

To subscribe *BRIGES Trade BioRes*, send a blank email to subscribe_biores@ictsd.ch

CONTENT

ALIEN INVASIVE SPECIES

| | |
|--|---|
| COP-6 Adopts Guiding Principles On Alien Species | 1 |
|--|---|

RISK ANALYSIS

| | |
|---|---|
| Codex Committee Moves Forward On Risk Analysis Standard | 2 |
|---|---|

BIOTECHNOLOGY

| | |
|---|---|
| Little Movement On Labelling At Biosafety Meeting | 4 |
|---|---|

IN BRIEF

EVENTS & RESOURCES

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Events | 7 |
| Resources | 8 |

Alien Invasive Species

COP-6 ADOPTS GUIDING PRINCIPLES ON ALIEN SPECIES

Delegates at the Sixth Conference of the Parties (COP-6) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on 7-19 April in The Hague, The Netherlands, adopted 15 Guiding Principles for the prevention, introduction and mitigation of the impacts of alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species despite a last-minute objection by Australia based on concerns that the principles might allow countries to avoid obligations under trade agreements.

In the final Plenary, Australia announced its decision that it could not support the Principles due to concerns that the ambiguous language on the precautionary approach (Principles 1 and 10) and references to socio-economic and cultural considerations in the context of risk management (Footnote vii) might result in conflicts with obligations under trade agreements. In particular, Australia expressed concern that these references could provide a cover for countries to implement measures that were inconsistent with the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS).

Throughout the negotiations of the Guidelines, Australia -- supported by Argentina, Canada and to a limited extent the US -- had emphasised the need for science-based rules that were consistent with the SPS Agreement, and had supported specific references to the SPS Agreement and to the international standard-setting bodies recognised in the Agreement (see related story on Codex, this issue). The countries had also raised trade concerns in the context of Principle 7 dealing with measures to prevent unintentional introduction of alien species, which they feared might be used to implement measures that constituted disguised trade barriers. Others, however, including the EU, stressed that the economic cost of not restricting potentially invasive alien

species might be much greater than the possible loss in trade revenue. One source pointed out that Australia's position was a good example of the apparent disconnectedness between the threats that countries are facing and their position in international negotiations, referring to the significant threats to Australia's ecosystems resulting from invasive alien species. Another observer speculated that the apparently inconsistent view might be due to the involvement of different agencies, adding that Australia had contacted three different Ministries during the final negotiations.

After delegates failed to resolve the issue in the plenary and in informal consultations, COP-6 President Geke Faber, supported by the two Working Group Chairs, adopted the Decision as originally presented to the Plenary "on the basis of past practice" with a note in the report on the objections. This led Australia to again raise its formal objection to the Decision and make reservations regarding the decision-making process. While supported the adoption of the Principles, several expressed concern regarding the decision-making process. The Principles, inter alia, recommend measures to prevent the spread of invasive alien species, with an emphasis on the least expensive and most effective measures, including border controls, quarantine measures, information exchange and capacity building. Also, recipient countries should have the opportunity to provide prior authorisation before the first intentional introduction of potentially invasive alien species.

The next meeting of the COP will take place in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia in the first quarter of 2004.

Background

In the multilateral trade system, measures to control the spread of alien species are generally covered by the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS), which acknowledges the right of Members to take SPS measures necessary for the protection of human, animal or plant life or health. Regarding precaution, the SPS Agreement states that in cases where relevant scientific evidence is insufficient, Members may provisionally adopt health-related measures on the basis of available pertinent information. In such circumstances, however, the SPS Agreement obligates Members to undertake a risk assessment within a reasonable period of time.

Additional Resources

The Guiding Principles and other documents adopted at COP-6 will be available on the CBD web site shortly (<http://www.biodiv.org>). For daily coverage and an analysis of COP-6, see IISD Linkages, <http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/cop6/>.

ENB Vol. 9 No. 239, 22 April 2002; ICTSD Internal Files.

Risk Analysis

CODEX COMMITTEE MOVES FORWARD ON RISK ANALYSIS STANDARD

The Codex Committee on General Principles (CCGP) at its meeting on 15-19 April in Paris, France, agreed to forward the "Proposed Draft Working Principles for Risk Analysis in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius" to the Executive Committee for adoption as Draft Principles. The previous deadlock over the scope of the Principles and references to precaution could finally be resolved following a decision to elaborate two separate standards for use within Codex and by governments. The CCGP also discussed traceability and ethics in food trade, but made little headway on these issues.

Delegates agreed to advance the Proposed Draft Working Principles to Step 5 of the Codex Procedure for consideration by the Executive Committee at its next session in June 2002 (see below for an outline of the Codex procedure). It is important to note that the finalised text will only apply in the framework of the Codex Alimentarius, not to governments, i.e. it will be included in the Procedural Manual as general guidance to the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) and its subsidiary bodies. The CCGP will now elaborate separate

"Proposed Draft Working Principles for Risk Analysis to be Applied by Governments". The decision to develop two sets of Principles -- instead of one set that would apply to both Codex and governments as originally envisaged -- meant that the deadlock could be resolved which had held up adoption of the Principles in previous meetings, when a number of countries, most notably the US, had objected to the inclusion of precaution in the Principles, leading some to suggest that Codex had become the latest battleground for trade negotiators, rather than health practitioners (see BRIDGES Weekly, 1 May, <http://www.ictsd.org/html/weekly/01-05-01/inbrief.htm>).

Delegates agree on precaution and trade references

In the adopted Proposed Draft Principles, delegates agreed to include references to precaution as an "inherent element of risk analysis" (including risk assessment, management and communication). While Argentina supported deleting the reference and the US called for a more detailed clarification on the nature of the risk and its potential public health consequence, the originally proposed wording was retained given the considerable effort that had been made to achieve a consensus. The issue of precaution has in the past repeatedly led to disagreement, in particular between the US and the EU, at the WTO -- most prominently over the EU's ban in hormone-treated beef from the US -- and during negotiations of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

The CCGP furthermore discussed how to address trade implications in standard setting. While Brazil suggested including language of the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) to clarify that risk management options should not be more trade restrictive than necessary, the Representative of WTO questioned whether the CAC should systematically consider trade implications and suggested such references to be deleted. Other delegates supported the view that an assessment of trade implications was not the role of the CAC, as the level of protection was determined by member countries and national measures were subject to the provision of the SPS Agreement. Following a debate on the extent to which trade aspects should be considered in the development of Codex texts, delegates agreed on a proposal put forward by Canada, which instructs the CAC to "seek and take into consideration the potential impact of such measures on trade between member countries". The Principles furthermore state, "in order to avoid unjustified trade barriers, risk management should ensure transparency and consistency in the decision-making process in all cases".

Little headway on traceability and ethics in food trade

Also of relevance in the trade context were discussions on traceability and ethics in food trade. Regarding traceability, delegates made little headway, only agreeing that the Secretariat should prepare a discussion paper on how the CCGP could best contribute to consideration of this issue in Codex. Discussions on traceability have in the past divided delegates in a number of Codex Committees, notably in the Codex Intergovernmental Task Force on Foods Derived From Biotechnology and the Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 3 February 2002; <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/02-03-21/story2.htm>). During Debates on the Proposed Draft Revised Code of Ethics for International Trade in Foods, Bolivia raised the question whether the Code should be restricted to ethical aspects in food trade or should be expanded to cover related issues, such as access to food, depletion of genetic resources and the resulting distortions in trade. Due to time constraints, consideration of the text could not be completed, leading some countries to express concern that the Code would again be delayed, especially given the limited progress that had been made.

Background

While Codex standards are only voluntary, the Codex Alimentarius Commission is recognised by the SPS Agreement as the international organisation responsible for standard-setting related to food safety. WTO Members "shall base" their measures related to human and plant health on these standards, guidelines or recommendations. Such measures "shall be deemed to be necessary to protect human, animal or plant life of health, and presumed to be consistent with the relevant provisions" of the SPS Agreement. The other two international standard-setting body recognised in the SPS Agreement are the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) for plant health and the Office International de Epizooties (OIE) for animal health and zoonoses. While Codex standards only apply to food safety, they are likely to have far wider implications on

discussions in the other standard-setting bodies as well as in related fora, including other Codex Committees, the WTO and bilateral negotiations.

Uniform procedure for the elaboration of Codex standards

Step 1- 3: Elaboration of a PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARD in the respective body

Step 4: Possible amendments by the respective body based on comments received from governments and interested international organisations

Step 5: Proposed Draft Standard forwarded to the Commission or the Executive Committee for adoption as a DRAFT STANDARD

Step 6: Circulation for comments

Step 7: Possible amendments by the respective body based on the comments

Step 8: Draft Standard submitted to the Commission for adoption as a STANDARD

For further details, see <http://www.codexalimentarius.net/Proced1.htm>.

Additional Resources

Documents of the CCGP meeting are available at http://www.codexalimentarius.net/ccgp17/gp02_01e.htm

"Precaution And Risk: A Consumer Response", Consumers International, Food Policy Briefing Paper No. 3, April 2002. http://www.consumersinternational.org/campaigns/food/Food_Papers.html.

ICTSD Internal Files.

Biotechnology

LITTLE MOVEMENT ON LABELLING AT BIOSAFETY MEETING

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

As mandated in Article 18 of the Protocol (handling, transport, packaging and identification), delegates discussed detailed requirements for documentation accompanying shipments of LMOs for the use in food, feed and processing, which should be labelled as "may contain" LMOs and as not intended for release into the environment. Similarly to previous discussions, many countries, in particular the EU, China, Japan, Mexico and other countries representing centres of origin and diversity, supported the use of "unique identification" for documentation [i.e. a code identifying a transgenic plant line], citing the OECD system as a possible model. Others, however, most notably the US, Australia and Argentina -- some of the world's largest exporters of LMOs -- favoured information requirements that did not go beyond the negotiated text. Argentina, supported by Brazil and Uruguay, furthermore stated that documentation requirements should not prevent commodity trade.

Regarding LMOs for contained use and for intentional release into the environment, delegates ended their discussions by referring back to the original text as proposed by the technical expert group on handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs, bracketing paragraphs where there was no agreement. Thus, once the Protocol enters into force, LMOs for contained use will at the minimum be labelled as "LMOs", while LMOs for release will also require a brief description of the organism, including category, name, relevant traits including transgenic traits, and characteristics such as event(s) of transformation. It still remains to be decided whether documentation for LMOs to be released into the environment should also include a reference system of identification, such as unique identifiers, and "other requirements in accordance with the regulatory status of the

LMO in the Party of import". As one source pointed out, the latter provision might be used by importing countries justify the implementation of much higher standards or restrictions on the import of LMOs based on their national situation, which could potentially contravene the WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT).

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

Additional Resources

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

Report Of The OECD Workshop On Unique Identification Systems For Transgenic Plants, June 2001, available on the OECD website at <http://www.oecd.org>.

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

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

In Brief

NATIVE CANADIAN GROUP TO BE HEARD IN LUMBER DISPUTE. A WTO panel currently considering a Canadian complaint against US duties on softwood lumber agreed on 30 April to receive a submission campaigning for recognition of land rights by the Interior Alliance, a grouping of Canadian First Nations peoples. "This is a groundbreaking victory for indigenous peoples around the world and for British Colombia Indians in particular," said Chief Arthur Manuel of the Neskonalith Indian Band. The Interior Alliance claims that the Canadian province of British Colombia does not take into account native title rights -- protected under British Colombia law and in the Canadian constitution -- in the administration of its forests and therefore the Alliance supports the US position that Canadian companies are effectively subsidised by being charged less than the market rate when they log on Canadian public land. Canada submitted a complaint to the WTO after the US had imposed import tariffs of up to 29 percent on softwood lumber from Canada, following claims by US producers that they would lose around \$US1.2 billion per year. The US announcement that it would impose tariffs noted that native title rights should be taken into consideration. The dispute panel was set up in December 2001 and is expected to report after one year. If they deem it appropriate, panels investigating WTO disputes have the right to consider submissions made by parties other than the governments involved in the dispute. The Interior Alliance represents Canadian native groups from the south-central interior of British Colombia. In a 4-0 decision, the US International Trade Commission (ITC) ruled on 2 May that provincial governments unfairly subsidise Canada's lumber industry by charging low fees to cut timber on public land. BRIDGES Trade BioRes will report further on the softwood lumber dispute in its next issue.

"WTO to hear Canadian Indians' complaint over lumber trade," AP, 30 April 2002.

BRITAIN AND INDONESIA SIGN AGREEMENT ADDRESSING TRADE IN ILLEGAL TIMBER. In an agreement signed on 18 April by British Environment Minister Michael Meacher and Indonesian Minister of Forestry Dr. Muhammad Prakosa, Britain and Indonesia agreed to take action to combat trade in illegal timber between the two countries. The deal commits Britain to revising its current laws, with the goal of eliminating

imports of timber from illegal sources, and requires Indonesia to open its forestry sector to closer independent scrutiny. Environmental groups estimate that 60 percent of Britain's tropical timber imports are from illegal sources, while it is estimated that about 70 percent of logging in Indonesia is illegal. The deal is intended to help protect the tropical forests of Indonesia from deforestation that threatens their disappearance within five to ten years. British companies have faced pressure from environmental groups for some time over their investment and trade in Indonesian forest corporations. A previous Friends of the Earth campaign in 1999 led to the British government changing its timber-buying policy after it was discovered that the Ministry of Defence purchased illegal Brazilian mahogany. For its part, Indonesia is planning a permanent ban on exports of raw logs (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 18 April 2002; <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/02-04-18/inbrief.htm>).

"Britain and Indonesia Sign Agreement to Combat Illegal Timber Trade," AP, 18 April 2002.

UK ESTABLISHES POLICE UNIT TO FIGHT ILLEGAL TRADE OF WILDLIFE. On 22 April environment Minister Michael Meacher announced the establishment of a new intelligence agency, which will fight against the illegal trade of endangered wildlife species. "There is no doubt that crimes against wildlife continue, the amounts of money involved are huge, and they are certainly pushing some of our most endangered species close to extinction," Meacher said. "Money and a complete disregard for the impact on some of our rarest wildlife species is driving this trade," he added. The new agency, which will be part of the existing National Criminal Intelligence Unit, will work at both national and international levels to stop the smuggling of high value items such as caviar, ivory, shatoosh shawls, parrots and birds of prey, while working closely with police, customs officers and wildlife agencies to effectively fight the trade of endangered species. Globally, illegal trade is estimated to total USD 5 billion annually, which constitutes one quarter of the total trade in animals, plants and their by-products. The UK is a signatory to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna (CITES) which controls and monitors international trade of wild species.

"Britain cracks down on wildlife crime," REUTERS, 23 April 2002; "UK creates new police unit to hunt wildlife criminals," ENS, 24 April 2002.

WHALING TALKS KICK OFF WITH JAPAN PUSHING FOR COMMERCIALISATION. Discussions at the annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC), which began on 25 April, have so far largely focused on Japan's request to lift the ban on commercial whaling. Japan and Norway are looking for a three-quarters majority vote in favour of resuming commercial whaling. Although the two whaling nations have to date been unsuccessful with their request to resume commercial whaling, concern is growing among environmental groups that votes might be changing. "The balance of (pro-whaling and anti-whaling) countries is a big issue that we are very worried about," according to Nanami Kurasawa of Tokyo's Dolphin and Whale Action Network. Joji Morishita, Deputy Director of the Fisheries Agency's Far Seas Fisheries Division echoed the concern of environmentalists: "For a long time, the anti-whaling side has had a simple majority but this is now changing. The two sides are in a similar power balance, and the voting is very close now." However, Nicky Grandy from the IWC Secretariat said that before commercial whaling could resumed, a key management plan would have to be in place, which is unlikely to be finalised during this meeting. The pro- and anti-whaling camps mainly disagree over the actual number of whales, and whether all whale species are threatened or not. The IWC Scientific Committee is scheduled to meet from 25 April to 7 May, followed by a number of Commission sub-groups. The plenary session, which is the only meeting open to the public, will take place on 20-24 May. For further information, see http://www.iwcoffice.org/2002_meeting.htm.

"Whaling: International Commission debates easing moratorium," AP, 26 April 2002; "Japan pushes for restart of commercial whaling," REUTERS, 26 April 2002.

US CRITICISES JAPAN'S FIRE BLIGHT MEASURES. The US is likely to ask the WTO to set up a panel to settle its dispute with Japan over Japan's quarantine restrictions on imported apples if the current consultations between the two countries -- requested by the US on 1 March under the WTO's Dispute Settlement Understanding -- failed to resolve the dispute by early May. The quarantine measure, imposed by

Japan in 1994 as a protection against the introduction of fire blight, inter alia, bans the import of apples from orchards where fire blight is detected and imposes certain requirements for producing apples for export. The US claims that the measures violate the SPS Agreement, including provisions that require measures to be non-discriminatory and least trade-restrictive. While harmless to humans, fire blight -- a bacterial disease of apples and pears -- kills blossoms, shoots, limbs and even entire trees. It is most commonly found in the mid-Atlantic region of the US, in New Zealand and in some other countries, but has not been detected in Japan. According to the US Department of Agriculture, exports of fresh apples to Japan fell from 1,360 metric tons (worth ca. USD 1.06 million) in 2000 to only 460 metric tons (USD 377,000) in 2001.

"US, Japan hold WTO talks on apple quarantine measures," WTO REPORTER, 22 April 2002; "US to soon seek WTO panel to seek apple dispute with Japan," KYODO NEWS, 23 April 2001.

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. 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

6-8 May, Hamburg, Germany: CONFERENCE ON EU AND GERMAN CLIMATE POLICY - CHALLENGES BEFORE THE ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL. The meeting is organised by the Hamburg Institute of International Economics, and will focus on the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol in the EU, challenges with regard to EU national climate strategies, internal EU emissions trading, integration of EU accession countries, the role of the Kyoto mechanisms, and EU strategies for achieving entry into force. For information contact: Axel Michaelowa, Hamburg Institute of International Economics; tel: (49-404) 283-4309; fax: 283-4451; email: michaelowa@hwwa.de; Internet: <http://www.hwwa.de/climate.htm>

6-10 May, Halifax, Canada: 30TH SESSION OF THE JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING. For information, contact the Codex Alimentarius Commission, tel: (39 06 5705.1); fax: 5705.4593; email: codex@fao.org; Internet: http://www.codexalimentarius.net/ccfl30/fl02_01e.htm

13-14 May, London, UK: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE NEW ROUND: TRADE, INVESTMENT AND ENVIRONMENT AFTER DOHA. The conference is organised by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, and will discuss the major issues arising from the Doha Declaration and look at what the new round will bring to the debate regarding multilateral environmental agreements, dispute settlement, institutional changes, investment and services, agriculture and fisheries, and the role and position of developing countries. For further information contact: Georgina Wright, Chatham House, London; tel: (44 20) 7957 5700; fax: 7957 5710; email: gwright@riia.org; Internet: <http://www.riia.org/Conferences/conf.html>

13-18 May, Bali, Indonesia: 32ND SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TROPICAL TIMBER COUNCIL AND ASSOCIATE SESSIONS OF ITS COMMITTEES. For further information contact the ITTO, tel: (81 45) 223 1110; e-mail: itto@itto.or.jp; Internet: <http://www.itto.or.jp>

13-17 May 2002, Maracay, Venezuela: BIOSAFETY 3 - ADVANCED ISSUES ON BIOSAFETY: RISK MONITORING AND PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF BIOTECHNOLOGY. Organised by Centro Nacional de Investigaciones agropecuarias / CENIAP (Maracay, Venezuela) and Centro Tecnológico Polar (Caracas, Venezuela). Postponed from 12-16 November 2001. For further information, contact: Dr. Efraim G. Salazar Yamarte; tel: (58-43) 471-066; fax: 471-066, 831-421; email: efra63@hotmail.com; Internet: <http://www.icgeb.trieste.it/~bsafesrv/bsfn0011.htm>.

16 May, Geneva, Switzerland: PRECAUTION IN ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY-MAKING. This roundtable, organised jointly by the Geneva Environment Network and the Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape (SAEFL), will examine Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration, how precaution has been applied since Rio and why it remains so important for the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). For further information contact: Aniket Ghai, tel: (41-22) 917-8505; fax: (41-22) 797-3464; email: aniket.ghai@unep.ch.

Other forthcoming events

20-24 May, Shimonoseki, Japan: 54TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION. For further information contact: IWC Secretariat; tel: (44-12-2) 323-3971; email: secretariat@iwcoffice.org; Internet: <http://www.iwcoffice.org/>.

3-7 June, Bergen, Norway: 25TH SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS. Organised by FAO. For more information contact the Secretariat of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, tel: (39 06) 570-51; fax: 5705-4593; email: codex@fao.org; Internet: http://www.codexalimentarius.net/ccffp25/fp02_01e.htm

23- 25 July, Bangkok, Thailand: 20TH SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL RICE COMMISSION. Every four years, FAO convenes a session of the International Rice Commission to provide a forum for senior policy makers and senior rice specialists from the Member Countries to address issues and constraints, as well as review and orient their national rice research and development programmes. For further information contact: Dat Van Tran, Executive Secretary, International Rice Commission, FAO; tel: (39-06) 570-55769; fax: 570-56347; email: Dat.Tran@fao.org; Internet: <http://www.fao.org/waicent/faoinfo/agricult/agp/agpc/doc/field/commrice/welcome.htm>

19-22 August, Wellington, New Zealand: CONFERENCE ON FISHERIES IN THE GLOBAL ECONOMY. The event is organised by the International Institute of Fisheries Economics and Trade (IIFET), and will provide a forum for participants to consider the future management of fisheries. For more information contact: IIFET 2002 Organiser; tel: (64 4) 389-3487; fax: 389-3457; email: bruce.shallard@xtra.co.nz; Internet: <http://www.iifet2002.com>

21-28 August, Victoria, Canada: 2002 WORLD ORGANIC CONGRESS - CULTIVATING COMMUNITIES. Organised by the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM), the event is expected to be attended by farmers, researchers, advisors, food processors, traders, certifiers, policy makers and consumers and others interested in organic agriculture and sustainable development. For more information contact the IFOAM 2002 Office, tel: +1-250-655-5652; e-mail: ifoam2002@cog.ca; Internet: <http://www.cog.ca/ifoam2002/>

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

MANAGING THE INVISIBLE HAND: MARKETS, FARMERS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE. Published by IATP, 2002. The report was produced by IATP for the Canadian Foodgrains Bank and deals with the WTO Agriculture Agreement. The report argues that the Agreement itself, whose structure is reflected in the negotiations, is fundamentally flawed. The report concludes that the current global agriculture trade agreement will not succeed in helping farmers and broad-based economic development until it addresses market power by transnational corporations and proposes several revisions to the Agreement. The full report and executive summary can be viewed at: <http://www.tradeobservatory.org>.

THE WTO, AGRICULTURE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. Edited by Heinrich Wohlmeyer and Theodor Quendler, April 2002. The aim of this book is to identify the strengths and weaknesses of liberalised world trade, in particular in the agricultural sector, and to investigate to what extent the current WTO agreements provide the necessary fail-safe devices to react to trade-related negative impacts on sustainability,

environmental protection and food security. For further information see: <http://www.greenleaf-publishing.com/catalogue/wtoagri.htm>.

THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY RECONCILING TRADE IN BIOTECHNOLOGY WITH ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT? Edited by Christoph Bail, Robert Falkner and Helen Marquard, April 2002. The book provides a review of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and includes over 40 contributions from many of the key stakeholders, negotiators and analysts of the biosafety talks.

"Economics of the US-Canada Softwood Lumber Dispute: A Historical Perspective," by SM Osman Rahman and Stephen Devadoss in THE ESTEY CENTRE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AND TRADE POLICY. The paper reviews the US-Canada softwood lumber dispute over the past two decades by outlining the key developments and critically appraising the arguments put forward by both countries. It also presents a welfare analysis of lumber trade distortions, arguing that given the importance of lumber trade between Canada and the United States, an expeditious resolution of this long-running trade dispute would be beneficial for both countries. The article is available at <http://128.233.58.173/estey/>.

STATE OF THE WORLD 2002: PROGRESS TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE SOCIETY.

Worldwatch Institute, 2002. Published annually in 28 languages, the Worldwatch Institute's team of researchers brings together both social and natural sciences in their analysis of the trends that have put the global economy on a collision course with the Earth's ecosystems. This 19th edition is dedicated to the forthcoming World Summit on Sustainable Development to be held in Johannesburg. For further information, see <http://www.earthscan.co.uk/asp/bookdetails.asp?key=3598>

THE POLITICS OF PRECAUTION: GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

By R. L. Paarlberg, 2001. Published by Johns Hopkins University Press. This paper examines genetically modified food policies in four developing countries - Kenya, India, China and Brazil - to clarify the role shared by developing and developed country governments in responding to the issues involved in the cultivation and marketing of GM products. Available at: <http://www.press.jhu.edu/press/books/titles/f01/f01papo.htm>

GMO LIABILITY THREATS FOR FARMERS - LEGAL ISSUES SURROUNDING THE PLANTING OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS. By David R. Moeller, November 2001. Published by the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, Genetically Engineered Food Alert in collaboration with the Farmer to Farmer Campaign on Genetic Engineering. Available at <http://www.gefoodalert.org/pages/home.cfm>

"THE GREAT RESHUFFLING: HOW ALIEN SPECIES HELP FEED THE GLOBAL ECONOMY" by Jeffrey A. McNeely, 2001. According to the author, the global economy fosters the spread of alien species, one of the negative by-products of the globalisation of the world economy. The author concludes that the Convention on Biological Diversity offers an important opportunity for addressing global problems of introduced species, adding that a biosafety protocol which also addresses the issues of alien species and international trade would be far more useful for achieving all the objectives of the CBD. For more information see <http://www.issg.org/publications.html#Publications>

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. Contributor to this issue was Marianne Jacobsen. The Managing Editor is Andrew Crosby, acrosby@ictsd.ch. 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 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