



INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR
TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT

Bridges

Weekly Trade News Digest

21 July 2004

Volume 8 Number 26

LEAD STORIES

DOHA ROUND: LAST-DITCH EFFORT TO FIND
AGREEMENT ON PACKAGE DEAL UNDERWAY 1
AGRICULTURE: DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
CRITICISE GROSSER DRAFT FOR DEVELOPED-
COUNTRY BIAS 3

IN BRIEF

EU SUGAR REFORM SPURS STRONG REACTIONS 5
EU APPROVES ANOTHER GM IMPORT AS WTO
DISPUTE DRAGS ON 5

WTO IN BRIEF

MAURITIUS CALLS FOR WTO MEETING ON TEXTILE
QUOTA PHASE-OUT 6
RUSSIAN ACCESSION TALKS FOCUS ON IP
VIOLATION PROBLEMS 6

EVENTS & RESOURCES

VACANCY AT ICTSD 6
EVENTS 7
RESOURCES 8

LEAD STORIES

DOHA ROUND: LAST-DITCH EFFORT TO FIND AGREEMENT ON PACKAGE DEAL UNDERWAY

On 16 July, WTO Director-General Supachai Panitchpakdi and General Council Chair Shotaro Oshima circulated a first draft Framework Text on the Doha Round trade negotiations, which Members are expected to adopt by the end of July. Following the release of the text, Members met in a number of formats, including a heads of delegation meeting called by Supachai on 19-20 July, informal meetings on agriculture and industrial market access on 20 July, and a video conference among the Five Interested Parties' (FIPs) group -- the US, EC, Australia, Brazil and India. The G-20 group of developing countries comprising, inter alia, Brazil, India, China and South Africa also met on 20 July. Negotiations continue on all issues and in different configurations.

The end-July deadline represents the WTO's attempt to put the Doha negotiations back on track following the collapse of talks at last September's Ministerial Conference. Members are working towards the deadline in order to keep the momentum up in the Doha round of trade negotiations. Should they fail to agree on the outline for negotiations by the end of the month, trade talks are likely to stall for months, if not for years, with US elections and leadership changes in the European Commission coming up towards the end of the year. The draft Framework Text covers all areas currently under negotiation, including agriculture, industrial market access, development issues, services and trade facilitation (one of the controversial Singapore issues, which also include investment, competition and transparency in government procurement).

Members see draft Framework as an acceptable point of departure

Introducing the draft Framework in a heads of delegation (HODs) meeting on 19 July, Supachai said it represented "a first draft whose purpose is to provide a basis for further negotiation among Members," and

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

called on countries to compromise during the two intense weeks of consultations left before the end-July deadline. He stressed that the paper was "not an agreed text but a negotiating document. We expect it will evolve over the course of the coming days. However, it is important to remember that this text is based on consultations and negotiations stretching back many months".

The cover letter to the draft Framework Text (see [http://www.ictsd.org/ministerial/cancun/docs/JOB\(04\)-96.pdf](http://www.ictsd.org/ministerial/cancun/docs/JOB(04)-96.pdf)) states that the text is intended to ensure the continued progress of the negotiations, rather than serve as a Ministerial Declaration. The text itself, in the form of a draft General Council decision, agrees on action in the areas of agriculture, industrial market access, development and other negotiating bodies. Under the draft decision, Members would also launch negotiations on trade facilitation.

For an outline of the text on agriculture -- the centrepiece of the negotiations -- and discussions around it, see the following story in this issue of BRIDGES Weekly.

While seeking a number of changes to particular parts of the text, Members agreed that it formed an acceptable basis for negotiations. Several countries cautioned that the text was complex, and said they needed time to consult with their capitals. Both the US and EC said that they wanted to see more balance between the different areas of the draft, especially agriculture, industrial market access and services. A number of developing countries also called for a more balanced text overall, emphasising the need for stronger and more operational text on development issues.

Industrial market access stirs controversy

On non-agricultural market access (NAMA), the Framework Text includes the draft negotiated but never adopted in Cancun -- the so-called Derbez text -- as a 'platform for further negotiation' in an annex. According to Chair of the industrial market access group Stefan Johannesson, the text remained in annex form because real negotiations had never taken off on industrial market access, with Members waiting for an outcome in agriculture first (see BRIDGES Weekly, 16 June 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-06-16/story2.htm>). Johannesson sent a letter to Supachai and Chair Oshima on 9 July, forwarding the Derbez text and identifying areas of concern.

At the 19-20 July heads of delegation (HODs) meeting, Nigeria, speaking for the African Group, said the Group could not accept the Derbez text as a basis for negotiations, and asked for clarification of the legal

status of the text, including the letter by Chair Johannesson. Brazil asked how the discussions would proceed, given that a number of countries opposed the Derbez text. Both the EC and US felt that the text represented a bottom line, and negotiations should be based on it.

Development issues under-developed?

The Framework Text specifies that all developing countries shall benefit from special and differential treatment (S&D). The text goes on to say that the specific concerns of preference-dependent, commodity-dependent countries and net food-importing developing countries should be taken into account, as should the concerns of small, vulnerable developing economies, "without creating a sub-category of Members".

The Framework Text further instructs the Committee on Trade and Development special session to send recommendations to the General Council on agreement-specific proposals, and to address all other outstanding work, including cross-cutting issues. Deadline dates are left up to negotiation.

A number of developing countries raised concerns regarding the treatment of development issues in the text. Brazil, echoed by other Latin American countries as well as some Asian countries, opposed differentiation between developing countries and called for a stronger focus on actual substance. The African Group said it was concerned about lack of progress in the area more generally, and felt the text lacked ambition. The group wanted a clear roadmap and an accelerated process on S&D, and asked for issues such as commodities, intellectual property protection and public health to be included in the text. Indonesia called for more specificity on S&D, and a balance between this area and the overall text.

Negotiations on trade facilitation to be launched

The Framework Text, in its current format, launches negotiations on trade facilitation, while the other three Singapore issues will be left out of the Doha Round. The modalities for negotiations on trade facilitation are included in an annex, which spells out the need for technical assistance, capacity building and S&D for developing countries.

The African group said the remaining three issues should be dropped not just from the Doha Round but from the entire WTO work programme. The group cautioned against putting trade facilitation on a fast track, calling for clear decisions first on issues such as technical assistance and the applicability of dispute settlement. Bangladesh called for balance, stressing that work on trade facilitation seemed much further

ahead than other areas under negotiation. India supported more clarification of trade facilitation at this stage.

Other reactions to the text

A number of countries said services should be given more prominence in the draft. India expressed general dissatisfaction with the text on implementation issues, which states that Members will "renew their determination to find appropriate solutions". Brazil asked why the extension of geographic indications had been singled out among implementation issues. The EC said all implementation issues should be negotiated, with geographic indications being an EC priority.

The race towards the end

In order to reach agreement on a July Framework, Members will continue to work in various formats to find an acceptable compromise. A HODs meeting will be called on Friday, 23 July, and a revised draft will likely be released following the weekend. The final meeting of the General Council is scheduled for 27-29 July, although Chair Oshima indicated that 30 July was the "drop-dead" deadline. A number of trade ministers -- including those from major Members such as the EC, US and Japan -- are tentatively planning to attend the General Council meeting.

ICTSD reporting.

AGRICULTURE: DEVELOPING COUNTRIES CRITICISE GROSER DRAFT FOR DEVELOPED-COUNTRY BIAS

On 20 July, a group of around 30 key WTO Members came together to review the framework for agriculture modalities drafted by the Chair of the WTO Committee on Agriculture (CoA) special (negotiating) session, Ambassador Tim Groser. The framework draft was attached as Annex A to the draft General Council (GC) decision (see [http://www.ictsd.org/ministerial/cancun/docs/JOB\(04\)-96.pdf](http://www.ictsd.org/ministerial/cancun/docs/JOB(04)-96.pdf)) circulated by GC Chair Shotaro Oshima and WTO Director-General Supachai Panitchpakdi on 16 July (see related story, this issue). As expected, the seven-page Annex A did not provide a high level of specificity, due to the wide gaps still remaining between countries' positions. Groser did not, for example, come up with a specific tariff reduction formula, nor did he make concrete proposals on the treatment of special products (SPs) or the provision of duty- and quota-free access for imports from least-developed countries (LDCs). Developing countries in particular criticised

Annex A for what they saw as significant imbalances in the level of specificity on issues important to developed countries, on the one hand, and those crucial to developing country Members, on the other. Several sources also questioned whether the vague language in Annex A could really help move the negotiations forward.

Market access

Annex A proposes a 'tiered' formula for reducing tariffs in both developed and developing countries, i.e. a formula under which tariffs would be divided into different bands depending on their respective bound tariff level. LDCs would be excluded from any tariff reduction commitments. Reductions would be made from bound rates, with higher tariffs being cut more than lower ones. Notably, the number of bands, the thresholds for defining the bands, as well as the type of reduction methodology -- e.g. using the Swiss formula or Uruguay Round formula -- would be subject to post-July modalities negotiations. Also, according to the framework, the issue of establishing an overall tariff cap would require "further evaluation".

On 'sensitive' products -- products that the EC and G-10 agricultural net-importers such as Switzerland and Japan would like to shield from substantial tariff cuts -- the text proposes that the number of products currently under tariff rate quotas (TRQs) would be "considered a very close approximation of the maximum permissible number of tariff lines for sensitive products". This, sources reported, would eventually allow countries to designate around a quarter of all their products as 'sensitive'. The framework further states that "substantial improvements" would be provided for 'sensitive' products through a combination of tariff cuts and new TRQ commitments.

With respect to 'sensitive' products in developing countries, the Groser text left most details open, stating the need for more clarity on "what contribution is likely to be forthcoming from developing countries [with respect to their 'sensitive' products]". Qualifying sensitive products in developing countries would therefore have to be determined in the post-framework stage, with the additional proviso that developing countries would -- under special and differential treatment (S&D) -- generally be subject to lesser reduction commitments. They would also be able to designate a number of special products (SPs) with no TRQs expansion requirements, and would have access to a new special safeguard mechanism (SSM).

Domestic support

The Annex A draft requires subsidising Members to reduce the overall sum of their trade-distortive

subsidies (including Amber Box, Blue Box and de minimis support) under a 'tiered' formula, which would cut subsidies progressively -- i.e. higher subsidy levels would be cut more than lower ones. In addition, Amber Box subsidies (trade-distorting support) would be reduced substantially from final bound levels under a progressive 'tiered' formula. Product-specific support would be capped at historical levels to be agreed, with the addition that "some of these product-specific caps will then be reduced".

On Blue Box payments (partially decoupled payments under production-limiting programmes), the framework text for the most part accommodates the US concern that its disciplines be altered to allow the US to notify its countercyclical payments under the 2002 US Farm Act as Blue Box measures. Under the current proposal, such payments could be scheduled as 'blue' as long they are "unrelated to current production". During the implementation period, Blue Box levels would be reduced under a cap to be agreed. Members with particularly high Blue Box levels would, however, not be asked to make "a wholly disproportionate cut."

Regarding the Green Box (decoupled subsidies), Annex A provides for the review of its criteria to ensure that measures in the box are truly at most minimally trade-distorting. Its "basic concepts, principles and effectiveness" would remain, and non-trade concerns taken into account. The transparency of new Green Box programmes would be enhanced, through, inter alia, commitments to notify new Green Box programmes completely and in a timely manner.

Export competition

The draft text clearly states that all forms of export subsidies are to be eliminated in parallel, and disciplines on all export measures established, with equivalent effect, by a "credible end date". This would include export subsidies, the trade-distorting elements of export credits and insurance programmes, trade distorting practices of state trading enterprises, and food aid used as a mechanism for surplus disposal leading to commercial displacement.

Cotton

With respect to cotton, the text states that this issue would be addressed as an integral part of the agriculture negotiations, but in an ambitious and expeditious manner. This could be achieved through effective reductions and capping of product-specific subsidies, through significant reduction commitments per tariff line, and the elimination of trade-distorting elements of export competition instruments such as

export subsidies. Moreover, the substantive part of the draft General Council Decision states that Members will try to work towards building coherence between the trade and development aspects of the cotton issue, e.g. by promoting cooperation between the WTO Secretariat and the development community.

Reactions to the framework text

The release of the draft framework text generated strong reactions among Members. No country outright rejected the document, but many voiced their strong displeasure with the draft. Generally, some observers pointed to a North-South divide in reactions to the document, with developing countries being much more critical of the document than developed countries.

At an informal heads of delegation (HOD) meeting at the WTO on 19-20 July, as well as an informal meeting focusing specifically on agriculture, delegates expressed varied reactions to the draft. The sections on 'sensitive' products under the market access pillar, and the proposed modification of the Blue Box category of domestic support created the strongest reactions. On sensitive products, many developing countries, along with the US, complained that the text gave too much flexibility to developed countries to protect sensitive products. Brazil, representing the G-20 group of major developing countries, argued that the text on sensitive products was biased in favour of developed countries because flexibilities for developed countries to protect their sensitive products are clearly articulated in the text, while similar protections for developing countries were to be negotiated at a later date. In contrast, the G-10 said the draft text did not include enough flexibility for them to protect their sensitive products, as they would be forced to expand their TRQs for these.

Proposed changes to the Blue Box also generated much criticism, especially from the G-20 and the Cairns group of agricultural exporters. These changes, which would allow the US to shelter some domestic subsidies now covered by the Amber Box prompted some Members to seek additional disciplines on so-called "box shifting". Brazil's ambassador to the WTO, Luiz Felipe de Seixas Correa, said it was important that the modified Blue Box not serve as a "blank check" for developed countries to avoid reducing trade-distorting domestic support.

Most developed countries accepted the text as an adequate basis for further negotiations. The EC indicated that it was generally happy with the text, but that it sought much more precision and clarification on domestic support and export competition. The US voiced its concern about the potentially low level of ambition in market access, but said it was ready to accept the text as a basis for further discussion.

Canada made positive comments about the draft in general, but reacted negatively to new disciplines on state trading enterprises, fearing that the changes could threaten the survival of the Canadian Wheat Board.

India said the draft did not provide the required balance, fairness or equity between the provisions for developed countries and those of developing countries in the area of agriculture. Speaking on behalf of the Africa Group, Ambassador Matthew Nwagwu of Nigeria also commented on the lower level of specificity on developing country issues in the draft. In addition, he voiced displeasure about the inclusion of cotton in the agriculture agreement, calling for consultations to resolve this matter. Representing the G-33, Indonesia expressed its disappointment with how SPs and the SSM had been addressed in the draft, and said that the G-33's ability to join any consensus was dependent on how SPs and SSM were finally dealt with in the framework.

ICTSD reporting: "India Denounces Draft Negotiations," FINANCIAL EXPRESS MUMBAI, 20 July 2004; "WTO Members Review Draft Framework On Agriculture; Some Provisions Panned," WTO REPORTER, 21 July 2004; "WTO Draft Declaration 'Disappointing'," OXFAM RELEASE, 16 July 2004.

IN BRIEF

EU SUGAR REFORM SPURS STRONG REACTIONS

On 14 July, the EC released an anticipated outline for reform of the EU sugar regime. Though the details of the reform had been leaked at the end of June (see BRIDGES Weekly, 30 June 2004 <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-06-30/inbrief.htm#1>), the official release still was met by strong reactions. Among other changes, the reform will reduce the EU's intervention price for sugar by 33 percent and the minimum price for sugar beet by 37 percent over three years. Other elements of the reform include reducing the European production quota for sugar by 2.8 million tons over four years and merging two national production quotas. The reforms will begin in January 2005, and will be implemented over four years.

The EC proposal faced heavy criticism from many fronts. Within Europe, farmers in uncompetitive EU regions, such as Ireland and the Nordic countries, questioned a reform they said would kill off their sugar production, provide no benefits to the poorest

developing countries, while mainly opening the market to countries such as Brazil "where social and environmental conditions of sugar farming are to say the least, questionable". African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) sugar supplying countries also expressed serious concern about the reform. These countries are upset about the unilateral decision to reform the ACP-EU Sugar Protocol, which has provided certain developing country farmers preferred access to Europe's markets since 1975. Even though the EU will maintain preferential access for producers in ACP countries, the reform will eventually reduce the price these producers receive by more than one-third. By 2008, this will result in a loss of 90 million dollars a year for these countries. Under the current proposal, EU sugar producers will be compensated for 60 percent of the price reduction, but ACP producers will not receive the same support. International organisations have also spoken out against the reform. Oxfam and WWF International released a joint statement describing the reform as a "half-hearted effort". They said the new system would "allow continued export dumping on developing countries, thereby undermining poor farmers' livelihoods".

For more information on the EU sugar reform, see http://europa.eu.int/comm/agriculture/capreform/index_en.htm

"European Commission's Sugar Plan will not end Destructive Regime," OXFAM AND WWF RELEASE, 14 July 2004; "Caribbean Bitter at EU Sugar Reform," TERRAVIVA, 18 July 2004.

EU APPROVES ANOTHER GM IMPORT AS WTO DISPUTE DRAGS ON

On 19 July the European Commission authorised Monsanto's NK603 corn, genetically modified (GM) to tolerate the herbicide Roundup Ready. This EC move followed the failure of European environment ministers to reach a decision on the corn at their last meeting (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 8 July 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/04-07-08/inbrief.htm#5>). The approval only applies for the use of corn as feed -- not for cultivation -- and imports will only be allowed once the maize also has been approved for food use. Agriculture ministers, meeting on 19 July on this issue, also failed to reach a decision on food use and it will again be up to the Commission to decide on the authorisation by late September. While the GM maize already was the second variety authorised by the Commission since approvals were put on hold in 1998, the US administration stressed that they would continue to pursue the WTO case against the EU's (now no longer existent) de facto moratorium on GM approvals (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 11 June 2004,

<http://www.ictsd.org/biores/04-06-11/story1.htm>). "Our bottom line is Europe needs to have a predictable, timely, transparent and science-based regulatory system for biotech products," said Richard Mills, spokesperson for the US Trade Representative. The proceedings, however, have been delayed to allow parties additional time to prepare their rebuttals (see BRIDGES Weekly, 7 July 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-07-07/wtoinbrief.htm#1>). No new timeline has been set for when the Panel will issue its report.

"GMOs: Commission authorises import of GM-maize for use in animal feed," IP/04/957, 19 July 2004; "Europe approves genetically modified corn as animal feed," NYT, 20 July 2004.

WTO IN BRIEF

MAURITIUS CALLS FOR WTO MEETING ON TEXTILE QUOTA PHASE-OUT

Mauritius sent a letter to WTO Members on 20 July, calling for a meeting to discuss the impending phase-out of textile quotas at the end of the year. Textiles coalitions have been calling for an emergency meeting, but only a WTO Member government can make the move (see BRIDGES Weekly, 23 June 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-06-23/story6.htm>).

According to trade sources, Mauritius would like to see the meeting focus on vulnerable countries in sub-Saharan Africa. A number of developing countries that currently enjoy preferential access to developed country markets, through schemes such as the US African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), fear they will lose all access after quotas are lifted and more competitive producers, such as China and India, pick up large market shares. These small and vulnerable economies are concerned that the development gains that their infant textile industries have allowed them to make will be lost and the industries devastated. The EC recently reviewed its preference schemes in light of the upcoming quota phase-out (see BRIDGES Weekly, 14 July 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-07-14/inbrief.htm#2>).

"Mauritius Requests WTO Meeting To Discuss Textile Quota Elimination," WTO REPORTER, 21 July 2004.

RUSSIAN ACCESSION TALKS FOCUS ON IP VIOLATION PROBLEMS

The WTO Working Party on the Accession of the Russian Federation met in Geneva on 16 July. At the meeting, both the US and the EC stressed the need for Moscow to crack down on intellectual property right violations. Japan, Australia, Norway and Switzerland echoed these concerns. Specifically, the US asked why Russia sold counterfeiting equipment rather than destroying it after such equipment was seized in police crackdowns. US music, software and film industry groups believe they lose up to US\$1 billion a year in Russia due to counterfeiting. Russia worked out an accession deal with the EC, its main trading partner, on 21 May this year (see BRIDGES Weekly, 2 June 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-06-02/story5.htm>).

Russia still needs to clinch bilateral deals with a number of Members requesting them, including China, Japan and Australia. Russia has indicated it hopes to reach an agreement with the US before the US presidential elections in November this year, improving Russian prospects for completing its now eleven-year accession process in 2005 or 2006. In addition to raising copyright concerns, the US wants to see improvements in Russia's offers in the areas of insurance and banking, as well as lower tariffs on aircraft imports and a deal limiting agriculture subsidies. The next meeting of the Working Party will likely take place in September or October this year.

"US, EU press Russia on piracy, customs at WTO talks," REUTERS, 16 July 2004; "'Dark Cloud' of Piracy Hangs Over WTO Bid," MOSCOW TIMES, 19 July 2004; "Russia's WTO Bid Is Timed to U.S. Poll," ST. PETERSBURG TIMES, 20 July 2004.

EVENTS & RESOURCES

VACANCY AT ICTSD

EDITOR, BRIDGES WEEKLY TRADE NEWS DIGEST. The Editor will have the overall responsibility for the full production process of ICTSD's BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest. In addition, the Editor will provide support to the BRIDGES Monthly Review. The primary duties and responsibilities of the Editor include: writing for and editing BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest, as well as managing the editorial team; serving as a focal point for information gathering and dissemination within ICTSD; developing both substantive and technical aspects of BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest and

other ICTSD publications, as well as the ICTSD website; and providing substantive input into and coordination between BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest and BRIDGES Monthly Review. ICTSD is looking for a candidate with a solid understanding of trade and sustainable development issues, as well as a background in journalism and writing. To apply, please send an expression of interest along with a CV and three writing samples to Malena Sell at ICTSD (email: msell@ictsd.ch) by 15 August. For further information see http://www.ictsd.org/about/ar/Weekly_Editor.pdf

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.

Coming Up: 22-30 July

19-22 July, London, UK: **TAKING FORWARD THE WORLD TRADE NEGOTIATIONS**. This Wilton Park conference will explore issues such as the way forward in the Doha Round, ways to improve the functioning of the WTO, the roles of the various new negotiating groups, regionalism, coherence, developing country issues, and implications of EU enlargement and agricultural reform. For further information contact Susan Linfield, Conference Administration, Wilton Park, Wiston, tel: +44-1903-817728; fax: +44-1903-814217; email: susan.linfield@wiltonpark.org.uk; Internet: <http://www.wiltonpark.org.uk/web/welcome.html>

22 July, Washington D.C., USA: **CLOTHING OPTIONAL? WHAT'S ALL THE BUZZ ABOUT TEXTILES IN 2005?** Organised by the Washington International Trade Association (WITA), this event will feature presentations by Erik Autor, International Trade Counsel of National Retail Federation and Auggie Tantillo, American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition. For more information see <http://www.wita.org/content.cfm?L1=4&QA=245>

25-30 July, Trondheim, Norway: **XI WORLD CONGRESS OF RURAL SOCIOLOGY**. This event will address a diverse range of food security interests under the theme of "Globalisation, risks and resistance". For further information contact Mark Shucksmith, ESRS, tel: +44-1224-273-901; fax: +44-1224-273-902; e-mail: IRSA@abdn.ac.uk; Internet: <http://www.irsaworld.org/XI/>

WTO Events

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

16 July: WTO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT.

21-22 July: WTO TEXTILES MONITORING BODY.

22 July: WTO COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT.

27-29 July: WTO GENERAL COUNCIL. **Other**

Forthcoming Events

17-19 August, Islamabad, Pakistan: **WTO Post-Cancùn Developments: Options for South Asia**. This meeting will be organised by the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI), Pakistan, CUTS Centre for International Trade, Economics & Environment (CITEE), India, Oxfam GB in Pakistan, South Asia Watch on Trade, Economics & Environment, Nepal. The objective of the event is to take stock of the developments, which have taken place vis-à-vis the international trading system after the Cancùn Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organisation. One of the objectives of the conference is to explore various options for South Asian countries with respect to a select set of critical issues. For further information contact Mr Sajid Kazmi, SDPI, email: sajid@sdpi.org; or Ms Purnima Purohit, CITEE, email: citee@cuts-international.org.

13 September to 9 October, Berlin, Germany: **TRAINING COURSE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE OF FOODS OF ANIMAL ORIGIN: ADAPTATION TO INTERNATIONAL QUALITY STANDARDS**. Intended for participants from Asia, this course aims to contribute to the modernisation of existing national food safety and security programmes through boosting the competitiveness of countries in the global trade of foods of animal origin according to the WTO globalised regulations, standards and rules for veterinary public health and preventive consumer protection. For further information see <http://www.dse.de/zell/zellprog/A810200000.rtf>

RESOURCES

LESSONS LEARNED ON TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. By Aaron Cosbey (International Institute for Sustainable Development, 2004). This book distills the lessons from six years of research undertaken by and for the Trade Knowledge Network (1998 - 2004). It draws on in-country research, thematic research and workshop papers to identify the key issues, and explores in depth what the TKN research has to say about them. The result is an excellent primer on the issues faced by the South in the area of trade and sustainable development. The book includes a companion CD covering all of the surveyed TKN research (more than 40 papers in all, including several in Spanish). For further information and to download the book, visit <http://www.tradeknowledgenetwork.net/publication.aspx?id=631>

FREE TRADE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE USA AND THAILAND THREATENS ACCESS TO HIV/AIDS TREATMENT. Oxfam Briefing Note (July 2004). This briefing Note warns that US demands for the US-Thai FTA to toughen existing intellectual property protection for drugs produced by giant pharmaceutical companies will hamper Thailand's successful HIV/AIDS treatment program and undermine future access to affordable medicines. Thailand is currently implementing a treatment program based on a generic fixed dose combination recommended by the WHO. This three-in-one tablet is around 10 times cheaper than the patented brand name drugs, and enhances patients' compliance by decreasing the number of pills that need to be taken to two a day. The patent rules in the proposed US-Thai FTA, if based on recent US FTAs with other developing countries, will close down the option of accessing such inexpensive generic medicines in the future. To access the report see http://www.oxfam.org/eng/pdfs/bn_USThai_FTA_HIVAIDS.pdf

THE USE OF ECONOMIC INSTRUMENTS IN ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES. By the UNEP Economics and Trade Branch (2004). This publication seeks to help policy-makers and experts to identify, design and evaluate economic instruments and integrate them effectively into pre-existing regulatory structures. It presents a wide range of tools for conducting comprehensive assessments and tailoring solutions to a specific country situation and need. It also provides a framework for conducting policy design, implementation and evaluation through a case study approach, analysing past experiences in an effort to assess which instruments have worked effectively to address particular types of environmental problems. To access the report visit

http://www.unep.ch/etu/publications/Economic_Instrument_Opp_Chnull_final.pdf

ECONOMIC INSTRUMENTS IN BIODIVERSITY-RELATED MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENTS. By the UNEP Economics and Trade Branch (2004). This study investigates the current and future potential role of economic instruments in the context of three biodiversity-related Multilateral Environmental Agreements: the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna, and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. The main types of economic instruments relevant to protecting biodiversity and the principal provisions and negotiations on economic instruments in the three MEAs are identified. Using numerous examples, the study suggests a range of thematic areas where the use of economic instruments could be further developed. It also discusses some of the conditions for successful implementation of such instruments. To access the report visit http://www.unep.ch/etu/publications/EconInst/eco_inst_bio_mea.pdf

ENERGY SUBSIDIES: LESSONS LEARNED IN ASSESSING THEIR IMPACT AND DESIGNING POLICY REFORMS. By the UNEP Economics and Trade Branch (2004). This publication aims to raise awareness of the actual and potential impact of energy subsidies and to provide guidance to policy-makers on how to design and implement energy subsidy reforms. It is based on work undertaken by UNEP in collaboration with the International Energy Agency. The report provides an overview of methodologies for policy makers and stakeholders to evaluate the economic, environmental and social effects of energy subsidies. This analytical framework sets the scene for a detailed discussion of energy subsidy issues at the country level, presenting nine country case-study experiences. It analyses the lessons learned and offers policy recommendations on how to design, implement and assess energy subsidies reform. To access the report visit <http://www.unep.ch/etu/publications/energySubsidies/Energysubreport.pdf>

Back issues of **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**© can be accessed at: <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/archive.htm>

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 Yvonne Apea, Heike Baumüller, Sarah Rogers and Alex Werth. Editor: Malena Sell, msell@ictsd.ch. Director: Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz, rmelendez@ictsd.ch. ICTSD is an independent, not-for-profit organisation based at: 13, ch. des Anémones, 1219 Geneva, Switzerland, tel: (41-22) 917-8492; fax: 917-8093. Excerpts from **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**© may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and should be directed to the Editor or the Director.

BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest is made possible in 2001 - 2004 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 1563-0