



INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR
TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT

BRIDGES

Weekly Trade News Digest

10 July 2002

Volume 6, Number 26

LEAD STORIES 1

- Rules Negotiations: Japan Questions Uniqueness Of
Fisheries Subsidies 1
Ctd Special Session - Finding Deliverables For 31 July 3

OTHER NEWS LAST WEEK 4

- WTO General Council Shows Little Movement On
Ministerial, D-G Processes 4
'Positive-List' Approach Popular At Wto Investment
Talks 5
Eu, Others Request Trading Partners To Open Up
Services Markets 6
Africa Establishes Union, Solidifies Nepal 7

IN BRIEF 8

- Brazil Says Ready To Share AIDS Drugs & Technology 8
EU-ACP Meeting Exposes Differences 8

WTO IN BRIEF 9

- Members Propose Ways To Combat Cartels At
Competition Meeting 9
New Zealand Becomes Number Seven In US-Steel
Dispute 9

EVENTS 9

RESOURCES 12

BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest is [also available online](http://www.ictsd.org/subscribe) and is updated every week. To subscribe to BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest, please visit the ICTSD website at <http://www.ictsd.org/subscribe>

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

LEAD STORIES

Rules Negotiations: Japan Questions Uniqueness Of Fisheries Subsidies

At an 8 July meeting of the WTO Negotiating Group on Rules, Members continued discussions on the clarification and improvement of WTO disciplines on fisheries subsidies, with three new papers submitted by China, Japan and New Zealand. The debate largely focused on Japan's communication, in which the country rejected the reasoning of the so-called 'Friends of Fish' group that had previously called for special disciplines on fisheries subsidies. "Those who insist on special and separate treatment of fisheries subsidies have a burden of proof to fulfil," Japan stated in its position paper. Members further discussed antidumping issues and will resume on 9-10 July to continue negotiations on regional trade agreements.

Japan disputes negative effects of fisheries subsidies

In its paper (TN/RL/W/11, searchable at <http://docsonline.wto.org>), which was broadly supported by Korea, Japan stressed that trade distortions caused by subsidies were not limited to the fisheries sector, and that it could not agree to the claim of the 'Friends of Fish' - Australia, Chile, Ecuador, Iceland, New Zealand, Peru, Philippines and the US - that special disciplines for fisheries subsidies were required (see BRIDGES Weekly, 7 May 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-05-07/story1.htm>). Based on figures from studies undertaken by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, Japan also disputed claims by the Friends of Fish group that global expenditures of USD 14-20.5 billion in fisheries subsidies had led to adverse impacts on resources or distorted trade (according to a report commissioned by the World Bank).

Stating that overexploitation of fish stocks was "largely due to lack of proper fisheries management," Japan furthermore said that management of fish stocks should be left to the coastal states, the regional fisheries bodies and the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). As a last point, Japan took the

view that Members should await the results of work done by relevant international organisations such as the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the OECD in order to "appropriately deal with the complex nature of the fisheries subsidies issue."

In its response, Iceland indicated that Members would most likely not sit together at the Rules Group to discuss fisheries subsidies if Japan's assertions were correct. The US said that the APEC study cited by Japan would point to USD 8.3 billion of trade-distortive subsidies instead of USD 370 million. Other trade sources further commented that only 35 percent of OECD fisheries subsidies were not likely to affect fisheries resources or trade negatively, rather than 70 percent as cited by Japan. For its part, the EC shared Japan's concern about adopting a sectoral approach in the subsidies negotiations, and fully agreed - together with Canada - that the WTO should draw from the work of other international agencies. Additionally, both Canada and the EC stressed the importance of sound fisheries management. The US and Argentina countered, however, that this consideration was no excuse for delaying the ongoing discussions on fisheries subsidies at the WTO.

China emphasises S&D

Pointing to the Doha mandate, WTO newcomer China stressed in its proposal (TN/RL/W/9) the need to accord special and differential treatment (S&D) in fisheries to developing countries. It also suggested limiting the scope of subsidies to be negotiated as well as to define certain fisheries subsidies as "non-actionable", or not challengeable under WTO dispute settlement. Several developing countries, including Indonesia, Brazil and the Philippines, supported China's proposal on S&D, whereas Japan and Korea said that S&D was a generic issue to be discussed under the general subsidies heading. Indonesia added that fisheries were often the only source of income in many rural areas, and that it would not agree to limit governments' role in rural development and the preservation of marine resources.

Fisheries exporter New Zealand submitted a paper (TN/RL/W/12) arguing that the "heterogeneous nature of fisheries products" would impede the application of existing subsidies rules. As such, the paper noted, there was "need for specific measures to improve WTO disciplines on fisheries." Canada, which has so far opposed a sectoral approach (BRIDGES Weekly, 23 April 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-04-23/wtoinbrief.htm#3>), announced that it also intended to prepare a submission on fisheries subsidies. Canada, a major exporter of natural resources such as timber, is anxious to prevent "spill-over effects" from technical debates on fisheries subsidies to other sectors, but is generally open to the environmental aspects of the discussions, trade sources said.

Antidumping

A group of 13 Members - dubbed 'Friends of Anti-Dumping' - singled out 11 provisions of the WTO Antidumping Agreement for negotiations in addition to the 12 they had already proposed at the last Rules meeting of 6-8 May (BRIDGES Weekly, 7 May 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-05-07/story1.htm>). In their statements, the sponsors of the paper (TN/RL/W/10) justified their proposal by pointing to the increasing use of antidumping measures. The US, however, said this development could also be the mere reflection of the increase in world trade since the completion of the Uruguay Round. The sponsors included Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Hong Kong, China, Israel, Japan, Korea, Norway, Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu, Singapore, Switzerland and Thailand.

The EC tabled a paper (TN/RL/W/13) in which it called for strengthened disciplines, such as using a public interest test and a new swift dispute-settlement mechanism to deal with initiating antidumping investigations. Japan, Chile and Brazil welcomed the paper.

Background

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

BRIDGES Weekly will report further on the Rules talks in its next edition.

Additional Resources

"Study Into the Nature and Extent of Subsidies in the Fisheries Sector of APEC Members Economies," APEC, 2000; <http://www.apecsec.org.sg/workgroup/fish.html>

"Fisheries Subsidies and Overfishing: Towards a Structured Discussion", Gareth Porter, UNEP, 2001; http://www.unep.ch/etp/acts/capbld/rdtwo/FE_vol_1.pdf.

"Subsidies in World Fisheries: A Re-examination", World Bank Technical Paper 406, 1998; searchable at <http://www-wds.worldbank.org/default.jsp>.

ICTSD reporting.

CTD Special Session - Finding Deliverables For 31 July

The special session of the Committee on Trade and Development met on numerous occasions over the last week and a half as it headed into the final stretch leading up to its 31 July deadline of reporting to the General Council - "with clear recommendations for action" - on the review of special and differential treatment (S&D). Informal and formal sessions were held on 27 June and 2-5 July. Discussions distilled down to four main focus areas: agreement-specific proposals and issues; institutional issues; cross-cutting issues; and the way forward. Another informal for the latter item was scheduled for 10 July. While many delegates have noted minimal expectations for the 31 July report, a few elements have emerged as potential deliverables.

Planning the road ahead

The 27 June informal meeting was intended to plan the road ahead, feeding into the regularly scheduled 2 July session and an expected draft report from Chair Ransford Smith (Jamaica) by 10 July. Divisions quickly emerged, however, over what areas should be dealt with and what timeframe should be envisioned. As such, Amb. Smith recommended four additional consultations. Sources in attendance noted that some industrialised countries were amenable to this, provided all issues were on the agenda. India made it known that it only wanted the proposals and institutional issues to be discussed (excluding principles & objectives and systemic issues). Furthermore, India noted that at present, they were not interested in looking beyond the July deadline. The meeting ended with little consensus other than the need for further consultations.

Back to the substantive

The 2 July formal session saw Members return to substantive issues. This entailed discussions on an addendum to a proposal from the least-developed country (LDC) group (TN/CTD/W/4/Add.1, not as yet de-restricted). This addendum called for, inter alia, the elimination of all tariff peaks and tariff escalation affecting semi-processed and processed products, debt relief through cancellation, targeted incentives to LDC enterprises to facilitate technology transfer, and a temporary compensation mechanism to account for reductions of most favoured-nation (MFN) tariff rates (where the share in the total export earnings of an LDC exceed 50 per cent).

Further discussions were also aired on Paraguay's proposal (TN/CTD/W/5, searchable at <http://docsonline.wto.org>) regarding the alleged illegitimate use of most-favoured nation (MFN) exemptions in the provision of preferential trading schemes. The proposal alleges that these exemptions are incompatible with the 1979 Enabling Clause (L/4903, searchable at link above), which stipulates, inter alia, that S&D should not be applied in a way that raises barriers or creates difficulties for other developing countries (see BRIDGES Weekly, 20 June 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-06-20/story2.htm>). In response, Hungary tabled a set of questions (TN/CTD/W/10, searchable at link above) seeking to clarify how a country might maintain preferential schemes if it is unable to discriminate based on basic criteria such as per capita income. Hungary suggested that if countries are not able to discriminate as such, then the options would be offer the schemes to all (including those with higher per capita incomes) or abolish them altogether. Commenting on the paper, Paraguay said that preferences must be granted on a rules-based reasoning in order to assure predictability in the trading system. Another issue that came to the fore in comments on this item was the implication of the self-selecting nature of being a 'developing country' in the WTO.

Also at the 2 July meeting, the US announced its intention to hold its own consultations on the historical utilisation of S&D provisions. Some developing country Members reiterated their concern that this could prove to be an onerous task with marginal returns. One African delegate noted however that this exercise was useful in providing a launching point for a long-term and comprehensive analysis of current S&D provisions - which would feed directly into looking to future required provisions.

Several developed and middle-income Latin American developing country Members reiterated their position that the specialised committees were better suited to examine changes in the respective agreements. Those in disagreement retorted that the new negotiating mandate had given the CTD the responsibility to look at S&D, and that while subsidiary bodies should play a role in the process, the task should remain with the CTD.

Further consultations finding little consensus

While providing time to continue the substantive discussions from the 2 July session, the 3 July consultation on agreement-specific proposals and issues did not bear much fruit. The 4 July talks on institutional issues, however, did see some consensus on what some experts speculate may be one of the few deliverables ready for the 31 July report - that of a monitoring mechanism. Aside from a consensus among Members that having such a mechanism is a good idea,

differences persist over how it might be designed. One perspective espoused by a number of developed countries sees the subsidiary bodies as best suited to review S&D in the agreements for which they are responsible. Sources say this would likely lead to the submission of an annual report of some kind to the General Council or the CTD. The other, as outlined in the Africa Group proposal (TN/CTD/W/3/Rev.1), envisages an S&D Monitoring Body similar to that of the Trade Policy Review Body. Under the auspices of the CTD, this body would work with the specific committees on how to best strengthen and operationalise S&D in their respective agreements. This, said one developing country delegate, "would provide a suitable mechanism to translate the Doha Declaration into a true development agenda." Another item that sources close to the negotiations speculate could be a deliverable for the 31 July report is the integration into the 2003 annual Technical Assistance Plan of some of the criteria laid out in Annexes I & II of the Africa Group proposal (see above).

BRIDGES Weekly will report on the 10 July meeting in its next edition.

The next and final formal special session of the CTD prior to the 31 July deadline will be held on 17 July.

ICTSD reporting.

OTHER NEWS LAST WEEK

WTO General Council Shows Little Movement On Ministerial, D-G Processes

WTO Members convened on 8 July for a meeting of the General Council, where delegates spent considerable time discussing the preparatory process for Ministerial Conferences and selection of Directors-General, though little headway was made on these contentious procedural areas. Members however did approve a waiver to extend least-developed countries' deadline for implementation of patents for pharmaceutical products until 2016.

Debate continues over Ministerial process

Discussion around internal transparency and effective participation of Members centred on three previously-submitted proposals: Bulgaria (WT/GC/W/422, searchable at http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_search.asp); Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, China, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore and Switzerland (WT/GC/W/477; see BRIDGES Weekly, 3 July 2002,

<http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-07-03/wtoinbrief.htm>);

and the Like-Minded Group of developing countries (WT/GC/W/471) (see below). In all, 34 delegations made interventions. Members were broadly divided between those, such as the Like-Minded Group, who advocated greater transparency, inclusiveness and predictability, and developed countries (together with larger developing countries) who emphasised the importance of flexibility in the Ministerial process. These countries, such as India and Malaysia, argued that too much flexibility could lead to cutting corners in Ministerial preparations, leaving the principles of transparency and inclusiveness for all Members behind. These countries pushed hard for a more open process at the last two Ministerials in Seattle in 1999 and more recently in Doha, Qatar in November 2001. Those on the other side said that prescriptive and rigid approaches to the preparatory process are inappropriate for a consensus to emerge.

The Like-Minded Group consists of Cuba, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Malaysia, Mauritius, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe.

Brazil suggested one way around the perceived disjuncture between the Geneva preparatory process, on the one hand, and the higher political process at the Ministerials, on the other, was to hold a pre- Ministerial 'Preparatory Committee' involving trade ministers or high- level trade ministry representatives. Their suggestion was prompted by the concerns of Ministers who had arrived in Doha last year without guidance as to how the Conference would be structured. According to trade sources, the Brazilian idea met with a "fair amount" of support from other Members.

Other sources explained that due to ongoing division of opinion, it would be unlikely that the issue of internal transparency and effective participation would be solved anytime soon, though they speculated that "guidelines or preambular language" could emerge eventually on these issues. General Council Chair Sergio Marchi indicated at the 8 July meeting that he intended on convening a retreat on 11-12 October 2002 for WTO permanent representatives in order to engage in informal discussions about systemic WTO issues - such as transparency and inclusiveness - and the direction the organisation was taking.

Director-General selection process

There was also little agreement on the ongoing discussion around procedures to select Directors-General. Members debated different proposals, with developed countries and larger developing countries such as Brazil rejecting any options involving majority voting. For their part, according to sources, smaller developing countries resisted selection procedures related to share of global trade flows. One Member

suggested the establishment of an advisory committee to select candidates, who would then be chosen by consensus. For now, Members remain far from achieving a decision in this area. In 1999, the WTO was caught up in a stalemate between two camps, with the result being the selection of two Directors-General to fill in for a single three-year term each (current D-G Mike Moore's responsibilities will be adopted in September by incoming D-G Supachai Panitchpakdi).

Formal approval for LDC-TRIPs waiver

Though primarily a matter of formal procedure, the General Council did agree to approve a waiver for least-developed countries (LDCs), exempting them from observing patent protection for pharmaceutical products until 2016, as agreed at a 25-27 June meeting of the Council for Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) (see BRIDGES Weekly, 3 July 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-07-03/story1.htm>). On behalf of the LDCs, Zambia said that the waiver is not to be confused with TRIPs Art. 66, which outlines the right of LDCs to request an extension of ten years from most TRIPs obligations. The LDCs raised the issue to ensure that the granting of the waiver would not interfere with their right to continue to request extensions in 2016.

The General Council will reconvene on 31 July to address, *inter alia*, outstanding implementation issues, including concerns relating to the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing and subsidies and countervailing measures. It will also hear the report of the Chair of the Committee on Trade and Development special session, who according to the Doha mandate must report to the General Council "with clear recommendations for action" on how to strengthen special and differential treatment provisions in the WTO Agreements (see related story, this issue).

ICTSD reporting.

'Positive-List' Approach Popular At WTO Investment Talks

At the second yearly session of the WTO Working Group on Trade and Investment, held from 3-5 July, Members in accordance with the Doha negotiating mandate discussed the issues of "development provisions", "non-discrimination", and "modalities for pre-establishment treatment based on a General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS)-type positive list approach". There seemed to be broad-based support cutting across the developed-developing country divide for a GATS-type positive list approach. At the same time, some developing countries said they wanted maximum leeway regarding their right to screen foreign direct investment (FDI).

GATS-type garners support

Support for a GATS-type positive list approach was reflected in the EU (WT/WGTI/W/121, searchable at http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_search.asp) and Korean (WT/WGTI/W/123) submissions. The EU submission stated that the approach would "allow flexibility for all WTO Members" who, as in the GATS, could confine national treatment and market access only to those sectors they feel ready to make commitments in, while concurrently providing across-the-board Most-Favoured Nation (MFN) treatment. At the same time, the submission said, it would enable transparency and predictability with regard to rules affecting admission and establishment of investors in each country. This approach, the EC argued, had the merit of being flexible enough "to allow a gradual and progressive liberalisation of FDI, fully compatible with any development strategy adopted by WTO Members." The Korean submission also appreciated the scope provided by the GATS approach to balance the goal of retaining disciplines for further liberalisation and the goal of providing flexibility for individual needs. Both submissions noted that since investment in service sectors was already covered by the GATS, a similar approach could prove useful for investment in the primary and secondary sectors. Among developing countries, the GATS-type approach received support from Malaysia and Brazil. Malaysia said that a GATS-type positive list would be in favour of developing countries.

Non-discrimination: critical to demandeurs, but exemptions possible

In a second submission, the EU (WT/WGTI/W/122) called for using the WTO's non-discriminatory provisions of MFN and national treatment in dealing with foreign investment, which it said "should not stay behind the level of treatment granted to foreign investors under the GATS." While the GATT provides for both unconditional MFN and National Treatment, the GATS applies across the board unconditional MFN (with possible exemptions), and National treatment is provided only in those sectors where specific commitments are made by the members. The EU submission however envisaged general, as well as subject-and country-specific, exceptions. The Canadian submission noted that drawing an *a priori* distinction between pre and post establishment national treatment could be seen to undermine the meaning of national treatment and market access. Pre-establishment treatment refers to the laws and regulations of a host country that govern the entry of foreign investment. While wanting to retain an understanding that "pre-establishment commitments are not 'off the table' in any International Investment Agreement under the WTO, Canada also acknowledged that pre-

establishment market access would not be permitted by the host country in all cases in all sectors. This, according to the Canadian submission, was as an important illustration of "flexibility" in MFN/National Treatment type of agreements.

Support for non-discrimination principles was also evident in the Korean submission, while the Japanese (WT/WGTI/W/124) submission called for including MFN and national treatment as "core" principles in a possible investment type agreement. A second Japanese submission (WT/WGTI/W/125) proposed developing an industrial classification system to easily identify and exempt possible economic sectors from such core principles. Chinese Taipei submitted papers on development provisions (W/126), non-discrimination (W/127), scope and definition of investment (W/128) and transparency (W/129).

Development

There was little consensus on the exact nature that development provisions within a possible multilateral investment agreement might take. According to a trade source, including MFN and national treatment as core principles in an Investment Agreement would certainly limit flexibility for many developing countries to meet their development objectives. It is flexibility in terms of the right to screen FDI that developing countries such as India are demanding. India, stressing that the Group was still in a study phase, underlined the need for policy space on investment, and that any multilateral discipline should not limit this space. It added that Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) already contained the flexibility required. According to India, any discussion on the mobility of capital remained incomplete without appropriate investigation into the scope for the mobility of labour. India also proposed discussing a binding code of conduct on investors, with a further stipulation for enforcement by home countries through a set of precise domestic laws that could be activated by any host country.

In its submission on Development Provisions, Canada (WT/WGTI/W/131) stated that the "recognition of the right to regulate, flexibility with respect to key sectors or policy areas, as well as recognition that the process of liberalisation should take into account differing levels of development" as the key elements in any investment agreement. The Canadian submission also called for considering special and differential treatment in terms of phase-in periods of compliance with focused technical assistance, a view shared by Chinese Taipei (WT/WGTI/W/126). One Latin American country said it felt "very negative about the Canadian approach" and that it was not alone in feeling this way.

Malaysia called for permanent "carve-outs" (exemptions) from any obligation regarding admission of FDI, while Brazil said that development provisions

must be built-in in any agreement, adding that a GATS-type approach would be the best way to ensure adequate balance between disciplines to protect investors and policy flexibility to allow governments to pursue development objectives. Egypt stressed the need to recognise security limitations and the right to use performance requirements and investment incentives. Opposing this right, Chinese Taipei said that if such requirements were allowed it should not be made permanent under future investment frameworks.

The next meeting of the Working Group is scheduled for 16-17 September.

(Also see BRIDGES Weekly, 23 April 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-04-23/story1.htm>)

ICTSD Reporting; WTO Documents: WT/WGTI/W/121, WT/WGTI/W/122, WT/WGTI/W/123, WT/WGTI/W/124, WT/WGTI/W/125, WT/WGTI/W/126, WT/WGTI/W/130, WT/WGTI/W/131.

EU, Others Request Trading Partners To Open Up Services Markets

On 4 July, the EU submitted its initial requests to 109 fellow WTO Members for improved market access in some 12 services sectors, including professional services, telecoms, postal and courier services, construction, engineering, banking, environmental services, tourism and energy. Other WTO Members, including the US (see BRIDGES Weekly, 3 July 2002, at <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-07-03/story2.htm>), Canada, Australia, Japan, South Korea, China and India confirmed that they had also sent out their services requests. Trade delegations in Geneva further reported that they had received requests from New Zealand, Poland, Norway, Switzerland and Taiwan.

The requests mark the beginning of the market access phase of negotiations under the WTO General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). Members are required to submit their initial offers of improved access to their own markets for foreign service providers by 31 March 2003.

EU stresses Members' right to regulate

According to an EU press release (see <http://europa.eu.int/comm/trade/services/pr040702.htm>), the European trading bloc did not make any requests to accession countries nor to members of the European Economic Area (EEA), i.e. Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway. Acknowledging that "opening services to international competition poses a number of challenges" for developing countries, the EU stated in an executive summary of the initial requests (at http://europa.eu.int/comm/trade/services/gats_sum.htm) that its requests to developing countries were limited to fewer sectors, and focussed on "backbone" or

"enabling" sectors" in the case of least-developed countries (LDCs).

Responding to several charges put forward by civil society groups regarding to the EU's negotiating strategy (see BRIDGES Weekly, 3 July 2002, at above link), the EU further explained that its requests "do not seek to dismantle public services, nor to privatise state-owned companies." No requests were made on health or audiovisual services, with a request on "privately-funded higher education services" only made to the US, the EU said. On water services, the European bloc assured that its requests on environmental services would "not touch the issue of access to water resources" and would "in no way undermine the host governments' ability to regulate pricing, availability and affordability of water supply".

Above all, the EU summary stressed Members' right to regulate to achieve public policy objectives, but further demanded that governments should administer their regulations "in a reasonable, transparent and objective manner." This, said the EU, could be achieved through disciplines on domestic regulation built on Article VI of GATS or "where appropriate" through "more pro-competitive disciplines".

Other Members' requests

According to Indian Commerce Minister Murasoli Maran, India in its services requests asked several developed countries to provide for greater market access for the movement of natural persons (mode 4).

A summary of Canada's initial requests to over 40 Members in 12 services sectors can be found at <http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/SSG/sk00139e.html>. In a press release, the Canadian government said it would not make market access offers in its domestic sectors of health, public education, social services and culture.

Australia also posted a summary of its requests to 33 Members in some 17 sectors at http://www.trademinister.gov.au/releases/2002/MVT064_02.html.

"EU Tables Market Access Requests To Inject Momentum Into WTO Services Negotiations, EU PRESS RELEASE, 4 July 2002; "Services: WTO Requests For Services Liberalisation Begin; US Targets 127 Members Countries, WTO REPORTER, 5 July 2002; "EU Seeks Improved Access To Markets, FT, 5 July 2002; "Services: EU Submits Bid To WTO For More Access On Services; Denies NGO's Secrecy Charge," INTERNATIONAL TRADE DAILY, 8 July 2002; " Deregulation Of Labour In Developed Mkts Crucial To India," DOW JONES, 2 July 2002.

Africa Establishes Union, Solidifies NEPAD

>From 28 June - 10 July, African leaders gathered in Durban, South Africa, to launch the African Union (AU), replacing the 39-year old Organization of African Unity (OAU) and bringing together 53 African countries. Meanwhile, the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) received prominence at the 26-28 June Group of Eight (G-8) summit meeting in Kananaskis, Canada. Whereas the AU is an economic and political partnership loosely modelled on the European Union, NEPAD is motivated by the desire to improve the economic well-being of the African continent, through among other things, better fiscal discipline and "good governance." NEPAD is the brainchild of South Africa's Thabo Mbeki, Nigeria's Olusegun Obasanjo, Algeria's Abdelaziz Bouteflika, and Egypt's Hosni Mubarak.

NEPAD at the G-8 Summit

In response to the NEPAD initiative, presented to the G-8 during its Genoa summit in 2001, the June 2002 G-8 released the details of its Africa Plan of Action in Kananaskis. Inter alia, the Action Plan proposes to "help Africa attract investment, both from within Africa and from abroad and implement policies conducive to economic growth." In the document, the G-8 endorsed a "firm commitment to assisting Africa" in its current efforts aimed at attracting domestic and foreign investment, including taking actions to provide greater market access for African products, increasing funding, improving the quality of support for trade-related technical assistance and capacity-building and promoting regional integration and intra-African trade.

The Action Plan also seeks to help African countries work towards enhanced market access on a WTO-compatible basis, increase trade with African free trade areas or customs unions, support the efforts of African countries to eliminate tariff and non-tariff barriers within Africa in a WTO-consistent manner, and support efforts by African countries to work towards lowering trade barriers on imports from the rest of the world. The G-8 leaders also agreed to increase aid to African countries by a total of USD 12 billion per year by 2006. As outlined in NEPAD, performance of African countries will be judged by a peer-review system that will decide whether a government is meeting its commitments. Nations that don't meet this peer review process will lose some of their share of aid.

NEPAD and the African Union

The relationship between NEPAD and the African Union (AU) remains what some observers have termed "fuzzy", with NEPAD establishing its own secretariat

and operating very much as an organisation in its own right despite the AU's adoption last year of NEPAD as a program. Paragraph 198 of the NEPAD Policy Document states that "the heads of state promoting the NEPAD will advise the AU on an appropriate mechanism for its implementation", indicating that NEPAD should be implemented within the aegis of the AU. There have also been concerns about regional representation within NEPAD, with the east African region as the most vocal critic along these lines. and is modelled after the European Union. South African President Mbeki, who was instrumental in formulating and marketing the idea of NEPAD, has been nominated the first chairman of the AU.

In a presentation at the WTO's 1 July Committee on Trade and Development (CTD), NEPAD Secretariat chair Wiseman Nkuhlu updated WTO Members on the objectives of NEPAD, stating inter alia that NEPAD's market access objectives were consistent with the WTO's Doha mandate.

"Leaders Gather To Bury OAU, Launch New Union," UNWIRE, 9 July 2002; "Huge Challenge for African Union," BBC, 8 July 2002; "Statement Issued By Four African Leaders of The NEPAD Steering Committee At The End of Their Meeting With The G8 During The Summit Held In Kananaskis, Canada, 27 June 2002; "G-8 aid plan sidelines NEPAD," IPS, 27 June 2002.

IN BRIEF

Brazil Says Ready To Share AIDS Drugs & Technology

At the opening of the 14th UN AIDS Conference in Barcelona on 8 July, Brazil announced that it was moving ahead with a plan to help other developing countries build their own manufacturing capacity to produce generic AIDS drugs. Speaking at the Conference (see <http://www.unaids.org/>) - where 15,000 representatives of government, international bodies, pharmaceutical companies and civil society are meeting to discuss the worsening epidemic - Brazil said it would spend USD 1 million per year to donate generic drugs as well as pass along requisite technology and know-how to ten projects in the developing world. Paulo Teixeira, the head of Brazil's HIV programme, attributed his country's ability to take this step in part to the flexibilities reaffirmed in the WTO Doha Declaration on Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) and Public Health (see BRIDGES Weekly, 12 March 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-03-12/story2.htm>). It is currently estimated that only four

percent of the six million AIDS sufferers have access to anti-retroviral drugs - with approximately half of those recipients in Brazil. Brazil is in a position to make such an offer because of its robust generics industry, combined with the fact that 15 of these drugs were in production prior to the government's passing of a patent protection law in 1997. Some experts speculate that it is in fact this very arrangement, combined with the Doha TRIPs Declaration, that makes it possible for Brazil to move ahead with this initiative. Importing developing countries, where a patent already exists for the drug in question, will still have to wait for the conclusion of the ongoing discussions at the WTO's TRIPs Council on how to deal with compulsory licensing for those without the capacity for a domestic generics industry before being able to participate (see BRIDGES Weekly, 3 July 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-07-03/story1.htm>).

ICTSD reporting; "Brazil Set To Help Countries Copy AIDS Drugs," FT, 8 July 2002; "Brazil Offers To Share Its Generic AIDS Drugs," DOW JONES, 9 July 2002.

EU-ACP Meeting Exposes Differences

On 4 July, delegates from the EU and from former European colonies in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific failed to bridge differences over trade policies at a meeting in the Dominican Republic (see BRIDGES Weekly, 3 July 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-07-03/index.htm>). Ahead of the commencement of negotiations on Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) in September, the ACP and the EU seem to be on the brink of a major disagreement. At issue is the loss the 78 ACP countries could face as they lose preferential market access to the EU that has been in place pursuant to the EU-ACP Lomé Agreements. In accordance with Article 37 (5) of the EU-ACP Agreement, signed in Cotonou in June 2000, negotiations on EPAs will be undertaken with those countries that consider themselves ready to do so and at a level they consider appropriate. The stated purpose of EPAs, according to the negotiations mandate, is "to develop a stable, predictable and transparent framework for economic and trade relations between the ACP and the EU". Under the requisite free trade arrangements, both parties would agree to cut tariffs on imports. The tariffs in place so far have made it easier for ACP countries to export to the EU than for the EU to export to the ACP region. ACP delegates were adamant about the importance of the principle of special and differentiated treatment for the ACP, which according to the President of the Dominican Republic is "a logical and justified consequence of the different levels of development between the ACP group and the EU". According to the ACP, "development and not commerce must be the priority".

"EU-ACP Meet Fails to Bridge Divide," IPS, 4 Jul 2002; "New strategy for partnerships with African, Caribbean and Pacific countries," EU PRESS RELEASE, 9 April 2002; "European Communities - transitional regime for the EC autonomous tariff rate quotas on imports of bananas," Decision of 14 November 2001 (WT/MIN (01)/16).

The next meeting of the Working group is scheduled for 26-27 September this year.

(Also see BRIDGES 2 May 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-05-02/story4.htm>)

ICTSD Reporting.

WTO IN BRIEF

Members Propose Ways To Combat Cartels At Competition Meeting

The Working Group on the Interaction between Trade and Competition Policy, held on 1-2 July, focused on so-called 'hard-core' cartels (those that engage in price-fixing, bid-rigging and market sharing) and ways of voluntary cooperation in competition policy. While the EU in its submission (WT/WGTCP/W/193, searchable at http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_search.asp) considered a WTO Agreement on competition policy banning hard-core cartels as the best way for dealing with the problem, other Members, including the US (WT/WGTCP/W/203), Japan (WT/WGTCP/W/195), Korea (W/WGTCP/W/200), Canada (WT/WGTCP/W/201), Australia (W/WGTCP/W/199) and Thailand (W/WGTCP/W/205) tabled new submissions stressing the importance of promoting voluntary cooperation in competition policy. Calling for multilateral cooperation against cartels, Thailand in its submission stated that developing countries were the most vulnerable to potential damage from international cartels. South Africa, Brazil, Romania and Indonesia also highlighted the harmful effects of international cartels and supported further discussion on the issue. India stressed that the group, under the Doha negotiating mandate, was still in a study phase said that the UN Conference on Trade and Development's Set on Principles and Rules on Competition (SET) could offer the best guidance on dealing with restrictive business practices. Supported by Pakistan, Malaysia, Cuba and Venezuela, India noted that more than half the Members of WTO did not have competition laws, adding that SET contained important development provisions, such as developing country exemption from obligations. Pointing to the existence of other agreements, such as the International Competition network, Hong Kong China was sceptical of a multilateral agreement on competition policy being touted as the solution. Members also discussed technical cooperation and capacity building in the area of competition policy.

New Zealand Becomes Number Seven In US-Steel Dispute

At a meeting of the WTO Dispute Settlement Body on 3 June, New Zealand became the seventh WTO Member to seek a ruling with regard to the safeguard measures imposed on steel imports by the US. The 'Steel' panel (see BRIDGES Weekly, 26 June 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/02-06-26/story6.htm>) now has seven complainants (the EC, Japan, Korea, China, Switzerland, Norway and New Zealand) and 14 third parties (Brazil, Chinese Taipei, Switzerland, Norway, Japan, Korea, Thailand, Canada, China, EC, Mexico, Turkey, Venezuela and Cuba). Under Dispute Settlement rules, Members can be both complainants and reserve third party rights simultaneously. The US maintains that its action of imposing tariffs of up to 30 percent on a range of steel products in March 2002, citing bankruptcies and job losses in the steel sector, was legitimate and WTO-consistent. The EC and other countries differ. They insist that there is no evidence that there has been a rise in imports or that US domestic industry has been damaged by imports. They are also upset that Mexico and Canada - the US' partners in the North American Free Trade Agreement - have been excluded from the measures. The EC, Japan and Korea welcomed the establishment of a single panel on 3 June to hear the dispute. Panellists for the case have not yet been selected. This is likely to be contentious given the high stakes involved. Upon selection of the panellists, the Members may have to wait for up to a year for the panel report.

United States - Definitive Safeguard Measures on Imports of Certain Steel Products - Request for the Establishment of a Panel by New Zealand, WT/DS258/9; "New Zealand joins formal case against U.S. steel tariffs," ASSOCIATED PRESS, 8 July 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>.

ICTSD-Related Events

17 July, Geneva, Switzerland: TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: WORKING GROUP ON ENVIRONMENT, TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (WGETD). Organised by ICTSD for World Civil Society Forum. This working group at the World Civil Society Forum (14-19 July) will discuss the linkages and conflicts between environmental protection, poverty alleviation and trade liberalisation, as well as civil society's role in helping to make trade policy of mutual benefit to development goals. For further information contact: World Civil Society Forum, 31 Chemin William Rappard, 1293 Bellevue/Geneva, Switzerland; fax: (41- 22) 959- 8851; email: forum@mandint.org; Internet: <http://www.mandint.org/forum/>.

18 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO AND CIVIL SOCIETY: WORKING GROUP ON ENVIRONMENT, TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (WGETD). Organised by ICTSD for World Civil Society Forum. This working group will focus on tangible examples of participation that can enhance public participation in the WTO processes at a national and global level. For further information contact: World Civil Society Forum, 31 Chemin William Rappard, 1293 Bellevue/Geneva, Switzerland; fax: (41- 22) 959- 8851; email: forum@mandint.org; Internet: <http://www.mandint.org/forum/>.

Coming Up This Week: 9-16 July

9-10 July, European Parliament, Brussels Eastman Building, Rue Belliard 135, Brussels, Belgium: CHANGING THE BALANCE OF TRADE: A SEMINAR ON SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENTS OF EU TRADE POLICY. Organised by WWF, Caroline Lucas MEP, and the Heinrich Böll Foundation. The seminar will focus on how to change the current balance of EU trade policies towards sustainable development through the use of Sustainability Assessments (SA). A key aim of the seminar will be to advance thinking on how Sustainability Assessments should fit in the policy-making mechanisms in the EU. The role of the Council, the Commission and the European Parliament will be discussed, as well as the involvement of civil society stakeholders in influencing negotiations of trade agreements through SA. For further information email balancedtrade@wwfint.org, or register online at <http://www.panda.org/balancedtrade>.

10-12 July, Geneva, Switzerland: UNCTAD EXPERT MEETING ON ELECTRONIC COMMERCE STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPMENT: THE BASIC ELEMENTS OF AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT FOR E-COMMERCE. Organised by the UN Conference on Trade and Development. For further information contact: Ms. Susan Teltscher, tel: (41 22) 917 5509; fax: 917 0044; email: susan.teltscher@unctad.org;

Internet:

<http://www.unctad.org/en/special/c3em15no.htm>.

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

July 16, Washington, D.C., USA: WORKSHOP ON CAPACITY BUILDING ON ENVIRONMENT, TRADE, AND DEVELOPMENT. Organised by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The workshop will be devoted to technical discussions of capacity building programs and how they might be expanded and improved from country, regional, and donor perspectives. Please note the change in the date and the agenda. For further information contact: Maria Carlo tel: (1- 202) 939 2306; email: mcarlo@ceip.org.

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.

8-10 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO NEGOTIATING GROUP ON RULES. On the agenda: anti-dumping, subsidies and countervailing measures, including fisheries subsidies and regional trade agreements. 8 July meeting covered in this edition; BRIDGES Weekly will report further on the meeting in next week's edition.

9-11 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO TRADE POLICY REVIEW BODY- BARBADOS.

10 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COMMITTEE ON TRADE-RELATED INVESTMENT MEASURES. On the agenda: notifications under article 6.2 of the TRIMS agreement (G/TRIMS/N/2/rev.9 and add.1-3); Outstanding implementation issues - Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Tires: 37, 38, 39 and 40 including changes to the specific provisions that shall be included in the agreement to provide developing

countries the necessary flexibility to implement development policies (intended to address, among others, social, regional, economic, and technological concerns) that may help reduce the disparities they face vis-à-vis developed countries.

10 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO TRADE RELATED INVESTMENT MEASURES (TRIMS) COMMITTEE.

11-12 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO NEGOTIATING GROUP ON MARKET ACCESS - DELAYED UNTIL END OF JULY.

11-12 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO WORKING GROUP ON TRADE, DEBT AND FINANCE.

12 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO WORKING PARTY ON THE ACCESSION OF NEPAL.

15 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO WORKING PARTY ON GATS RULES.

15-16 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO SEMINAR ON ACCESSIONS (TECHNICAL COOPERATION).

15-16 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO SPECIAL SESSION OF THE DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BODY, on review of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

16 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO HIGH LEVEL BRIEFING/MEETING ON TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND CAPACITY BUILDING.

16 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO SUB-COMMITTEE ON LEAST-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES. On the agenda: Follow-up to ministerial decisions/declarations: WTO work programme for Least-Developed Countries' accession.

16 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO WORKING PARTY ON DOMESTIC REGULATION.

18-19 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO TRADE NEGOTIATIONS COMMITTEE.

19 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO NGO BRIEFING ON THE MEETING OF THE TRADE NEGOTIATIONS COMMITTEE (TNC). On 18 July, the TNC will hear reports from the chairpersons of the negotiating bodies established by the TNC, and this briefing will allow NGOs to get an update on the workings of the Committee. For further information contact: Hans-Peter Werner, External Relations Division, WTO; tel: +41 22 739-5286; email: peter.werner@wto.org.

Other Forthcoming Events

22 July, London, UK: ASIA-PACIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY AND REGULATORY REGIMES: RHETORIC AND REALITY ORGANISED BY APTN AND THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME. Organised by The Royal Institute of International Affairs. For this seminar the spotlight moves to an evaluation of the policy and regulatory concerns surrounding the activities of both industries

and agriculture in the Asian context. For further information contact: Louis Turner, Chief Executive, Asia-Pacific Technology Network, Chatham House, 10 St James's Square, London SW1Y 4LE; tel: (44-790) 5204 677; fax: (44-207) 957 5710; email: louist@aptn.org.

23 September - 1 October, Geneva, Switzerland: ASSEMBLIES OF THE MEMBER STATES OF THE WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO). For further information contact: WIPO, tel: (41 22) 338 9111; fax: 733 54 28; email: WIPO.mail@wipo.int; Internet: http://www.wipo.inthttp://www.wipo.org/news/en/index.html?wipo_content_frame=/news/en/conferences.html.

14-18 October, Rome, Italy: FAO COMMISSION ON GENETIC RESOURCES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (9th session). For further information contact Paloma Señor, CGRFA, tel: (39 06) 570 52199; fax: 57056347; email: Paloma.Senor@fao.org; Internet: <http://www.fao.org/ag/cgrfa/>.

11-15 November, Geneva, Switzerland: WIPO STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE LAW OF TRADEMARKS, INDUSTRIAL DESIGNS AND GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATIONS (SCT) (Ninth session). For further information contact: WIPO, tel: (41 22) 338 9111; fax: 733 54 28; Email: WIPO.mail@wipo.int; Internet: http://www.wipo.inthttp://www.wipo.org/news/en/index.html?wipo_content_frame=/news/en/conferences.html.

21-22 November, London, UK: CLIMATE POLICY FOR THE LONGER TERM: FROM HERE TO WHERE? Organised by The Royal Institute of International Affairs. For further information contact: Conference Unit, Chatham House, 10 St. James Square, SW1Y 4LE London, UK; fax: (44-207) 321 2045; email: contact@riia.org.

9-11 December, Lima, Peru: INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM OF BIOTECHNOLOGY ANDEAN REGION. Topics: Biotechnology and Biosecurity. Organised by La Universidad La Molina. For further information, contact: La Universidad La Molina, tel: (51 1) 349 5647; fax: 348 0747; email: instituto@ibt.lamolina.edu.pe; Internet: <http://www.ibt.lamolina.edu.pe>.

9-17 December, Geneva, Switzerland: WIPO INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND GENETIC RESOURCES, TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND FOLKLORE (Fourth session). For further information contact: WIPO, tel: (41-22) 338 9111; fax: 733 54 28; Email: WIPO.mail@wipo.int; Internet: http://www.wipo.inthttp://www.wipo.org/news/en/index.html?wipo_content_frame=/news/en/conferences.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 (email resources@ictsd.ch).

"Affordable access to essential drugs in developing countries: conflicts between ethical and economic imperatives," in JOURNAL OF MEDICINE AND PHILOSOPHY, 27(2): 179-195. By U Schuklenk and RE Ashcroft. Recent economic and political advances in developing countries on the African continent and South East Asia are threatened by the rising death and morbidity rates of HIV/AIDS. The authors try to explain the reasons for the absence of affordable access to essential AIDS medication, then take a closer look at some of the pivotal frameworks relevant for this situation and finally discuss a few of the proposed solutions to the problem.

AFRICA ENVIRONMENT OUTLOOK REPORT. By the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), June 2002. The report provides an integrated analysis of Africa's environment, including i) an overview of developments in Africa, particularly over the three decades up to 2002; ii) a description of the current state of the environment in Africa (outlining its physical attributes in terms of the atmosphere; land; biodiversity; forests; freshwater, marine and coastal areas; and the urban environment) and iii) a set of scenarios for Africa's future over the next 30 years. The report concludes in Chapter 5 with a list of 31 recommendations for specific actions by policy makers. For further information contact: Nick Nuttall, UNEP; email: nick.nuttall@unep.org; Internet: <http://www.grida.no/aeo>. or <http://www.unep.org/aeo>.

"The Composition of Foreign Direct Investment and Protection of Intellectual Property Rights: Evidence from Transition Economies" WORLD BANK WORKING PAPERS SERIES (WPS# 2786), February 2002. By Beata Smarzynska. The author addresses impact of intellectual property protection on the composition of foreign direct investment (FDI) flows empirically, using a firm-level data set from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. She finds that weak IP protection deters foreign investors in technology-intensive sectors that rely heavily on intellectual property rights. For further information contact: email: trade@worldbank.org; the working papers can be downloaded at: <http://www.worldbank.org/research/trade/archive.html>.

WTO Documents

Unless otherwise noted, all WTO documents can be downloaded at http://docsonline.wto.org/gen_search.asp.

WTO ANNUAL REPORT 2002. The Annual report of the WTO is comprised of five chapters which focus on trade policy, research results, the regular activities of the organization and details of its current structure, staff and budget. The entire report or individual chapters of the report in pdf format can be downloaded at: <http://www.wto.org/index.htm>.

JAPAN'S BASIC POSITION ON THE FISHERIES SUBSIDIES ISSUE (TN/RL/W/11). Negotiating Group on Rules, 1 July 2002. The communication from Japan presents formally its basic position on fisheries subsidies and follows from the previous position papers Japan issued between 1999 and 2001 (JOB (99)5367 and WT/CTE/W/173).

NEGOTIATIONS ON ENVIRONMENTAL GOODS (TN/MA/W/3). Communication from the US to the Negotiating Group on Market Access. 1 July 2002. The communication from the US Mission aims to identify the issues to be considered in defining the scope of environmental goods subject to the negotiation process.

TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT BULLETIN. A new edition of the Trade and Environment bulletin is now available for downloading from the WTO website at http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/envir_e/envir_e.htm#bulletins.

FACTS AND FIGURES. Updated statistics on Regional Trade Agreements notified to the WTO can now be downloaded at: http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/region_e/region_e.htm#facts.

SEMINAR ON REGIONALISM AND THE WTO. Additional papers for further reading can now be downloaded at http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/region_e/sem_april02_e/sem_april02_e.htm.

Electronic Resources

DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE CLEARINGHOUSE EXPRESS. By USAID. This is a free bi-weekly e-publication that provides a listing of the latest USAID development experience reports. Topic include sustainable agriculture, economic growth, privacy markets, human rights and capacity development. To subscribe and for further information see: <http://www.dec.org/addtolist.cfm>.

WWF LIVING PLANET REPORT 2002. The Living Planet Report is WWF's periodic update on the state of the world's ecosystems - as measured by the Living Planet Index - and the human pressures on them through the consumption of renewable natural

resources - as measured by the Ecological Footprint. The report shows that humans are currently running a huge deficit with the Earth - using over 20 percent more natural resources each year than can be regenerated - and this figure is growing each year. Projections based on likely scenarios of population growth, economic

development and technological change, show that by 2050, humans will consume between 180 percent and 220 percent of the Earth's biological capacity. To download visit <http://www.panda.org/livingplanet/lpr02/>.

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**© are Heike Baumuller, David Primack, Victor Mosoti, Mahesh Sugathan, Muge Dolun and Alex Werth. Technical support: Matteo Rizzolli. Assistant Editor: David Primack. 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 1563-003X