGRESS OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMISTS. The four-day program will consist of plenary sessions with key-note speakers, parallel sessions with contributed papers, and some sessions with invited papers and panels on special topics and environmental and resource economics. The keynote speakers are: Kenneth Aroow, Parth Dasgupta, Daniel McFadden, and Martin Weitzman. For further information visit: <http://weber.ucsd.edu/~carsonvs/>.

WTO Events

An updated list of forthcoming WTO meetings is posted at: 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.

19- 21 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO TRADE POLICY REVIEW OF INDIA.

20- 21 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COMMITTEE ON TECHNICAL BARRIERS TO TRADE. On the agenda: programme of March 2002-March 2003 under Paragraphs 13 and 14 of the Doha Ministerial Declaration. Summary report by the Chairperson on the main features of the discussions concerning technical elaboration of detailed possible modalities, including rules-related elements in the area of export competition (including export restraints).

20-21 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO SPECIAL SESSION ON AGRICULTURE NEGOTIATIONS. On the agenda: follow-up of the Second Triennial Review of the Operation and Implementation of the TBT Agreement Under Article 15.4 (G/TBT/9 And G/TBT/W/162, 165, 167, 170 And 174/Rev.1); Technical Assistance (G/TBT/W/156, 160, 163, 164, 166 And 172, Job(O2)/1, Job(01) 128 and 128/Add.1-2); Outstanding Implementation Issues in accordance with Paragraph 12 of the Ministerial Declaration (WT/MIN(01)/17, WT/MIN (01)/Dec/1 and Job(01)/152/Rev.1).

20 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO WORKING PARTY ON THE ACCESSION OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

24 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BODY. On the agenda: Surveillance of implementation of recommendations adopted by the DSB: United States - Anti-Dumping Act of 1916: Status report by the US (WT/DS136/14/Add.5 - WT/DS162/17/Add.5); Rules of Origin for Textiles and Apparel Products- Request for the establishment of a panel by India (WT/DS243/5/Rev.1); Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Certain Steel Products.

Other Forthcoming Events

26 June, 18:00-20:00 (CET), online: COMMISSIONER LAMY INTERNET CHAT "EU-US TRADE RELATIONS - FRIENDS OR FOES?" Hosted by European Commission, Trade DG, Information Unit. Questions may be sent in all 11 European languages in advance to: chat- lamy@cec.eu.int. For further information contact: email: eis@cec.eu.int; Internet: http://europa.eu.int/comm/chat/index_en.htm or http://europa.eu.int/comm/chat/lamy8/index_en.htm.

29 June, Geneva, Switzerland: NO TO GATS - YES TO PUBLIC SERVICES: COMMON PLATFORM - DEMONSTRATION IN GENEVA. Supported by ATTAC France. For further information contact: Secretariat of ATTAC Switzerland, email: suisse@attac.org.

8-10 July, Bratislava, Slovakia: WORKSHOP ON IMPROVED INVESTMENT ANALYSIS TOOLS: LINKS TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. For further information contact: Internet: <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/finance.htm>.

9-10 July, Brussels, Belgium: CHANGING THE BALANCE OF TRADE: A HIGH-LEVEL SEMINAR ON SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENTS OF EU TRADE POLICIES. WWF, Caroline Lucas MEP and the Heinrich Böll Foundation are hosting this seminar to examine the role of Sustainability Assessments (SAs) in EU trade Policy. This seminar will bring together delegates from member states, the European Commission, SIA practitioners and representatives from NGOs EU trade partners, and other stakeholder groups to address key questions on the role of sustainability assessments (SA) in delivering more sustainable EU trade policies. For further information visit: <http://www.panda.org/balancedtrade>.

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: (502) 379- 9830; fax: 475- 4407; email: cici2002@inab.gob.gt; Internet: <http://www.inab.gob.gt>.

3-5 October, Germany: BUKO SEMINAR ON PATENTS, PROFITS AND AIDS The aim of the conference is to search for strategies and solutions which would help to secure the continuous access to patented essential drugs. For further information contact: Doris Segatz Evangelische Akademie Bad Boll, tel: (49-71) 647 9384; fax: 647 9125; email: doris.segatz@ev-akademie-boll.de.

8-9 November, Quito, Ecuador: CURSO AVANZADO SOBRE DESARROLLO Y MEDIO AMBIENTE EN IBEROAM (Ibero-American Congress of Development and the Environment: Local Challenges in the Face of Globalization). For further information contact: Jesus Ramos, email: jesusramosmartin@yahoo.es; Internet: <http://www.flacso.org.ec/cidma.html>.

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).

OWNERSHIP AND PARTNERSHIP IN AFRICA'S DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY. By The North-South Institute, 12 June 2002. The briefing paper based on an international conference recently organised by the NSI in Nairobi, Kenya calls for dialogue with civil society and monitoring of donor countries. The North-South Institute is calling on G-8 leaders, who will meet in Kananaskis, Canada, the last week of June, to implement five key recommendations in an effort to make development co-operation with Africa, as well as the New Partnerships for Africa's Development (NEPAD), a more inclusive and effective process. For further information contact: Lois L. Ross, Coordinator of Communications and Publications, NSI, email: lross@nsi-ins.ca; Internet: http://www.nsi-ins.ca/ensi/news_views/index.html, the document is available for download at: http://www.nsi-ins.ca/download/NSI_G8_briefing.pdf.

WORLD SUMMIT POLICY BRIEF #6: FROM RIO TO JOHANNESBURG: ECOLOGICAL FARMING - REDUCING HUNGER AND MEETING ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS. By Brian Halweil, Worldwatch Institute, 11 June 2002. This brief looks at the current situation with regards to agriculture which has remained high on the international agenda since the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, as it brings together critical issues such as water, poverty, hunger, and health. For further information contact:

Worldwatch Institute, 1776 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20036; tel: (1-202) 452-1999; fax: 296-7365; email: worldsummit@worldwatch.org; Internet: <http://www.worldwatch.org>.

ACHIEVING AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH AGRICULTURAL TRADE. Produced by The International Policy Council on Agriculture, Food and Trade. For further information visit: <http://www.ipcaft.org/DW%20Book/DW%20Cover.htm>.

CONSULTATION PAPER ON WTO SUBSIDIES AND TRADE REMEDIES NEGOTIATIONS. By Trade Policy Consultations and Liaison Division (EBC), Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada. This paper's objective is to elicit the views of Canadians in the identification of issues and proposals that will form the Canadian negotiating position for the WTO trade remedies negotiations. For further information contact: Trade Negotiations Consultations; fax: (1-613) 944-7981; email: consultations@dfait-maeci.gc.ca; Internet: <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/tna-nac/consult-e.asp>.

INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE TRADE AND ORGANISED CRIME. By Dee Cook, Jason Lowther and Martin Roberts. Regional Research Institute, University of Wolverhampton, June 2002. Produced as part of WWF and TRAFFIC Wildlife Trade Campaign, "International Wildlife Trade and Organised Crime" shows that 50 per cent of prosecuted wildlife criminals have previous convictions for drugs, violence, theft and firearms offences. For further information visit: http://www.wwf.org.uk/News/n_0000000589.asp; the document is available for download at: <http://www.wwf.org.uk/filelibrary/pdf/organisedCrime.pdf>.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES OF THE EVOLVING NORTH AMERICAN ELECTRICITY MARKET- Secretariat Report to Council Under Article 13 of the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation (CEC), 17 June 2002. For further information and to download the document visit: http://www.cec.org/pubs_docs/documents/index.cfm?varlan=english&ID=842.

STUMBLING TOWARD SUSTAINABILITY. By J.C.Dernbach ed., 2002. Published by the Environmental Law Institute, Washington, D.C. This book delivers a review of US efforts to achieve sustainable development since Rio. Several experts from diverse academic fields contributed to the book and made assessments of US law and policy concerning the environment. For further information contact: tel: (1-800) 433-5120 or (1-202) 939- 3844; email: orders@eli.org; Internet: <http://www.eli.org>.

WTO Documents

Unless otherwise indicated, all WTO documents listed are available at: http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_search.asp.

COMMUNICATION FROM CUBA, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, KENYA, NIGERIA, PAKISTAN, SENEGAL AND ZAMBIA -- WTO Council for Trade in Services Special Session, Assessment of Trade in Services, 10 June 2002, TN/S/W/3 (02- 3211).

REVIEW OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 27.3(b), RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TRIPS AGREEMENT AND THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND PROTECTION OF TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND FOLKLORE. WTO Council for Trade- Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Committee on Trade and Environment. Note from the WTO Secretariat, 10 June 2002. (IP/C/W/347/Add.1 WT/CTE/W/210 (02-3206)) The document compiles updated information from the secretariats of the CBD, on its activities in relation to the agenda items on review of the provisions of Article 27.3 (b), relationship between the TRIPs Agreement and the Convention on Biological Diversity and protection of traditional knowledge and folklore.

AVAILABLE INFORMATION ON THE EXISTENCE OF PATENTS IN REGARD TO DISEASES REFERRED TO IN THE DECLARATION ON THE TRIPS AGREEMENT AND PUBLIC HEALTH. WTO Council for Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights. Note from the WTO Secretariat, 11 June 2002, IP/C/W/348 (02- 3214). In this note, the Secretariat provides available background information on the extent to which patents exist in regard to the diseases referred to in the Declaration on the TRIPs Agreement and Public Health, which are HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. Available at: http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_search.asp.

DEVELOPMENT PROVISIONS. WTO Working Group on the Relationship between Trade and Investment. Note from the WTO Secretariat, 11 June 2002, WT/WGTI/W/119. In this note from the Secretariat, "Development Provisions" which is one of the seven topics that are listed in Paragraph 22 of the Doha Ministerial Declaration, are being clarified by the Working Group.

Electronic Resources

ELDIS DEVELOPMENT REPORTER. <http://www.eldis.org>. The newly redesigned Eldis website now includes resource guides and email-newsletter archives. For further information contact: email: www4mail@lin.ids.ac.uk or eldisnews@lyris.ids.ac.uk.

WORLD TRADE AGENDA ARCHIVE. Former trade newsletter publisher World Trade Agenda has announced it will be continuing as a trade policy consultancy based in Geneva, and has made all its archives open and freely accessible online. WTA was published fortnightly by this company from 1999 to the end of 2001. Over that period it covered, in depth, all the issues currently being negotiated in the Doha round and many other topical WTO-related matters. For further information and to access the archive visit <http://www.tradeagenda.com>.

Position Vacancy

POLICY ADVISER, TRADE AND INVESTMENT OXFAM GB POLICY DEPARTMENT. Based at: Oxford, UK. Salary: £25,700 - £33,080 p.a. Key responsibilities: Analysis and policy development on international trade and investment issues and their effects on sustainable development, developing advocacy strategies,

lobbying decision makers, principally UK government, EC, WTO, World Bank and IMF. Closing date: Friday 12 July 2002. Interviews: Monday 22 July 2002. For further details and an application form, please send a large stamped addressed envelope to Anni Long, Oxfam GB, Policy Department, 274 Banbury Road, Oxford, OX2 7DZ; email along@oxfam.org.uk, quoting the job title and where you saw the advert.

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 of **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**©: Heike Baumueller, David Primack and Mahesh Sugathan. Technical support: Philippe Maret, David Primack and Matteo Rizzolli. Editor: 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 1563-003