

## Special Edition for COP-6 and ICCP-3

*The International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD)* is proud to present a new product to the trade and sustainable development communities: *BRIDGES Trade BioRes - Trade and Biological Resources News Digest*. This new publication is produced in collaboration with *The World Conservation Union (IUCN)*, and its *Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP)*, in an effort to complement the activities of both organisations to promote coherence and mutually supportive policies in the areas of international trade and biological resources.

At a time when environment-related issues are increasingly featuring in trade negotiations, including the new round of trade talks launched at the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference last year, *BRIDGES Trade BioRes* aims to build bridges between the specialised and diverse communities (including policy-makers and those in civil society) working on issues related to biological resources, trade and sustainable development. The publication thereby aims to support policy coherence in these areas by improving understanding among the trade and conservation communities of their respective goals and objectives, and by enabling in particular the non-trade communities to better formulate the trade-related aspects of their strategies. To this end, the publication will continue in the tradition of *BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest*, providing its objective coverage, context setting, reporting and analysis on these intersecting issues. Articles cover a diverse field of activities as they relate to trade policy and development of international governance mechanisms in areas such as biodiversity, traditional knowledge, intellectual property rights, forestry, biotechnology, agriculture, fisheries, and food security.

To subscribe to this bi-weekly newsletter *BRIDGES Trade BioRes*, please send a blank email to [subscribe\\_biores@ictsd.ch](mailto:subscribe_biores@ictsd.ch). The publication is also available on the ICTSD website at <http://www.ictsd.org/biores>. For enquiries, contact Heike Baumüller, Editor, +41 22 9178 478, [hbaumuller@ictsd.ch](mailto:hbaumuller@ictsd.ch).

### CONTENT

<b>ACCESS TO GENETIC RESOURCES</b>	<b>2</b>
Traditional Knowledge And Biodiversity Under Discussion At WTO And CBD	
<b>TRADE AT WSSD</b>	<b>4</b>
WSSD Preparations Continue At PrepCom III And The CBD	
<b>AGRICULTURAL BIODIVERSITY</b>	<b>6</b>
CBD To Assess, WTO To Expand Farm Trade Liberalisation	
<b>SUSTAINABLE FOREST TRADE</b>	<b>8</b>
CBD And UNFF Consider Certification As A Tool For Sustainable Forestry	
<b>BIOTECHNOLOGY</b>	<b>10</b>
Biotech Labelling Contentious At The WTO And ICCP	
<b>EVENTS &amp; RESOURCES</b>	<b>12</b>

---

**Access to Genetic Resources**

---

**TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND BIODIVERSITY UNDER DISCUSSION AT WTO AND CBD**

Intellectual property rights and traditional knowledge as they relate to biodiversity use and conservation are among the topics for discussion at the Sixth Conference of the Parties (COP-6) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) where Parties are expected to adopt international guidelines on access to genetic resources and benefit sharing. Similar discussions are also taking place at the World Trade Organization (WTO), most recently at the Council for Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) on 5-7 March where largely repeated previously stated positions with the main decisions restricted to procedural matters.

**COP-6 expected to adopt guidelines on access to genetic resources**

The Parties to the CBD are expected to adopt the "Draft Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of their Utilization" -- adopted by the CBD Open-ended Working Group (WG) on Access and Benefit-sharing in October 2001 -- which would constitute the first-ever international guidelines on this issue. Outstanding items to be concluded in The Hague include the use of terms, the scope of guidelines with respect to products and derivatives of genetic resources, and stakeholder involvement. Parties will also discuss intellectual property rights (IPR) as they relate to access and benefit-sharing, focusing in particular on clarifying the relationship between the CBD and the TRIPs Agreement. In this context, the WG's recommendations for COP-6 as well as those of the WG on Article 8(j) reflect some of the developing countries' proposals put forward in the TRIPs Council.

In particular, the Groups called on the Conference to encourage the disclosure of the origin of genetic resources and relevant TK in IPR applications, and urged Parties to (a) consider taking into account the CBD provisions of prior informed consent and mutually agreed terms in IPR applications, and (b) take TK into account in the examination of novelty and inventive step in patent applications. COP-5 of the CBD had previously invited the WTO to acknowledge relevant provisions of the Convention, to take into account the fact that the provisions of the TRIPs Agreement and the CBD are interrelated, and to further explore this interrelationship. The COP had furthermore reiterated its request for observer status in the TRIPs Council -- which has still not been granted primarily due to objections by the US (see related story on the CTE, this issue) -- and is expected to do so again at its upcoming meeting.

Working Group 2 of COP-6 is currently scheduled to discuss access and benefit-sharing as related to genetic resources on **9 April** in the afternoon and issues related to Article 8(j) on the morning of **15 April**.

**Little movement on life patentability, TK and biodiversity at WTO**

Discussions at the WTO TRIPs Council on the patentability of life forms (as set out in Article 27.3(b) of the TRIPs Agreement which is currently under review), traditional knowledge (TK) and the relationship between the CBD and WTO rules made little headway with Members mainly reiterating their previously stated positions. In the past, Brazil, India and some other developing countries have highlighted what they see as possible conflicts between the CBD and the TRIPs Agreement, and suggested that 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 TK, and that they provide evidence of fair and equitable benefit sharing and prior informed consent. Most developed countries, in contrast, including the EC, US and Japan, have generally resisted such amendments to the TRIPs Agreement, arguing that there is no conflict between the two agreements and that they can be simultaneously applied.

The debate on these issues had stalled prior to the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference in November, leading some analysts to speculate that they could only be resolved within a new round of trade talks. While negotiations on these issues were not explicitly launched at the Conference, the Ministerial Declaration for the

first time included references to TK and folklore, linking discussions on TK and the CBD-WTO relationship to the reviews under Articles 27.3(b) and 71.1. [Article 71.1 deals with reviews of the implementation of the Agreement, including with a possible view to modifying or amending it.] According to one developing country delegate, the discussions have thus become part of the larger package of items in the work programme (to be completed by the end of 2004), thereby possibly providing the urgency required to advance the debate.

TRIPs Council meetings for 2002 are currently scheduled for 25-27 June, 17-19 September and 25-27 November.

### **Access, benefit-sharing and TK at the WTO and CBD**

While most of the world's genetic resources are found in the developing world, commercial benefits derived from their use are largely concentrated in industrialised countries. The CBD aims to strike a balance by requiring Parties to facilitate access to genetic resources while also stipulating that such access should be on mutually agreed terms and with the prior informed consent of the country of origin. Making the State the responsible entity for determining access (rather than e.g. local or indigenous communities) has been an issue of concern to some. To protect the TK associated with the genetic resources, Article 8(j) requires Parties to "respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles" relevant to achieving the objectives of the CBD, and to promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of TK holders while ensuring the equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of TK.

In the WTO, discussions on access to genetic resources and associated TK have mainly taken place in the context of the TRIPs Agreement. Article 27.3(b) is of particular relevance for the CBD. The Article allows countries to exclude plants, animals and certain biological process from patentability as long as plant varieties are protected by patents, *sui generis* systems or both. The Article is currently under review in the TRIPs Council where discussions focus on whether to extend the scope of 27.3(b) to include issues such as biodiversity, TK, benefit sharing, and the ethics of patenting of life forms; whether and how to harmonise the TRIPs Agreement with the CBD; and the extent of flexibility to create *sui generis* plant variety protection that Members are allowed. In contrast to the CBD, the TRIPs Agreement's focus is primarily on patents and other IPRs defined in conventional IPR regimes. This emphasis is seen by many as favouring inventors and corporations involved in the formal research sectors of developed countries, while failing to provide equivalent legal protection for informal innovators including holders of TK. Others, however, argue that a strong IPR regime is necessary to encourage innovation as it allows producers to recover the research and development costs.

Traditional Knowledge associated with biodiversity can be valuable for finding and using biological resources, such as genetic resources or associated biochemicals that can be the basis for pharmaceuticals, herbal medicines and other products, but also for non-market applications, such as locally used technologies and resources applied to conservation, agriculture and healthcare. Regarding the protection and use TK, and the sharing the benefits derived from their use, discussions have primarily focused on whether TK can and/or should be protected using existing IPR systems as provided in the various conventions of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and in TRIPs. In most cases TK cannot be attributed to identifiable individuals, but rather has developed through several generations. In addition, TK is often shared by groups within a community or even whole communities. For these reasons, it is often argued that conventional IPR systems are not suitable for the protection of TK. Others, however, believe that existing systems can be modified to accommodate TK. The frequent lack of a specified source of TK also raises questions with regard to benefit-sharing. For example, it is often unclear whether the benefits should be distributed to an individual, an indigenous community, or to the country of origin of TK, and in what form they should be distributed, such as direct payments (up-front payments or royalties) or contributions to a fund.

### **Additional Resources**

Background information on Article 27.3(b) is available at:  
[http://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/trips\\_e/intel2\\_e.htm#patents](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/trips_e/intel2_e.htm#patents).

The Reports of the two CBD Working Groups on Access and Benefit-sharing (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/6, including the Draft Guidelines) and on Article 8(j) (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/7) and can be found at  
<http://www.biodiv.org/meetings/cop-06.asp>.

Relevant documents on TK and IPRs are also available from WIPO's Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property, Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore at  
<http://www.wipo.int/globalissues/igc/documents/index.htm>

"Australia assails EU over WTO talks on geographical indications," WTO REPORTER, 8 March 2002; ICTSD Internal Files.

---

## Trade at WSSD

---

### WSSD PREPARATIONS CONTINUE AT PREPCOM III AND THE CBD

The UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), acting as the Preparatory Committee for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), is holding its third session (PrepCom III) in New York from 25 March to 5 April, with the aim of producing the first draft of a 'review' document as well as elements of the CSD's future work programme. Preparations for WSSD will also feature at the Sixth Conference of the Parties (COP-6) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) where delegates will discuss a draft statement to be submitted to the Summit.

### Trade also features at third WSSD prep meeting

Delegates at PrepCom III began the second week by discussing the revised Chairman's paper released on Saturday with many participants criticising the 100-page text as not sufficiently action-oriented. While trade-related discussions took place under a few agenda items, most delegates deferred to ongoing work at the WTO and to the mandate agreed upon by WTO Members at the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference in Doha, Qatar, in November 2001.

Continuing on from discussions at the second preparatory meeting in February (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 21 February 2002; <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/02-02-21/story1.htm>), delegates raised a number of trade-related aspects. In the context of talks on agricultural and rural development under 'poverty eradication', delegates were divided over whether to include references to trade-distorting subsidies. The EU and Korea said subsidy issues should be considered under 'globalisation'. Japan supported deletion of trade-distorting subsidy references, arguing that this language went beyond the WTO's Doha mandate. The G-77 / China, supported by New Zealand, suggested that language on trade-distorting subsidies and barriers to trade should follow WTO Doha text that mandates elimination of barriers to trade in developed countries.

While debating how to change unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, a number of countries requested that eco-labelling be made voluntary, but should not be used as a hidden trade barrier. The G-77 / China, together with New Zealand, objected to a proposal from Switzerland and the EU to provide consumer information throughout the production chain. The US -- in line with its position at the WTO -- proposed language on gradually reducing and eliminating environmentally-harmful and trade-distorting subsidies that inhibit sustainable production and consumption patterns. Norway suggested deleting "trade-distorting" in this context.

Concern persisted among some NGOs that WSSD would be subordinated to the trade regime (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 21 February 2002; referenced above). Friends of the Earth International (FOEI) expressed alarm that governments "seem hell-bent on making sustainable development subservient to the WTO's trade agenda," and called on the UN meeting to commit to the necessary targets and timetables to achieve meaningful change.

Rather than assuming that the new WTO negotiating agenda will ensure that global trade talks will serve sustainable development, governments should launch an assessment of the social and environmental impacts of trade liberalisation, FOEI said. In addition, FOEI called on WSSD to establish the principle that multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) always take precedence over trade rules. The relationship between MEAs and WTO rules has long been an issue of debate and is currently being negotiated at the WTO Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE) as part of the new round of trade talks launched at the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference in November 2001 (see related story, this issue).

### **Partnerships towards sustainable development**

According to Chair Emil Salim from Indonesia, two types of outcomes are expected to result from the Johannesburg Summit. Type I outcomes will include a concrete and realistic implementation plan combined with a political declaration, while Type II outcomes will consist of partnerships, which would not be negotiated in the PrepCom but would be agreed by partners involved. The partnership concept was proposed in response to the question of how to ensure that commitments and good intentions are actually put into practice. If specific actions could be announced by specific partners in Johannesburg, it is hoped that donors would also contribute resources to actions that can achieve results.

Some delegates expressed concern that they were not receiving sufficient guidance on how these partnerships would be achieved and what is expected of governments in support of such partnerships. Others also voiced doubts about including all stakeholders in the partnerships. The Third World Network, for instance, claimed that in that case, those who have the money would drive the process, while the Women's Caucus refused to enter into partnerships with multinational companies and criticised the concept for being unclear and not containing any criteria. While welcoming concrete partnerships addressing the root causes of unsustainable development, FOIE stated that "the task of negotiating and delivering on global social and environmental rules must remain with governments" rather than "self-interested entities such as transnational companies".

PrepCom IV will be held in Bali, Indonesia, on 27 May - 7 June to prepare a concise and focused document for consideration at WSSD on 26 August - 4 September in Johannesburg, South Africa.

### **COP-6 to adopt statement for WSSD**

Delegates at COP-6 will discuss a draft statement to WSSD prepared by the CBD Executive Secretariat. The draft statement outlines experiences gained and lessons learned in implementing the CBD, and puts forward ideas and proposals for implementing Agenda 21. Regarding policy coherence, the draft urges member states, international organisations and processes "to actively seek ways to ensure harmonization" of the provisions of MEAs, in particular of CBD, with provisions of international agreements in other areas related to sustainable development, particularly trade, climate change, forests and agriculture. The draft furthermore urges Members "to actively promote policy coherence in national positions under different international instruments and processes".

Working Group 1 of COP-6 will discuss the implementation of Agenda 21 on the morning of **12 April**.

### **Additional Resources**

The official website of PrepComm III can be found at <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/prepcom3.html>. As *BRIDGES Trade BioRes* went to press, the revised Chairman's paper had not yet been made available online.

For daily coverage, see IISD Linkages at <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/2002/pc3/>.

The draft CBD statement for WSSD (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/15) is available at <http://www.biodiv.org/meetings/cop-06.asp>

"Right questions, wrong answers?" FOEI, 25 March 2002; "Enthusiasm and some concerns voiced over partnership proposals," WSSD PRESS RELEASE, 2 April; ENB Daily Reports, PrepCom III. IISD.

## **Agricultural Biodiversity**

---

### **CBD TO ASSESS, WTO TO EXPAND FARM TRADE LIBERALISATION**

Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) are convening for their sixth meeting in The Hague, The Netherlands, on 7-19 April to discuss, inter alia, the impact of trade liberalisation on the conservation and use of agricultural biological diversity. At the same time, negotiations at the World Trade Organization (WTO) to further liberalise trade in agricultural products overcame a major hurdle when WTO Members on 26 March agreed on a work programme to establish the modalities for the negotiations.

#### **Agro-biodiversity and trade liberalisation at COP-6**

Based on a paper prepared by the CBD Executive Secretariat, Parties at COP-6 will debate the impacts of trade liberalisation on agricultural biodiversity in the context of the multi-year programme of activities, established at COP-3, which aims to promote the positive and mitigate the negative impacts of agricultural practices on biodiversity, while trying to promote the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources of actual or potential value for food and agriculture as well as the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the use of genetic resources.

According to the Secretariat's paper, further removal of trade restrictions are likely to lead to an increase in world prices for agricultural products and consequently a shift in production location as countries use their comparative advantages, leading to a contraction of production in developed countries and an expansion in developing countries. These developments are expected, according to the paper, to result in changes in the abundance of natural habitats and new land cover types, and to changes in spatial patterns as well as in natural patterns of environmental variation. Additionally, a contraction of productive land could lead to the loss of species dependent on certain types of farmland. Assessing the effects of production intensification due to farm trade liberalisation, the report finds that this might result in greater genetic vulnerability as more homogeneous modern plant varieties are used. However, while production intensification is expected to have immediate negative impacts on agro-biodiversity, eg through ground and surface water pollution, the report also points out that a decrease in producer price support and other subsidies can reduce agrochemical use overall. Lastly, as transport costs decline and exports grow, the spread of alien invasive species would be facilitated, possibly leading to a loss of native species.

In its recommendations to COP-6 on trade and agriculture, IUCN - The World Conservation Union agrees with the findings of the Executive Secretariat, but further recommends that Parties should take into account that trade contributes to food security eg through bridging the gap between production and consumption needs as well as by rationalising the allocation of resources as more food is being produced in places benefiting from "positive comparative advantages". IUCN furthermore points out that investment into traditional crops, diversifying farming systems and promoting sustainable and organic agriculture are insufficient if they are not accompanied by appropriate policies and incentives, such as market access support or labelling schemes, to encourage investment.

Working Group 1 of COP-6 will discuss agricultural biodiversity in the afternoon of **9 April** and on the morning of **10 April**.

#### **WTO Agriculture Committee agrees on work programme for negotiations**

At the negotiating session on 26 March, the WTO Committee on Agriculture agreed on a work programme, which will establish the so-called "modalities" or targets for the final stage of the ongoing agriculture

negotiations (31 March 2003 - 1 January 2005). According to the work programme, Members will address the three "pillars" of the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA), namely export subsidies, competition and restrictions on 17-20 June, market access on 2-4 September, and domestic support [i.e. farm subsidies other than those promoting export] on 23-27 September. Furthermore, Members plan to have a draft overview paper ready for circulation by 18 December, which would then be finalised in the follow-up process until the end of March 2003.

The 12-month work programme deals with one of the most critical phases in the agriculture talks as it will set targets -- including numerical targets -- for achieving the objectives set out in the Doha Declaration, i.e. significant reductions in tariffs, export subsidies and domestic support. This stage will therefore determine the shape of the negotiations' final outcome as the "modalities" will be used by Members for making their initial offers to negotiate new commitments. This practice of agreeing on "modalities" first and then negotiating specific commitments had already been used during the 1986-94 Uruguay Round.

WTO Members have been holding 'special' agriculture sessions since early 2000 as mandated by the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA), which provides for a continuation of the "fundamental reform" programme for the liberalisation of the world's farming sector through ongoing negotiations (Article 20). While the agriculture negotiations have so far been taking place independently of other talks in the WTO in line with the 'built-in agenda', they are now part of the single undertaking launched at the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference in November, to be concluded by 1 January 2005 (see BRIDGES Weekly, 15 November 2001; <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/01-11-15/story1.htm>).

### **Agriculture and environment at the WTO**

According to the preamble of the AoA and reiterated in the Doha Declaration, "the need to protect the environment" is one of the so-called "non-trade concerns" which should be taken into account. WTO Members, however, continue to disagree on how this should be done (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/01-12-06/story2.htm>). In general, farm subsidies are deemed to be trade-distortive and are only allowed under certain conditions listed in the AoA. For instance, Members can use the so-called "Green Box" to compensate farmers eg for environmental conservation or protection provided through their agricultural work. Payments under the Green Box, however, must be non- or at most minimally trade distorting. Thus, direct payments to farmers, for example, should be decoupled from production so as not to create an incentive for farmers to increase their production -- which would have a trade-distorting effect. Some WTO Members, such as the EU and Switzerland, would like to maintain the Green Box as it stands now, whereas others, such as the Cairns Group of agriculture exporting countries as well as various developing countries, have called for restricting its applicability. Some Members, notably Norway and Japan, would like to be allowed to address non-trade concerns such as rural development and environment outside the coverage of the Green Box, keeping the agreement structure intact, but allowing more flexibility for certain targeted measures that may be trade distorting but necessary to achieve specific domestic policy objectives.

### **Additional Resources**

The CBD Secretariat's paper on trade liberalisation and agro-biodiversity (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/2) can be accessed at <http://www.biodiv.org/meetings/cop-06.asp?tab=1>

IUCN Policy Recommendations Papers for COP-6 are available at <http://www.iucn.org/themes/biodiversity/cop6/index.html>.

For further information on the ongoing agriculture negotiations at the WTO, see [http://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/agric\\_e/negs\\_bkgrnd00\\_contents\\_e.htm](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/agric_e/negs_bkgrnd00_contents_e.htm).

ICTSD Internal Files.

---

**Sustainable Forest Trade**

---

**CBD AND UNFF CONSIDER CERTIFICATION AS A TOOL FOR SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY**

At their sixth meeting, Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) will consider recommendations by a CBD expert panel to adopt better economic policies to combat global deforestation, and ensure that market mechanisms are complemented by other measures, such as certification, legislation and regulation. The use of certification systems in sustainable forest management as well as the relevance of trade policies were also discussed at the Second Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF-2) in New York on 4-15 March.

**COP-6 to discuss economic policies and forest certification**

According to recommendations of the CBD Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on Forest Biological Diversity, better economic policies are required to make sustainable forest management profitable as ecologically sustainable forests are, at least in the short term, generally less profitable in monetary terms than ecologically unsustainable ones. Thus, non-timber benefits from sustainable forests, such as carbon storage, watershed protection and non-timber forest resources, must have a market price that exceeds this loss of profit in order to be "competitive". The panel furthermore states that establishing "enforceable and transferable property rights for individuals or communities is likely to be an important precondition for sustainable long-term conservation and use". Also, market mechanisms should be complemented by other measures, including certification. Outlining suggested priorities in the expanded work programme on forest biodiversity, the CBD Executive Secretariat also highlighted the implementation of "voluntary third-party credible forest certification schemes" as one of the main tools to combat trade in illegally harvested forest resources to support the conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity.

Working Group 1 of COP-6 will discuss forest biodiversity in the afternoon of 8 April and on the morning of 9 April.

**Certification and trade also feature at UNFF-2**

In their Ministerial Declaration, delegates at UNFF-2 stressed the importance of voluntary certification schemes in achieving the objective of sustainable forest management. Several delegates pointed out, however, that such schemes should not be used as a barrier to trade for tropical timber. Malaysia's Deputy Minister of Primary Industries, Datuk Anifah Aman, for instance, said that "unending allegations, attacks and misinterpretations" had led an increasing number of municipalities and local governments in developed countries to ban or restrict the use of tropical timber. "Timber certification should not be used as a non-tariff barrier, as it is against the principle of free trade," he added. Issues related to certification were also discussed at a WTO side-event to UNFF-2, where the WTO Trade and Environment Division outlined how forestry may be relevant to the WTO. While the WTO membership had not made forestry a priority issue as yet, the secretariat representative pointed out that eco-labelling has been discussed more generally at the WTO Committee for Trade and Environment (CTE) and the CTE was mandated by the Doha Work Programme to give particular attention to labelling requirements for environmental purposes in its work (para. 32, iii).

In their Decision on combating deforestation and forest degradation, delegates furthermore urged countries to promote sustainable forest management "through trade policies and practices, including in the WTO", and "to negotiate in the context of the Doha Work Programme" in order to implement Intergovernmental Panel on Forests / Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IPF/IFF) proposals for action. This compromise text was suggested by South Africa in an effort to resolve the disagreement between developing countries on the one side, who proposed the inclusion of references to the elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers on forest products in the context of the WTO Doha agenda, and developed countries on the other side who were opposed to such references. The IPF/IFF proposals of action were prepared to support the efforts of UNFF in developing a plan of action for the implementation of IPF and IFF proposals, including financial provisions.



UNFF-3, to be held from 26 May to 6 June 2003 in Geneva, Switzerland, will focus on the economic aspects of forests, including the overall role of trade in forest products and services in optimising the economic functions of forests in full support of sustainable forest management.

### **Why are trade and certification important to sustainable forest management?**

Being included in the UNFF's multi-year programme of work and plan of action to implement the IPF/IFF proposals, trade will be one of the common items to be considered at each of its sessions. The IPF/IFF has identified trade as one of the important tools for the implementation of sustainable forest management, as the buying and selling of wood and non-wood forest products and services have a significant effect on sustainable forest management, forest harvesting and the value of forest products. One of the main items of discussion in the context of international trade is certification/labelling of forest products. It has been suggested that certification might provide an incentive to manage forests sustainably, as products certified to come from sustainably managed forests might experience an increase in market share and suppliers might receive a price premium for selling a "green product". Western Europe constitutes the biggest market for certified products. Similarly, most certification schemes for sustainable forestry are found in European countries, partly because developing countries often lack the resources to implement such schemes. As a result, many developing countries are concerned that their non-certified products might be discriminated against and that thus, certification and labelling schemes might constitute a non-tariff barrier to trade. Others, however, argue that certification schemes are usually voluntary and that countries are not forced to comply with them.

In the multilateral trading system, labelling is generally covered by the WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) which allows governments to introduce regulations if they are necessary to fulfil legitimate objectives, including "protection of human health or safety, animal or plant life or health, or the environment". WTO rules also state that Members should give the same treatment to "like" products, i.e. they should not discriminate against a product on the basis of the process and production methods (PPMs) used. As eco-labelling schemes are often based on such PPM criteria (eg on sustainable forest management), some argue that they might not be compatible with WTO rules, at least in cases where they are mandatory. While to date no mandatory labelling scheme has been challenged at the WTO, the question of voluntary PPM-based eco-labelling was addressed in the context of the US-Tuna dispute where the GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] Panel found that a voluntary US labelling scheme certifying that tuna was fished in a way not harmful to dolphins was compatible with trade rules. While the US-Tuna Panel Report was not adopted, it is likely to influence future discussions on this issue.

### **Additional Resources**

The report of the CBD expert panel (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/7/6) is available at <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.asp?lg=0&wg=sbstta-07>. The Secretariat's note (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/17/Add.1) and other documents on forest biological diversity can be found at <http://www.biodiv.org/meetings/cop-06.asp>.

Note by UN Economic and Social Council on "Trade and Sustainable Forest Management" (E/CN.18/2002), [http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/unffddocs/unff\\_ss2-itto.pdf](http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/unffddocs/unff_ss2-itto.pdf). IPF/IFF proposals for action, <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/unffddocs/ipf-iff-proposalsforaction.pdf>.

"Trading Away the Last Ancient Forests," Richard Tarasofsky and Stefanie Pfahl, Greenpeace International, 2002. A summary of this report is available at <http://www.greenpeace.org/politics/wto/Doha/reports/forestsummary.pdf>. For hard copies or pdf version of the study contact [juergen.knirsch@greenpeace.de](mailto:juergen.knirsch@greenpeace.de).

For daily coverage of UNFF, see IISD Linkages, <http://www.iisd.ca/forestry/unff/unff2/>.

"Deforestation crisis linked to market distortions," CBD, March 2002; "Summary of the Second Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests," ENB, 18 March 2002. "In-Session Seminar: Certification and Forest Product Labelling: A Review," FAO, 2000 (FO:APFC/2000/10).

---

**Biotechnology**

---

**BIOTECH LABELLING CONTENTIOUS AT THE WTO AND ICCP**

Delegates at the third meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (ICCP-3) on 22-26 April in The Hague, The Netherlands, will further elaborate rules for ensuring biosafety when trading living modified organisms (LMOs), including possible modalities for standards with regard to labelling shipments of LMOs for food, feed and processing (LMO-FFPs). These discussions come at a time when China's and the EU's national biotechnology regulations on labelling, traceability and import requirements for LMOs are increasingly coming under attack at the World Trade Organization (WTO).

**Labelling of LMO shipments on the agenda of ICCP-3**

ICCP-3 will continue discussions on the contentious issues of liability and compliance, which had been postponed from ICCP-2 for further discussion at the first Meeting of the Parties (MOP-1) which will be held once the Protocol has been ratified by 50 Parties and thereby enters into force. MOP-1 had originally been scheduled to take place in April 2002, but only 14 Parties have so far ratified or acceded to the Protocol. Of particular interest in the trade context will be discussions on handling, transport, packaging and identification practices for which Parties are required to consider the need for and modalities of developing standards (Article 18). Under this agenda item, ICCP-2 saw similar debates over labelling of shipments of LMO-FFPs as had taken place in the negotiations of the Protocol, with some supporting the general system of identifying shipments that "may contain" LMO-FFPs as currently stated in the Protocol, while others -- in particular countries representing centres of origin and diversity -- favoured a more specialised system involving "unique identification" of genetic material contained in LMO-FFPs.

**EU labelling and traceability rules not workable, says US**

Argentina, Canada, Australia, the US and others (including Israel, Jordan, Singapore and Egypt) expressed concern regarding the draft EU labelling and traceability requirements for genetically modified (GM) foods -- proposed by the European Commission and currently under discussion in the European Council (see BRIDGES Weekly, 31 July 2001; <http://www.ictsd.org/html/weekly/31-07-01/story5.htm>) -- at both the WTO Committees on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) on 15 March and the WTO Committee for Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) on 19-21 March. The proposed EU regulations would require all GM foods to be labelled, including foods derived from but no longer containing GMOs, such as highly refined products (e.g. maize or soy oil) where the original GMO content is removed during the production process. The labelling threshold for accidental presence of GMOs would be set at 1 percent.

The US reiterated its criticism that the proposed rules were not workable, not enforceable, costly and more trade-restrictive than necessary (and therefore not compatible with WTO rules; see also BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 24 January 2002; <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/02-01-24/story1.htm>). They also pointed out that the aim of the proposed rules appeared to be confused, mixing up the protection of the environment, the protection of health, and consumer protection against deception. In addition, the US questioned the need for tracing and labelling GM foods produced from what they referred to as "biotechnology events", but not containing traces of GM ingredients (eg oil made with GM soy). The latter point was also picked up by Canada who said that the proposed regulations could be discriminatory as they would only apply to foods derived 'from' GMOs (eg GM soy oil), but not to foods made 'with' GMOs (eg certain wines and cheeses made with GM enzymes).

The EC stressed that the proposed rules aimed to ensure consumer safety and social acceptance of GM foods, to allow consumers to make an informed choice, and to monitor potential environmental effects. Also, the EC argued that labelling and traceability were not restricted to GM foods, but were required for all food products (as set out in new EU food safety law, see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 7 March 2002; <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/02-03-07/story2.htm>), and that the proposed rules simply specified in more detail the labels required for GM products. Norway supported the EC's proposed rules, arguing that they followed the

Codex Alimentarius Commission (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 21 March 2002; <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/02-03-21/story2.htm>), the Biosafety Protocol and OECD guidelines.

### **China's GM regulations criticised for lack of transparency**

At the meeting of the TBT and SPS Committees, Argentina, Canada and the US also addressed China's recent biotechnology regulations, which require importers of agricultural biotechnology products to apply for official safety verification approval from China's Ministry of Agriculture, a process that could take up to 270 days complete. The regulations were originally scheduled to enter into force on 20 March, but have been temporarily waived mainly in response to US concerns. Instead, preliminary safety approvals will be issued to foreign firms during a transition period of nine months (20 March - 20 December 2002). While welcoming the interim arrangement, Canada and the US used the Chinese regulations as an example for the importance of transparency and notification. In particular, they argued that the Chinese rules, whose details were announced on 7 January, did not leave a reasonable time for compliance, and that China had not developed the regulations in a transparent way. In response, China contested that the new regulations had been developed prior to its WTO accession when China had not been under transparency obligations.

### **Background**

The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety -- also sometimes referred to as the "Biotrade" Protocol as it mainly focuses on the transboundary movement of LMOs -- regulates the safe transfer, use and handling of LMOs that may have adverse effects on biodiversity, taking into account risks to human health. The Protocol deals with two types of LMOs. First, LMOs for "intentional introduction into the environment of the Party of import" (eg seeds intended for planting) are subject to an Advanced Informed Agreement (AIA) procedure, which requires the importing country to give its consent prior to the first intentional transboundary movement of the LMO. The AIA procedure does not apply to the second category of LMOs, ie those "intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing" (eg soybeans for use in food). Instead, exporting countries are required to send information on any new LMO to the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) where it can be accessed by potential importers who then decide on the import under their domestic policy. Shipments of these LMOs have to be labelled as "may contain" LMOs and as not intended for intentional introduction into the environment.

At the WTO, labelling requirements for GMOs are covered by the TBT Agreement, which allows governments to introduce TBT regulations if they are necessary to fulfil legitimate objectives, including "protection of human health or safety, animal or plant life or health, or the environment". In addition, the SPS Agreement covers packaging and labelling requirements directly related to food safety. The Agreement allows WTO Members "in cases where relevant scientific evidence is insufficient" to provisionally adopt SPS measures. In such cases, Members are instructed to seek to obtain additional information necessary for a more objective risk assessment "within a reasonable period of time". Both Agreements stipulate that any measures should not be more trade-restrictive than necessary. Some argue that labelling requirements for GMOs are unnecessarily trade-restrictive (and therefore not admissible under WTO rules) due to the high cost of segregating GMOs from non-modified products. Others also believe that there is not enough evidence of threats of GMOs to human health and the environment to justify labelling requirements.

The Biosafety Protocol's relationship to the WTO remains unresolved. The Preamble includes a so-called "savings clause" stating that the Protocol does not change the rights and obligations of a Party under any existing international agreements, but also says that this clause is not intended to subordinate the Protocol to other international agreements. Thus, it is unclear which agreement would prevail should a conflict between their provisions arise. The relationship between WTO rules and multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) is currently being discussed in the Committee on Trade and Environment as part of the new round of trade negotiations launched at the WTO Ministerial Conference in November 2001 (see related story, this issue).

### **Additional Resources**

Documents of ICCP-3 are available at <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.asp?wg=ICCP-03>. Daily coverage will be provided by IISD Linages, <http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/iccp3/>. For daily coverage and an analysis of ICCP-2, see <http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/iccp2/>.

ENB, Vol. 09, No. 203, 8 October 2001; "China drags feet on GMO certificates, markets fret," REUTERS, 21 March 2002; ICTSD Internal Files.

---

## Events & Resources

### EVENTS

For a more comprehensive list of events in trade and sustainable development, please refer to ICTSD's web calendar at <http://www.ictsd.org/html/calendar.htm>. For further information on WTO events, contact the WTO Information and Media Relations Division, Geneva; tel: (41-22) 739 5007; fax: 739 5458; email: [enquiries@wto.org](mailto:enquiries@wto.org). 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.

#### Coming up in the next two weeks

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

8-9 April, Manchester, United Kingdom: INTERNATIONAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CONFERENCE. The conference is organized by ERP Environment, and will address issues such as corporate social responsibility, natural resource management, public participation, and globalisation. For further information contact: Elaine White; tel: (44-1274) 530-408; fax: 530-409; email: [elaine@erpenvironment.co.uk](mailto:elaine@erpenvironment.co.uk); Internet: <http://www.erpenvironment.org>

8-12 April, San José, Costa Rica: 18TH MEETING OF THE CITES ANIMALS COMMITTEE: For further information contact: CITES Secretariat; tel: (41-22) 917-8139; email: [cites@unep.ch](mailto:cites@unep.ch); Internet: <http://www.cites.org/eng/cttee/animals/index.shtml>

8-20 April, Cape Town, South Africa: SYMPOSIUM ON ALTERNATIVE WAYS TO COMBAT DESERTIFICATION. The travelling event is organised by various rural communities and Gobabeb Namibia. The aim of the combined international symposium, rural community interaction and workshop is to connect community action with science and common sense. For further information contact: Odette de Heer Kloots; tel: (27-21) 762-8600; email: [desertification@globalconf.co.za](mailto:desertification@globalconf.co.za); Internet: <http://des2002.az.blm.gov/homepage.htm>

12-14 April, Banff, Alberta Province, Canada: G-8 ENVIRONMENT MINISTERS MEETING. Inter alia, the summit will address the leadup to the World Summit on Sustainable Development scheduled for August-September 2002. For further information contact: Environment Canada; tel: (1-819) 956- 5212; fax: (1-819) 956-5964; email: [enviroinfo@ec.gc.ca](mailto:enviroinfo@ec.gc.ca); Internet: <http://www.canada2002earthsummit.gc.ca/>.

15-17 April, Nadi, Fiji: MANAGEMENT, CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF ALL TYPES OF FORESTS: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IPF/IFF PROPOSALS FOR ACTION: The workshop is sponsored by Australia, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and others and will, inter alia, assist Pacific Island countries and regional programmes to evaluate their progress toward implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action. For further information contact: Peter Lawrence, Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Australia; tel: (+02) 6272-5479; fax: 6272-4875; email: [peter.lawrence@affa.gov.au](mailto:peter.lawrence@affa.gov.au);

15-19 April, Paris France: The 17<sup>th</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES. Organised as a joint session by the FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme. The session will, *inter alia*, address working principles for Risk Analysis. For further information contact the Codex Alimentarius Secretariat; tel: (39 06) 5705 1; fax: 5705 4593; email: [codex@fao.org](mailto:codex@fao.org); Internet: [http://www.codexalimentarius.net/ccgp17/gp02\\_01e.htm](http://www.codexalimentarius.net/ccgp17/gp02_01e.htm)

16-17 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO Working Group On Trade And Transfer Of Technology.

17 April, Brussels, Belgium: FROM RIO VIA DOHA TO JOHANNESBURG: COUNTERBALANCING THE WTO WITH STRONG ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RULES. Organised by Friends of the Earth Europe. The public hearing will address the two specific cross-cutting issues of Environmental Governance and Alternatives to Trade and Investment Liberalisation. For further information contact: Alexandra Wandel, email: [alexandra.wandel@foeeurope.org](mailto:alexandra.wandel@foeeurope.org); Internet: <http://www.foeeurope.org>.

18 April, Geneva, Switzerland: SPECIAL SESSION OF THE WTO COUNCIL FOR TRADE-RELATED ASPECTS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

### **Other forthcoming events**

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

4-6 June, Vancouver, Canada: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON INDIGENOUS PEOPLES FORESTRY - LINKING COMMUNITIES, COMMERCE AND CONSERVATION. Organised by The University of British Columbia (UBC), the conference will promote indigenous peoples forest enterprises and joint ventures by advancing the collective understanding of key market, policy, and technical issues surrounding indigenous peoples management, promoting information exchanges between indigenous peoples and their supporters active in forestry, and connections to new opportunities for investment. For further information contact: Gordon Prest Faculty of Forestry; tel: (604) 822-0651; fax: 822-8645; email: [prest@interchange.ubc.ca](mailto:prest@interchange.ubc.ca); Internet: <http://www.forestry.ubc.ca/globalperspectives/index.htm>

6-8 June, Rome, Italy: 28TH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY. For further information, contact: Barbara Huddleston, FAO; tel: (39-06) 5705 1; fax: 5705-3152 email: [Barbara.Huddleston@fao.org](mailto:Barbara.Huddleston@fao.org); Internet: <http://www.fao.org/unfao/bodies/cfs/default.htm>

10-13 June, Rome, Italy: WORLD FOOD SUMMIT: FIVE YEARS LATER. The conference, organised by the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), will review progress towards ending hunger and track progress achieved since the 1996 World Food Summit as well as consider ways to accelerate the process. World leaders will be requested to outline the measures needed to achieve the goal of reducing the number of hungry people by half by 2015, and make suggestions on how to accelerate progress. For further information contact the FAO Secretariat; tel: (39-06) 57051; fax: 5705-3152; email: [food-summit@fao.org](mailto:food-summit@fao.org); Internet: <http://www.fao.org/worldfoodsummit/>

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

9-13 December, Geneva, Switzerland: 6TH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE BASEL CONVENTION. Organised by the Basel Convention on Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal. Please the change of date from 20-24 May. For further information contact: Ms. Sachiko Kuwabara-Yamamoto, Executive Secretary, Basel Convention; tel: (41 22) 917-8218; fax: 797-3454, email: sbc@unep.ch; Internet: <http://www.basel.int>

## RESOURCES

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

"NGOs and the protection of biodiversity: the ecologists' views," by Jane H. Bock Katy Human in COLORADO JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND POLICY 13 (1, Winter 2002): 167-181. This paper first explores the problem of biodiversity loss - how NGOs are working to define the magnitude of the problem and influence citizens and government agencies to consider biodiversity impacts in their decision-making. Second, the paper summarises the panel discussion that took place at the symposium.

THE PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL RISK ASSESSMENT. By I.M. Goklany, published by Cato Institute, 2001. This book demonstrates the insufficiency of the widely invoked precautionary principle for building sustainable policies of technology regulation and advocates a more focused hazard assessment framework to use instead. For further information, see [http://www.cato.org/cgi-bin/Web\\_store/web\\_store.cgi?page=precprinciple.html](http://www.cato.org/cgi-bin/Web_store/web_store.cgi?page=precprinciple.html)

EARTH SUMMIT 2002: A NEW DEAL - REVISED EDITION Edited by Felix Dodds with Toby Middleton, UNED-UK, 2001. At the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992, world leaders adopted a comprehensive programme of action for implementing sustainable development worldwide. As preparations for Earth Summit 2002 proceed, leading players from around the world present a frank assessment of progress to date. They set goals and describe mechanisms that will enable the international community to complete the tasks set in Rio and prepare for new challenges and opportunities. For further information, see <http://www.earthscan.co.uk/asp/bookdetails.asp?key=3524>

"Regulation of genetically modified products in a multi-level system of governance: science or citizens?" by Tamara K. Hervey in REVIEW OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW (RECIEL) 10 (3, 2001): 321-333. Since the 1990s, products made from genetically modified organisms (GM products) - in particular those within the human food chain - have been regulated within the European Union's system of governance. Such regulation is conducted on the basis of mutual recognition of national marketing approval systems, underpinned by a 'comitology' procedure.

"Will biotechnology feed the world's hungry?" by Peter W.B. Phillips in INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL 56 (4, 2001): 665-677. According to the author, scientific breakthroughs, such as hybrid crops, the industrialization of the agri-food sector, and the Green Revolution greatly accelerated the world's food production capacity and lowered the proportion of the world's population that is short of food, but it did not eliminate hunger. The author concludes that the new biotechnology offers even greater opportunities and greater hope that technical constraints will be removed, but they have somewhat limited commercial, economic, social, and political applicability in developing countries.

"CITES and the CBD: tensions and synergies" by Rosie Cooney in REVIEW OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW (RECIEL) 10 (3, 2001): 259-267. This article examines the relationship between the CBD and one of the more specific agreements: the Convention on International

Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES; Washington, 1973). These treaties overlap considerably in scope and purpose - while dozens of bilateral, regional or international instruments address conservation, only these two are potentially applicable to every species, in any habitat in the world. Detailed analyses of the content of the Conventions are widely available elsewhere, but this article begins with a brief introduction to each.

"Demystifying the relationship between CITES and the WTO" by Marceil Yeater Juan Vasquez in *REVIEW OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW (RECIEL)* 10 (3, 2001): 271-276. CITES, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, was designed more than 25 years ago to cope with circumstances where international trade was a strong factor in the threat of extinction of a species. It is known for its effective decision-making and compliance mechanisms to prevent unsustainable exploitation of wildlife.

"Environment and trade: a review of issues and methods" by Haixiao Huang & Walter C. Labys in *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES* 2 (1-2, 2002): 100-160. This survey attempts to provide an overview of the major issues concerning economic interactions between environmental and trade policies. It provides a perspective on received and future research by employing a dual approach: economic studies of the major environmental and trade issues are analysed first and then progress in the methods necessary to analyse their interactions is assessed second. The conclusions suggest new possibilities for research design and policy goals.

"Does forest certification assure sustainability? - a case study" by Milo Mihajlovich in *FORESTRY CHRONICLE* 77 (6, 2001): 994-997. Criteria and indicators are currently being developed and used at several scales to foster sustainability of many forest values. Certification has emerged as an area of considerable discussion and debate as some large retailers have asked their suppliers to assure them that forest products come from certified forests. Further, many environmental non-government organizations (ENGOS) use forest certification as a point of focus in discussions with forest managers.

*BRIDGES Trade BioRes*© is published by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), <http://www.ictsd.org>, in collaboration with IUCN - World Conservation Union, <http://www.iucn.org>, and IUCN's Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy, CEESP, <http://www.cenesta.org/ceesp/>. This edition of *BRIDGES Trade BioRes* was edited by Heike Baumüller, [hbaumuller@ictsd.ch](mailto:hbaumuller@ictsd.ch). Contributors to this issue were Alexander Werth, Hugo Cameron and Marianne Jacobsen. The Managing Editor is Andrew Crosby, [acrosby@ictsd.ch](mailto:acrosby@ictsd.ch). The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz, [rmelendez@ictsd.ch](mailto:rmelendez@ictsd.ch). ICTSD is an independent, not-for-profit organisation based at: 13, ch. des Anémones, 1219 Geneva, Switzerland, tel: (41-22) 917-8492; fax: 917-8093. Excerpts from *BRIDGES Trade BioRes* may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and should be directed to the Editors or the Director. *BRIDGES Trade BioRes* is made possible in 2002 through the generous support of the Minister of Housing, Spatial Planning, and the Environment (Netherlands). It also benefits from ICTSD's core funders: the Governments of Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden; Christian Aid (UK), the Rockefeller Foundation, MISEREOR, NOVIB (NL), Oxfam (UK) and the Swiss Coalition of Development Organisations (Switzerland).

To subscribe to *BRIDGES Trade BioRes*, please send a blank email to [subscribe\\_biores@ictsd.ch](mailto:subscribe_biores@ictsd.ch)