



INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR  
TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE  
DEVELOPMENT

# BRIDGES

## Weekly Trade News Digest

2 April 2003

Volume 7 Number 12

### LEAD STORIES

AGRICULTURE MODALITIES: DEADLINE MISSED,  
EYES NOW ON CANCUN 1

### OTHER NEWS

ONLY FEW SERVICES OFFERS TRICKLE IN BY END-  
MARCH DEADLINE 3  
DISPUTE SETTLEMENT: PANEL RULES AGAINST US  
STEEL TARIFFS; PANEL ESTABLISHED ON US  
UPLAND COTTON 3

### IN BRIEF

US-MOROCCO FREE TRADE TALKS WOBBLE  
ALONG 4  
RIGHTS EXPERT CALLS FOR JUST TRADE  
POLICIES 4  
NEW EXPERT GROUP ON SINGAPORE ISSUES 5

### WTO IN BRIEF

GI NEGOTIATIONS PROGRESS IN INFORMAL MODE  
5

### EVENTS & RESOURCES

EVENTS 6  
RESOURCES 7  
POSITION VACANCY 8

### LEAD STORIES

#### AGRICULTURE MODALITIES: DEADLINE MISSED, EYES NOW ON CANCUN

During a 31 March wrap-up meeting of the WTO Committee on Agriculture (CoA), Chair Stuart Harbinson formally declared that Members' efforts to agree on agricultural modalities by the end-March deadline had failed. The meeting concluded the last special (negotiating) session of the CoA within the official modalities phase of the Doha round negotiations. Nevertheless, Harbinson said he would continue consultations on technical issues such as tariff formulas and Strategic Products (SPs) for developing countries after the mid-April Easter break, and that further CoA special sessions had been scheduled for June and July. He urged Members to "continue working together towards completing the job given to us by Ministers in Doha as soon as possible". While Harbinson and WTO Director-General Supachai Panitchpakdi overtly expressed their disappointment over Members' disability to agree on the modalities -- or formulas for negotiations -- for an agricultural framework accord, officials from key Members, such as the US and the EU were keen to downplay the failure. These Members justified their stance by referring to other deadlines, such as those on special and differential treatment for developing countries and on access to inexpensive, generic essential medicines, which have been missed as well in the course of the negotiations since November 2001.

The modalities still to be agreed are to set out the scope of the agriculture negotiations, the methodology to be followed during the actual process, and the end-results expected in the agriculture negotiations. Trade ministers had agreed in Doha to establish modalities by 31 March 2003. At the forthcoming fifth WTO Ministerial Conference, to be held from 10 to 14 September in Cancun, Mexico, Members are supposed to submit their draft country-specific offers for further farm trade liberalisation, which would be based on the modalities agreed. According to the Doha work programme, the agriculture talks, as well as all other negotiations within the 'single undertaking', are to be concluded by 1 January 2005.

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

If you require any assistance setting up your BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest subscription, please contact Malena Sell, Editor, by email at: [msell@ictsd.ch](mailto:msell@ictsd.ch), or by telephone at: (41-22) 917-8336

**Harbinson disappointed, but committed to continue work**

In his opening remarks to the 31 March formal session, the CoA Chair confirmed an earlier conclusion given at a 28 March informal plenary session that had followed a last set of negotiations beginning on 25 March (see [BRIDGES Weekly](#), 26 March 2003). He indicated that the modalities could not be established by the agreed deadline, and that he would not be able to produce a second modalities draft (see [BRIDGES Weekly](#), 20 March 2003). "This is, of course, a very serious matter. We must all be disappointed that all our efforts have not come to fruition," Harbinson said in his address to the formal plenary on 31 March. Nevertheless, he pointed to some positive aspects of the process, especially the "considerable progress made on a number of technical issues". He further said that he had "a strong sense from all sides of a continuing commitment" to continue the work underway so as to establish "modalities for further reform... as soon as possible".

In this context, however, Harbinson made clear that Members would have to work even harder in the coming period to develop the basis and framework for the necessary compromises. "To achieve this will require greater appreciation by all sides of the sensitivities and expectations of others," he added. At a news conference following the formal plenary session, Harbinson further declared that the "ball is clearly in Members' court now," as he felt that he had done all he could in terms of hammering out a draft compromise text for possible modalities. "I need a clearer signal from Members that they are in a more receptive mood to have another look at a new piece of paper," he added.

**The road to Cancun**

In terms of managing the crisis between now and the forthcoming Cancun Ministerial, the CoA special session Chair announced on 31 March that, after the Easter break, he would continue informal consultations on technical issues, including tariff reduction formulas, tariff rate quotas (TRQs), Strategic Products (SPs) for developing countries, a new special safeguard mechanism for developing countries, domestic support, preferential trade schemes, export credits, food aid, state trading enterprises, and geographical indications. Moreover, he earmarked further negotiating sessions to be held on 26 to 27 June and 1 July, as well as on 16 to 17 July.

Trade sources further indicated that they interpreted Harbinson's outline as a sign that he would now take a more integrated approach to the modalities negotiations, which would comprise numbers and targets, as well as rules-based elements. In his

modalities drafts submitted earlier, he had suggested agreeing on reduction modalities first, while deciding on disciplines at a later stage, sources said. It was further stated that Harbinson would try to get more capital-based officials involved in the consultations, and that he would schedule future meetings at times convenient for non-Geneva negotiators. All in all, Harbinson reportedly is hoping to have the modalities established before the Cancun meeting, as Members would need sufficient time to prepare their individual offers to be tabled at the Ministerial Conference. However, some sources noted that it is more than unlikely that modalities could be agreed before trade ministers meet in Mexico.

**The blame game**

In an official statement, the US said Members such as the EU and Japan were responsible for the failure to adopt modalities within the agreed timeframe. Hinting at the internal EU mid-term review of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) starting in June this year, the statement called on EU member states to endorse the CAP reform proposals presented last year by EU Agriculture Commissioner Franz Fischler (see [BRIDGES Weekly](#), 17 July 2002) so as to "give the [European] Commission more flexibility to meet the mandate of the 'Doha Development Round'". Australian Trade Minister Mark Vaile also lashed out at the EU, blaming it for "continuing to oppose efforts to bring about genuine reform of agricultural trade". Vaile further added that "The European Union's game appears to be to make the world wait until it is able to finalise the review of its Common Agricultural Policy and present the results of that process as a *fait accompli* in Geneva".

The EU, however, countered in a press release that the EU had done its homework with regard to moving the WTO agriculture talks. "The EU modalities proposal represents a middle way between extreme positions," Fischler said. Fischler also defended the EU's major use of export subsidies, stating that "bogus food aid," export credits (both mainly used by the US), and the pricing practices of certain state trading enterprises" (as in the case of Australia) also would have trade-distorting effects.

Notably, on 31 March the EU officially announced its decision to initiate dispute settlement proceedings against Australia to challenge its strict quarantine system. The system "flagrantly breaches WTO rules, despite Australia's constant claims to be the only beacon of free agricultural trade," EU Trade Commissioner Pascal Lamy commented.

ICTSD reporting; "Agriculture: trade diplomats downplay impact of missed deadline in WTO agriculture negotiations," WTO REPORTER, 1 April 2003;

"Australia blames EU, Japan for missed WTO farm deadline," DOW JONES, 1 April 2003; "WTO farm talks: 'We will plough on', Fischler says," EU PRESS RELEASE; "European Union to challenge Australia's protectionist food import regime at WTO," EU PRESS RELEASE.

---

## OTHER NEWS

---

### ONLY FEW SERVICES OFFERS TRICKLE IN BY END-MARCH DEADLINE

A few countries have recently submitted their initial offers of services liberalisation, adhering to an end-March deadline. According to the negotiating mandate on services that WTO Members agreed at Doha in 2001, "participants shall submit initial requests for specific commitments by 30 June 2002 and initial offers by 31 March 2003". The countries presenting their offers to the Council on Trade in Services (CTS) by the deadline -- mainly developed countries -- included the Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the US. The EU was not yet able to agree on its offer, but is expected to present it over the next few weeks. Switzerland said it would submit its proposal by 15 April. The offers are not publicly available. The WTO Secretariat indicated it expected offers to trickle in up until the next WTO Ministerial in September. The fact that only a few Members presented their services offers, with developing countries notably absent, is seen by some as a reaction to the many other deadlines missed in the current round of negotiations (i.e. TRIPS and health, implementation issues and concerns, special and differential treatment for developing countries, and agriculture). While many countries -- both developed and developing -- are interested in the current services negotiations, developing countries have seen no rush in this area, as deadlines essential to their interest have lapsed. Up to date, only about 30-plus developing countries have presented their services requests and none have presented offers. The US services offer is, according to some trade sources, becoming an important benchmark for other countries engaged in the services request-offer exercise, that have yet to submit their offers. The US services offer has politically kicked the ball of the request phase pushing other countries to do the same, and showing the intent to go ahead in the services area even when overall negotiations are stalling.

Regarding its content, the US proposal covers sectors such as financial services, legal services, telecommunications, express delivery, energy services, healthcare, higher education, and environmental services. The proposal consolidates much of existing liberalisation in US law, and goes further in certain

particular areas. The US request does not make offers in certain monopoly supply services, including the US postal services, or in certain sub-sectors, such as water supply services. All subsidies delivered under modes 1 and 2 (cross border supply and consumption abroad) were not committed under national treatment column (unbound), and the same holds for many of the subsidies under mode 3 (foreign commercial presence). According the US Trade Representative interpretation of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), the proposed offer will not interfere or affect: regulatory interests; specific assistance programmes to US citizens or minorities; or the autonomy of US educational institutions. Some US NGOs have reacted negatively to the US proposal. The Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP) has indicated its concern that the US services offer, "affects US state law. Trade negotiations could rewrite wide swaths of local law without the knowledge or vote of state legislatures and state attorneys general" and noted a lack of about consultations during the preparation of the services offer. Informally, various NGOs are celebrating that Canada, the US and the EU have made or plan to make their respective offers public, and call for full transparency as a rule in negotiations rather than an isolated incident.

ICTSD reporting; "Trade Facts", USTR, 31 March 2003; "Bush prepares to put U.S. Service Sectors on the negotiations table at WTO", PUBLIC CITIZEN and IATP, 31 March 2003.

---

### DISPUTE SETTLEMENT: PANEL RULES AGAINST US STEEL TARIFFS; PANEL ESTABLISHED ON US UPLAND COTTON

---

On 26 March, the interim panel report in the "US - Definitive Measures on Imports of Steel" was issued at the WTO, ruling against US steel tariffs. Early last year, the US imposed tariffs on most types of steel imported from, inter alia, the EU, and a number of countries in Latin America and Asia. The tariffs were ostensibly imposed to re-energise the ailing steel sector in the US. Such actions, referred to as a 'safeguard measures,' are allowed under Article 5 of the Agreement on Safeguards and Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which also detail the conditions to be met before such a measure is considered justified. According to the report, the US did not meet the conditions and had, in particular: failed to show an increase in imports (in fact, according to the complainants, there had been a decrease in steel imports in the material period); failed to adequately establish the link between imports and injury to its domestic steel industry; and had included import figures from NAFTA countries in its injury investigation even

though it had excused Canada and Mexico from application of the safeguard measures. The final report of the panel is due in early May, and if the panel's findings remain unchanged, the US will be open to the imposition of sanctions of an equivalent value by the EU and the other complainants. However, the US has already indicated that it will appeal an unfavourable decision. This would protract the dispute through the end of 2003.

### **US upland cotton subsidies challenged**

At an 18 March meeting of the WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB), Brazil's request for the formation of a panel in the "US - Subsidies on Upland Cotton" case (WT/DS267/7, searchable at <http://docsonline.wto.org>) was accepted. The US, which is the respondent, was locked into acceptance but made it clear that it would "mount a vigorous defence against the Brazilian case". According to the US, the dispute "would not give Brazil the result it is seeking". In the dispute, Brazil contends that the subsidies granted by the US government to its cotton farmers -- such as marketing loans, export credits, commodity certificates and direct payments -- are depressing world prices and are injurious to Brazilian cotton growers. Brazil claims that the cotton subsidies are exempted from the normal immunity granted under the "peace clause" of the WTO's Agreement on Agriculture (AoA), which protects countries using subsidies that comply with the Agreement from being challenged under other WTO agreements. Article 13 of the AoA exempts domestic support measures that comply with the peace clause from being challenged as illegal subsidies or as nullifying or impairing benefits normally accruing to a WTO Member through dispute settlement proceedings. This immunity, however, only applies as long as the level of domestic support for a commodity remains at or below 1992 levels. Brazil maintains that since 1992, the US has doubled the level of support to its farmers through subsidies programs.

Having endorsed the establishment of the panel at the March 18 meeting, the next step, to be finalised within 20 days, is the selection of panellists. If the parties are unable to agree on the selection -- which has been a common occurrence given the heavy-premium-nature of WTO disputes -- they are free to request the WTO Director General to do so on their behalf.

"WTO Rules Against U.S. on Steel Tariff," NEW YORK TIMES, 26 March 2003. "WTO Sets Up Dispute Panel to Resolve Brazil Case Against U.S. Cotton Subsidies," WTO REPORTER, 19 March 2003.

---

## **IN BRIEF**

---

### **US-MOROCCO FREE TRADE TALKS WOBBLE ALONG**

Talks aiming at a bilateral free trade agreement between the US and Morocco experienced difficulties last week due to the war in Iraq. The second round of talks, scheduled to take place on 24 March in Rabat, Morocco, were delayed by a day and moved to Geneva, Switzerland. The Moroccan daily L'Economiste reported that the talks were moved "far from public opinion disgusted" at the war. Marrakech and other major Moroccan cities have seen massive anti-war demonstrations. The US-Morocco talks were launched on 21 February, and are expected to be completed by the end of 2003 (see [BRIDGES Weekly](#), 22 January 2003). At the time of the launch, US Trade Representative Robert Zoellick stressed Morocco's role as a close US ally in the war against terrorism, and said the agreement would "send a signal throughout a tempestuous region of America's support for tolerant, open and more prosperous Muslim societies". The next round of talks will be held in May.

Meanwhile, USA Today reported that "spurred by the success of a recent US-Jordan free-trade agreement and the Bush administration's desire for closer economic ties with Muslim nations, a number of Mideast governments are pushing for trade pacts with the US," naming Egypt and Bahrain as possibly next in line. The agreement with Jordan was concluded in 2001.

"Morocco set to postpone free trade talks with U.S.," REUTERS, 24 March 2003; "Morocco, US resume trade talks," MIDDLE EAST ONLINE, 25 March 2003; "More Mideast nations seeking trade agreements with U.S.," USA TODAY, 25 March 2003.

---

### **RIGHTS EXPERT CALLS FOR JUST TRADE POLICIES**

Arjun Sengupta, an independent expert on the right to development appointed by the UN Commission on Human Rights, has called for fair, rights-based trade policies. Highlighting the impacts of globalisation -- which he said made the right to development a real possibility for countries around the globe -- he stressed that in practice, trade rules "severely constrained the ability of developing countries to adopt policies that would realise the right to development". His report to the Commission on the impact of international



economic and financial issues on the enjoyment of human rights, stressed that international organisations and individual countries should cooperate and adopt policies that enable all countries to implement their right to development. Drawing attention to the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), he highlighted its strengths and weaknesses from a right-to-development perspective.

Also at the Commission meeting, Bonaventure Bowa, Rapporteur of the Commission working group on the right to development, stressed the need for countries to eliminate protectionist policies that keep exports from developing countries out of developed country markets, and said they should stop subsidising economic sectors with a scope for developing country imports. Among many country statements, Uganda said market access for products and produce from developing countries was key to realising this right, while Argentina said the current world trade system is unjust because it limits the possibilities developing countries have to export agricultural products. The 59th session of the Commission, meeting from 17 March to 24 April in Geneva, considered the issue of right to development from 25-27 March.

To access the preliminary study of the independent expert on the right to development on the impact of international economic and financial issues on the enjoyment of human rights, visit: [http://www.unhchr.ch/Huridocda/Huridoca.nsf/0/6e17e9b31e0922c1c1256cbb00\\_340080/\\$FILE/G0215863.pdf](http://www.unhchr.ch/Huridocda/Huridoca.nsf/0/6e17e9b31e0922c1c1256cbb00_340080/$FILE/G0215863.pdf).

ICTSD reporting; "Countries Tell Commission On Human Rights That Greater Efforts Are Needed To Spur Development," UN PRESS RELEASE, 26 March 2003; "Commission On Human Rights Starts Debate On The Right To Development," UN PRESS RELEASE, 26 March 2003.

---

## **NEW EXPERT GROUP ON SINGAPORE ISSUES**

A new expert group has been formed in the UK by the Federal Trust for Education and Research to focus on the so called Singapore issues -- investment, competition policy, transparency in government procurement and trade facilitation. The expert group will scope out the potential for WTO negotiations in these areas, and will consist of members from various walks of society, including businesses and law firms, NGOs and academia. The members will meet on a regular basis over the next few months, and will exchange views with various players in the area of trade. The group will present a final report and recommendations in June and hold seminars in London, Geneva,

Brussels, Washington DC and Singapore. The Singapore issues, and the potential launch of WTO negotiations in these areas, are highly contentious. A group of NGOs recently started a campaign against negotiations in these areas (see [BRIDGES Weekly](#), 26 March 2003), and many developing countries oppose negotiations.

To visit the Federal Trust for Education and Research website on the Singapore issues, go to: <http://www.fedtrust.co.uk/newissues.htm>.

---

## **WTO IN BRIEF**

---



---

### **GI NEGOTIATIONS PROGRESS IN INFORMAL MODE**

The Ambassador Eui-yong Chung (Korea), Chair of the Council for Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) special session, has produced a document containing "possible elements" and "options" for a multilateral register for geographical indications (GIs) for wines and spirits. The paper was based on consultations with a number of Members, and intended to provide momentum in the negotiations. It has been discussed among Members and at informal sessions on 21 March and 1 April. Chair Eui-yong Chung stressed that the paper does not set out consensus positions, and he will circulate an actual first draft on his own responsibility before the next formal TRIPs Council meeting unless Members provide him with one. Members are scrutinising the draft topic by topic, although they continue to disagree on the key issue. Australia, Canada, Japan, the US and others envisage the system to function mainly as a database and that the protection of registered terms should be "voluntary". The EC, Bulgaria, Switzerland, Sri Lanka and others are advocating that Members should be required to protect the GIs registered in the multilateral system and that "voluntary" registration would allow countries to choose whether to register a particular GI. The former group said a negotiating draft would be premature at this time, while the latter felt that these issues had been discussed for years, and supported a phase of real negotiations by the end of April.

WTO Members are mandated to finalise the negotiations on a multilateral system by the next WTO Ministerial Conference in September. The next TRIPs Council meeting is tentatively scheduled for 29-30 April.

ICTSD reporting.

## EVENTS & RESOURCES

### EVENTS

For a more comprehensive list of events in trade and sustainable development, please refer to ICTSD's web calendar at: <http://www.ictsd.org/cal/index.htm>. If you would like to submit an event, please email [events@ictsd.ch](mailto:events@ictsd.ch).

#### Coming Up This Week: 3 - 10 April

3-4 April, Brussels, Belgium: FIFTH BLUEPRINT WORKSHOP: "FORESIGHT AND INTEGRATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND INNOVATION POLICY". This event seeks to assess various topics including green technology, sectoral innovation systems (SIS), environmental management and financing of sustainable innovations. For further information, see: [http://www.blueprint-network.net/pdf/atticonvegini/5th\\_WS\\_programme.pdf](http://www.blueprint-network.net/pdf/atticonvegini/5th_WS_programme.pdf).

4-6 April, Durham, North Carolina: INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC GOODS AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY AFTER TRIPS. The Center for the Study of the Public Domain at Duke Law School is hosting a conference on the intellectual property rights regime in order to examine its economic and legal foundations. Special attention will be paid to the Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) and other international agreements. For more information on the conference, please visit: <http://www.law.duke.edu/trips/index.html>.

7-8 April, Chatham House, London: TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES POST-DOHA. Organised by the International Institute for Sustainable Development and the Royal Institute of International Affairs. During this event investment rules, multilateral environmental agreements, sustainable development and the WTO will be discussed. For further information, contact: Sam Usiskin; tel: (44 20) 7957-5711; email: [sam.usiskin@riia.org](mailto:sam.usiskin@riia.org).

8-10 April, Manila, the Philippines: SOUTH EAST ASIA FORUM ON GHG MARKET MECHANISMS AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. Arranged by the International Emissions Trading Association (IETA), the event will provide the opportunity for participants to discuss and interact with policy makers and business representatives from Indonesia, Thailand, Philippines, Malaysia and Vietnam, as well as OECD countries. Recent developments in climate change policy, their impact on market mechanisms and GHG market and

the overall contribution they can make in the drive for sustainable development in the region will be some of the topics discussed. For further information, see: <http://www.ieta.org>.

### WTO Events

An updated list of forthcoming WTO meetings is posted at: [http://www.wto.org/english/news\\_e/meets.pdf](http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/meets.pdf). Please bear in mind that dates and times of WTO meetings are often changed, and that the WTO does not always announce the important informal meetings of the different bodies. Unless otherwise indicated, all WTO meetings are held at the WTO, Centre William Rappard, rue de Lausanne 154, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland, and are open to WTO Members and accredited observers only.

3-4 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS.

4 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO TRADE NEGOTIATIONS COMMITTEE.

4 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO TRADE POLICY REVIEW BODY - BURUNDI.

4 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO WORKING PARTY ON THE ACCESSION OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

10-11 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO SPECIAL SESSION OF THE DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BODY.

### Other Forthcoming Events

15 April, Washington, US: SERVICES 2003. This event, hosted by the Coalition of Service Industries, the Department of Commerce, and the US Trade Representative, will include two discussion panels on topics related to WTO trade and services negotiations and will include presentations from the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative and the Chief Economist of the Department of Commerce. The topics of the discussions will be public services and the right to regulate, and challenges with regard to developing countries and environmental issues. For more information on this event, please contact: Jennifer Moll, Conference Coordinator, tel: +1-202-482-1316; fax: +1-202-482-2669; e-mail: [OSImail@ita.doc.gov](mailto:OSImail@ita.doc.gov).

15 April, Madison, US: ENERGY POLICY AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE - A PATH FORWARD. Organised by Alliant Energy, this regionally-focussed meeting will seek to find ways of moving beyond the rhetoric toward practical steps to begin to limit the impacts that global climate change is starting to have

on the environment. For further information, visit:  
<http://www.environmentalconference.alliantenergy.com/>

22-23 April, Washington, US: LINKAGES: HOW DO WE BRIDGE THE GAP? This event, organised by CUTS Centre for International Trade, Economics & Environment (CUTS-CITEE) and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, is part of a series of sessions intended to enhance the understanding of trade issues concerning the connection between labour and environmental standards. For updates on this event, please visit: <http://cuts.org/forthcoming-events.htm>.

14-15 May, Geneva, Switzerland: SECOND International forum on Trade facilitation - SHARING THE GAINS OF GLOBALISATION IN THE NEW SECURITY ENVIRONMENT. This forum, organised by the UN Economic Commission for Europe in cooperation with other international organisations dealing with trade facilitation, will focus on the need to allow weaker participants in the global trading system to receive a fair share of the benefits of trade facilitation, and on new initiatives aimed at increasing security in the international trading system. The Forum will seek to define practical measures to progress trade facilitation in the new international environment, highlighting possible ways of constructing an equitable mechanism of facilitating trade allowing small and large countries and businesses to share the benefits. Parallel to the Forum, workshops on technical issues and intellectual property rights in trade facilitation will be organised. For further information, contact Forum Coordinator Mario Apostolov, tel: +41 22 9171134; fax: +41 22 9170034; e-mail: [mario.apostolov@unece.org](mailto:mario.apostolov@unece.org); internet: <http://www.unece.org/trade/forums/forum03/index.htm>.

17-20 June, Marrakech, Morocco: IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF TRADE. This event is part of the 23rd annual conference of the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) and will address topics such as capacity building and technical assistance in developing countries, international consultation and stakeholder involvement, assessment techniques, trade development policy, multilateral environmental agreements, and corporate responsibility in relation to technology transfer, multinational operations, and free trade zones. Papers concerning these and related topics are welcome. For more information on this event, please contact visit: Clive George, e-mail: [clive.george@man.ac.uk](mailto:clive.george@man.ac.uk); or Bernice Goldsmith, e-mail: [bernice@encs.concordia.ca](mailto:bernice@encs.concordia.ca); internet: <http://www.iaia.org>.

## RESOURCES

TRADE PREFERENCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL GOODS. By Scott Vaughan, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (CEIP). Trade, Equity, and Development Series Issue no. 5. According to the author, for the WTO, the most important development in a decade related to trade-environment linkages is the agreement to liberalise commerce in environmental goods and services. If properly executed, the agreement will increase the availability of "green" goods in global markets and break the North-South deadlock that has paralysed discussion on the trade regime governing such goods. To download visit: [http://www.ceip.org/files/Publications/TED\\_5.asp?from=pubdate](http://www.ceip.org/files/Publications/TED_5.asp?from=pubdate).

"Fighting back: the growth of alternative trade" by Mark LeClair in DEVELOPMENT 46 (1, 2003): 66-73. The author looks at the growing influence of fair trade, the marketing and sale of products at greater than free trade prices, on international trade. He argues that fair trade represents a unique response to the perceived inequities of unrestricted free trade and through a survey conducted with fair trade organizations shows how it is operating at the moment to balance inequalities, though he warns there is a precarious future for the artisans relying on such a system.

"Consumer sovereignty, economic efficiency and the trade liberalisation debate" by John Gowdy and Marsha Walton in INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES 3 (, 2003): 1-13. The authors examine the policies of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) as an example of the conflict in neoclassical theory between consumer sovereignty and efficiency in production. They claim that WTO policies attempt to institutionalise 'progress through increased efficiency' by ruling out any restriction of trade based on national sovereignty, or the social or environmental context of the commodity, and present evidence for this in WTO policy statements.

UKRAINE: WTO ACCESSION STRATEGY. By the Ukrainian Ministry of Economy and European Integration with the support of the AHT Consulting Group provides an overview of the Ukrainian accession to the WTO. The report states the conviction that Ukraine will become a WTO member, and that its accession to the WTO will become a powerful engine driving economic reforms, which in turn will help create a foundation for achieving increased economic growth rates. To access the report visit: <http://www.aht.org/eng/articles/2003/wto/wto.pdf>.

DEVELOPING COUNTRY PROPOSALS ON MODALITIES FOR FURTHER REFORM IN AGRICULTURE. By Luisa Bernal (Action Aid and

CAFOD). The paper summarises the different proposals made by developing countries on issues of development and food security, including the food security mechanism, balancing mechanism, and special safeguards. To access the paper, visit: <http://www.cafod.org.uk/policy/proposals2003.shtml>.

DEVELOPMENT AND AGRICULTURE IN THE WTO: A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE DEVELOPMENT BOX, THE EU'S FOOD SECURITY BOX AND THE HARBINSON DRAFT MODALITIES. By Duncan Green and Tim Rice (Action Aid and CAFOD). The paper provides a detailed comparison of the three proposals on key issues and concludes that, rather than taking up developing country proposals for the inclusion of permanent and integral rules for special and differential treatment in the Agreement on Agriculture (the 'development box'), the EU merely offers a minor extension of special safeguards to developing countries as well as the 'possibility' of allowing greater flexibility in domestic support. While the Harbinson draft goes a little further, it too fails the development test on a number of counts. To access the paper, visit: <http://www.cafod.org.uk/policy/harbinson2003.shtml>.

---

### POSITION VACANCY

WWF is seeking to recruit a Project Manager on Sustainability Assessment of Trade. This is a half-time position, based in Gland, Switzerland. The main focus of the work is to manage project activities on sustainability assessment in different locations (US, Europe, Philippines, Brazil), including international level advocacy. The candidate should possess a first degree in economics and preferably a post graduate qualification covering some combination of economics, ecology and international relations, and have three to five years of experience. The closing date for applications is 4 April 2003. For more information, or to submit your application, contact Philippa Sekkiou, Human Resources Department at WWF International, e-mail: [recruitments@wwfint.org](mailto:recruitments@wwfint.org).

A searchable archive of **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**© can be accessed at: [http://www.newsbulletin.org/bulletins/WhichBulletin.cfm?Bulletin\\_ID=14&SID=](http://www.newsbulletin.org/bulletins/WhichBulletin.cfm?Bulletin_ID=14&SID=)

**BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**© is published by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), <http://www.ictsd.org/>. Electronic distribution is carried out by the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP).

Contributors to this issue of **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**© are Kevin McAdam, Heike Baumuller, Victor Mosoti, Candis Robinson, David Vivas and Alex Werth. Editor: Malena Sell, [msell@ictsd.ch](mailto:msell@ictsd.ch). Managing Editor is Hug Cameron. Managing Editor is Andrew Crosby. The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz, [rmelendez@ictsd.ch](mailto:rmelendez@ictsd.ch). ICTSD is an independent, not-for-profit organisation based at: 13, ch. des Anémones, 1219 Geneva, Switzerland, tel: (41-22) 917-8492; fax: 917-8093. Excerpts from **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**© may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and should be directed to the Editor or the Director.

**BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest** is made possible in 2001 - 2003 through the generous support of the Government of the United Kingdom (DFID). Additional support is provided by ICTSD's core donors: the Governments of Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden; Christian Aid (UK), MISEREOR, NOVIB (NL), Oxfam (UK) and the Swiss Coalition of Development Organisations (Switzerland). The **Weekly** also benefits from support for the **BRIDGES** series of publications including: the Rockefeller Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and Swiss Development Cooperation. ISSN 1563-003X