



# Bridges Trade BioRes

*News, events and resources at the intersection of trade and biodiversity*

**Issue: 10 June 2005**

<b>Biotechnology</b> .....	<b>1</b>
MOP-2: Divisions Over Labelling Prove Insurmountable At Biosafety Meet.....	
<b>Fisheries</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Fisheries Talks Stumble Along At WTO .....	
<b>Standards</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Animal Health Organisation Looks At Trade, Biotech Standards.....	
<b>In Brief</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Events &amp; Resources</b> .....	<b>8</b>

To subscribe to *Bridges Trade BioRes*, send an email to [subscribe\\_biores@ictsd.ch](mailto:subscribe_biores@ictsd.ch)

## Biotechnology

### MOP-2: DIVISIONS OVER LABELLING PROVE INSURMOUNTABLE AT BIOSAFETY MEET

After long and difficult negotiations, talks on documentation requirements for shipments of living modified organisms for use as food or feed, or for processing (LMO-FFPs) finally broke down on the last day of the 2nd Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (MOP-2), gathering from 30 May to 3 June in Montreal, Canada. Concerns over impacts of such

requirements on international trade lay at the heart of the more hard-line positions. Civil society groups sharply criticised New Zealand and Brazil for what they saw as an obstructive and inflexible stance.

### Disagreement over "may contain" language

Parties were mandated to finalise the documentation requirements for LMO commodities under Article 18.2(a) within two years of the Protocol's entry into force, thus effectively at MOP-2 (see *Bridges Trade BioRes*, 27 May 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/05-05-27/story1.htm>). The Protocol currently requires LMO-FFPs to only be labelled as "may contain" LMOs. Mirroring debates during the Protocol's negotiations, it was again the use of "may" that deeply divided Parties. Several late-night sessions and a last-ditch attempt by Switzerland to put forward a compromise text on the final day failed to bridge the differences between the Parties and the decision was postponed to MOP-3.

The African countries, led by Ethiopia, fought hard to eliminate the "may contain" language, insisting that any shipment should be clearly labelled as "contains" LMOs and list all the LMOs that are or may be contained. Given the limited regulatory and monitoring capacities in many African countries, they would like to see the onus of assessing the LMO content of a shipment placed on the exporter.

The EU took a somewhat more flexible stance on the "may contain" language, accepting its use provided that a clear specification of the LMOs that may be contained in the shipment was included. However, they insisted on references to say that

thresholds may be adopted on a national basis for the adventitious (that is, accidental) or technically unavoidable presence of LMOs (such thresholds are already in place in the EU under their traceability and labelling regulations).

The strongest resistance to these proposals came from New Zealand and Brazil, and to a lesser extent from Peru. They stressed that the trigger for documentation requirements should be the intended content of the shipment rather than the content itself, which would exclude adventitious presence. Brazil, a staunch proponent of agricultural trade liberalisation in the WTO, has long been struggling with illegal plantings of LMOs in the country. While New Zealand does not export any LMOs at present, they also sought to defend their economic interests as an agricultural exporter (and a member of the Cairns Group in the WTO).

### Widespread disappointment

Many delegates expressed their disappointment with the failure to reach agreement. During the final Plenary, Tewolde Egziabher of Ethiopia invited developing country delegates to not give into the pressures "that want to cause global genetic pollution and escape unnoticed and unscathed". "Let us go back to our respective countries and thwart their design through national legislation," he urged. The EU lamented that proposals had been rejected without explanations on why they were unacceptable, and feared that the failure may have negative impacts on the ability to achieve the objectives of the Protocol.

Brazil also expressed their regret at the lack of agreement, but felt that good progress had been made that could be built on at MOP-3. They would like to see a realistic, step-by-step approach, taking into account the wide variety of views. New Zealand rejected accusations that they were undermining the Biosafety Protocol. Environment Minister Marian Hobbs stressed the need for a labelling regime that was realistic and did not impose an unreasonable burden on exporters.

Civil society groups squarely laid the blame for the failure on the shoulders of Brazil and New Zealand. "The actions of Brazil and New Zealand are shameless," said Doreen Stabinsky of Greenpeace. "They have prevented the vast majority from bringing in rules that will protect the environment,"

she added. Juan Lopez, GM Coordinator of Friends of the Earth International accused the two countries of "hypocrisy and untruthfulness" and as serving the interests of the biotechnology industry and biotech exporting non-Parties. However, he also pointed to the more than 100 countries that had expressed their commitment to implementing strong requirements.

### Some achievements

Despite this setback, Parties managed to finalise a number of important decisions, including on public awareness, capacity building, the Biosafety Clearing House and risk assessment. On documentation requirements for LMOs for contained use under Article 18.2(b) and for intentional introduction into the environment under Article 18.2(c), Parties simply decided to consider the rules as part of the mandated review of the Protocol's implementation five years after entry into force, but left the option open to discuss the use of a stand-alone document at MOP-3.

While the rules of procedure for the Compliance Committee -- which is charged with promoting compliance and addressing cases of non-compliance -- were adopted at MOP-2, one bracket was left in the text after Parties failed to agree on the voting rules. Despite intense informal negotiations throughout the meeting, Panama and New Zealand in the end opposed the two-thirds majority decision-making (in cases where Committee members were unable to reach than consensus).

MOP-3 will be held in Curitiba, Brazil, from 13-17 March 2006, back-to-back with the 8th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

### Additional Resources

MOP-2 documents:

<http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.aspx?mtg=MOP-02>

Decisions will be available shortly at

<http://www.biodiv.org/biosafety/cop-mop/search.aspx?menu=mop1>

For daily coverage of MOP-2, see IISD Linkages,

<http://www.iisd.ca/biodiv/bs-copmop2>.

ICTSD reporting; ENB Summary, Vol. 9 No. 320, 6 June 2005; "Greens and NGOs distort NZ approach," NEW ZEALAND GOVERNMENT PRESS RELEASE, 3 June 2005.

## Fisheries

### FISHERIES TALKS STUMBLE ALONG AT WTO

As part of week-long discussions in the Negotiating Group on Rules, WTO Members on 3 June briefly examined two submissions on fisheries subsidies from the EC and the US. Members looked at a new paper from the EC on enforcement and transparency measures, requesting clarification on the dual notification system proposed by the EC. They also took up the question, posed by the US, of the appropriate categorisation of subsidies for decommissioning fishing vessels, raising questions regarding the conditions attached to their decommissioning schemes. Discussions were characterised as good and informative, although many countries have yet to reveal their positions on fisheries subsidies.

#### The EC maintains focus on enforcement

In a continuation of the debate at the last Rules Group meeting regarding the need to ensure that whatever disciplines are adopted by WTO Members are well enforced in practice (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 15 April 2005, <http://www.ictsd.com/biores/05-04-15/story1.htm>), the EC presented a new version of their paper on enforcement and transparency (TN/RL/GEN/39, available at <http://docsonline.wto.org>). Pointing to the fact that normal enforcement mechanisms were inadequate for fisheries subsidies, and drawing on its own experience in this field, the EC elaborated further on its proposed dual notification system whereby Members could choose between a domestic and a WTO enforcement system. While the multilateral system would be based on pre-notification of subsidy programmes, the domestic one would rely on monitoring of the subsidies after they have been granted to the fishing industry. The EC also suggested that Members create a "de minimis rule" so that small subsidies likely to only have a minor trade and resource impact would have less stringent notification requirements. To ensure transparency, the EC suggested that information about subsidies should be made readily available to WTO Members via the Internet.

#### Clarifications needed

While there seemed to be a general consensus regarding the importance of enforcement and transparency of whatever rules emerge from WTO

negotiations on fishery subsidies, several Members questioned how the dual notification procedures would work. Given the choice between a national and multilateral notification procedure, concerns were raised that countries would opt for the national one and that it would be more difficult to ensure enforcement of WTO rules and sharing of information on national subsidies measures through this option. It was also argued that the European system might not be transferable to other countries that did not have a competent regional authority such as the European Commission to monitor enforcement at a national level. Having just a national authority do the monitoring, some argued, might not be as effective as a multilateral system. It was also felt that the Internet-based solution might not be adequate to provide easy access to the information. Furthermore, Members expressed concerns regarding discussing enforcement of disciplines without knowing what the categories would look like.

The paper also proposed longer phase-in periods and technical assistance to address the special needs of developing countries to implementing any enforcement or implementation requirements. However, Brazil said that this proposal was insufficient to address their needs. What developing countries wanted, they said, was not charity, but efficient rules that adequately take into account their needs, and that a simple phase-in period could not be classified as special and differential treatment (S&D).

#### Decommissioning schemes candidate for "green-box"

Based on Members' earlier-stated intention to look at specific subsidy categories rather than an overall approach (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 4 March 2005, <http://www.ictsd.com/biores/05-03-04/story1.htm>), the US presented a paper on subsidies for vessel decommissioning at the meeting (TN/RL/TEN/41) that was generally well received by Members. Sharing its experience with decommissioning programmes, the US suggested that such subsidies could be a candidate for the "green box" of permitted subsidies. The paper warns about possible dangers that might jeopardise the beneficial effects of such programmes, such as capital stuffing, a practice where money received from decommissioning schemes are reinvested in capacity enhancing measures for remaining vessels which may harmfully deplete other or the same fisheries. Also, there might be a danger that

decommissioned vessels might find their way back to other fisheries.

On this issue, some Members felt that the usefulness of decommissioning schemes depended on the criteria and conditions attached and that these were not addressed by the US paper. On the other hand, the EC pointed out that there was no need for specific conditions to be attached to the programmes, as long as there was a general prohibition of any subsidies that lead to increased fishing capacity. Whereas the paper did not explicitly refer to a specific approach to the fisheries subsidies debate, one trade source suggested that it might be interpreted as seeing decommissioning schemes as an exception from a general prohibition of fisheries subsidies. The top-down approach, advocated by a loosely defined group of countries known as the 'Friends of Fish', including Australia, Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, New Zealand, Philippines, Peru, Norway, Iceland and the US, favours such a blanket ban with exemption approach. However, Japan, Korea and Chinese Taipei remain in favour of a bottom-up approach that would identify prohibited subsidies on a case-by-case basis. Japan circulated an informal copy of paper on illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing to the group that will be officially submitted and discussed when discussions resume in July.

### **Most developing countries quiet for now**

Despite the fact that S&D was touched upon by the EC paper, few developing countries were active in the meeting. Regarding the US paper, developing country Members said that they did not subsidise decommissioning of vessels and even less so decommissioning, and were thus unsure whether the US experience and proposal was relevant to them. Efforts will be made to co-ordinate developing countries' positions in the lead-up to the rules meeting in July, where Brazil hopes to present a revised version of their previous submission on fisheries subsidies (TN/RL/W/176), with possible support from India.

The next meeting in the WTO negotiation group on rules on fisheries subsidies is scheduled from 11-12 July 2005.

ICTSD reporting.

## **Standards**

### **ANIMAL HEALTH ORGANISATION LOOKS AT TRADE, BIOTECH STANDARDS**

At the 73rd General Session of the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), meeting from 22-27 May in Paris, France, OIE members heard presentations and adopted resolutions on genetically engineered animals and the relationship between the implementation of the organisation's standards and international trade. OIE Standards have been recognised by the WTO's Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement) as the international organisation responsible for standard-setting related to animal health.

### **New focus on biotechnology**

During discussions under the technical item on 'Applications of genetic engineering for livestock and biotechnology products', OIE Members widely supported the potential use of vaccines produced through genetic engineering as a tool for improving animal health, suggesting that there was a less negative public response to this use of biotechnology than to other uses. They stressed the importance of developing OIE standards in this field as a priority because potential benefits were high. Also discussed was the creation of cloned animals and the use of genetically engineered animals to produce medicines or chemicals (for example, an animal that is genetically engineered to make milk that contains insulin). While genetically engineered animals are subject to the OIE's overall risk assessment standards, some Members raised concerns about the unique risks posed by these two types of engineering and the lack of standards for regulations that aim to address them.

OIE Members decided to create an Ad hoc Group on Biotechnology. They also asked the Secretariat to develop and adopt standards and guidelines for: research and use of vaccines for animals produced through biotechnology; animal health risks linked to cloning; exclusion of unapproved animals and products from the livestock population and segregation from the feed and food supply; and animals that have been genetically engineered to produce medicines or chemicals. In order to address these concerns, the OIE will convene a group of

scientists to discuss the issues, draft a business plan and produce a document that the OIE's elected specialist and regional Commissions could then adopt in coming years into a draft standard.

### **Developing countries look to standards to help trade**

As a result of increasing adoption of OIE-based standards around the world, exporting countries have stepped up efforts to meet these standards to enhance market access. However, many exporters have expressed concerns regarding domestic implementation costs of stringent OIE standards. Importers, on the other hand, prefer strong standards to ensure domestic animal health and, because of the potential for animal diseases to spread to humans (called "zoonoses" as in the case of Mad Cow disease), human health. Based on a survey and report conducted prior to the meeting, some delegates suggested during the discussion on 'Implementation of OIE standards in the framework of the SPS Agreement' that domestic adoption of OIE standards could bring several benefits for both importing and exporting countries, including increased domestic animal health leading to decreased animal mortality, which in turn could alleviate human poverty in many developing nations. As well, human health can be improved as a result of fewer animal-borne diseases being transmitted to humans and because of the economic growth that may result from enhanced access to international markets for their animals and animal products when exporters adopt the standards.

Delegates decided in resolution No. XXVII to address the challenges and opportunities faced by developing countries adopting OIE standards to participate in international and regional trade, including through asking the OIE Secretariat to facilitate the capacity building of officials and take into account the "needs and specific circumstances in developing countries" in the development of standards. In addition, standardisation techniques such as inclusion in standards of descriptions of risk mitigation procedures to make animal products safe for trade and the establishment of a uniform format for standards to make understanding them easier was called for. Lastly, the resolution asked the OIE to request the WTO to consider observer status for regional organisations at the SPS Committee to represent countries that do not have the capacity or expertise to otherwise participate; and work with

the WTO to study how to "take into account" OIE standards on animal welfare.

Measures relating to animal health and zoonoses, which are governed by OIE standards, accounted for 40 percent of concerns raised at the SPS Committee since it began work in 1995. The OIE is an intergovernmental organisation created in 1924 to provide information to ensure transparency regarding the global animal disease situation. Within its mandate under the WTO SPS Agreement, it also aims to safeguard world trade by publishing health standards for international trade in animals and animal products. As a leading scientific organisation, it also collects, analyses and disseminates veterinary scientific information, provides expertise and encourages international solidarity in the control of animal diseases and works to improve the legal framework and resources of national veterinary Services.

The background documents for the discussions on international trade and biotechnology are available at [http://www.oie.int/delegatesite/sg/en\\_sg.htm](http://www.oie.int/delegatesite/sg/en_sg.htm)

ICTSD Reporting.

---

### **In Brief**

#### **AGREEMENT REACHED ON AARHUS COVERAGE OF GMOS**

Participants in the 25-27 May second meeting of the Parties to the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (the Aarhus Convention) agreed to extend the public's legal right to participate in environmental decision-making, as set out in the Convention, to the release and placing on the market of genetically modified organisms (GMO). Under the Amendment agreed at the meeting held in Almaty, Kazakhstan (ECE/MP.PP/2005/2/Add.2), the Parties to the Convention would be required to inform and consult the public in decision-making on the deliberate release and placing on the market of GMOs. The public would have the right to submit comments and the public authorities would be expected to take these into account in the decision-making process. Once made, the decision taken should be publicly available together with the information, reasons and considerations upon which it is based (excepting information protected by commercial confidentiality). However, Parties could not withhold as confidential information on the

intended uses of the release or assessment of environmental risk.

When the Aarhus Convention was adopted in 2001, decisions on GMOs were expressly excluded from the binding requirements on public participation set out in Article 6 of the Convention. During subsequent negotiations in the Convention's Working Group on Genetically Modified Organisms, UNECE countries were split on whether to extend the Article's provisions to GMOs (see BRIDGES Trade Biores, 19 November 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/04-11-19/inbrief.htm>). Civil society groups thus hailed the agreement on public participation in decision making on GMOs as a breakthrough. "This is a major victory for the public," Juan Lopez, GM Coordinator of Friends of the Earth International, said. "No GMO will be introduced anymore in this region without public scrutiny and adequate information." The amendment replaces Article 6.11 of the Convention and introduces a new Article 6bis and Annex Ibis. It will enter into force once three quarters of the Parties to the Convention ratify it and will be binding on only those countries that have ratified it.

For more information on the meeting, and to access relevant documents, visit <http://www.unece.org/env/pp/mop2.htm>

"UNECE agree on public participation in GMO discussion," CROP BIOTECH, 3 June 2005; "Governments reach agreement on public participation in decision-making on genetically modified organisms," UNECE PRESS RELEASE, 27 May 2005; "Victory For The Public!!" FOE EUROPE PRESS RELEASE, 27 May 2005.

## **WTO AGRICULTURE CTTE TAKES UP GREEN BOX**

WTO Members on 30 and 31 May re-started talks on exemptions to agricultural liberalisation commitments under the "Green Box" during informal negotiations of the Committee on Agriculture. Although WTO Members are in general required to reduce agricultural subsidies under the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA) and the reduction commitments that are currently being negotiated, Annex 2 says that some subsidies can be exempted if they fall into the green box requirements of not distorting trade (or at most causing minimal distortion), being government-funded, not involving price support and not being targeted at particular products. They include direct income supports for farmers and environmental protection and regional development programmes. There are two divergent views on the scope of the review of the Green Box as mandated in the Doha

negotiations, with Members such as the EC and the G-10 group of developed country advocates for exemptions from liberalisation looking at it as just a "health check" while others think that the scope is broadly whether or not the policy criteria set out in the box meet the objective of the box.

In a paper presented at an informal consultation on 31 May, which in turn was based on discussions on 30 May, Canada suggested a number of detailed amendments to ensure that the exempted subsidies do not distort trade. In negotiations, Canada and the G-20 group of developing country advocates of special and differential treatment for developing countries said that some of the programmes currently exempted by the green box might, in contradiction to its objectives, distort trade. In addition, on 2 June, the G-20 introduced a new paper that aims to exclude trade-distorting subsidies from the Green Box and also suggests a number of amendments aimed at providing special and differential treatment to developing countries. These include a suggestion to make sure that exempted direct payments to producers are not linked to production levels. Provisions aimed specifically at helping developing countries include a change to ensure that exempted income support is provided only to low-income producers; an exemption for subsidies for land reform in developing countries; a call to give developing countries more flexibility in deciding what sort of income insurance or support after natural disasters could be exempted under the green box; and an exception from some of the more stringent criteria for exempting payments made under regional assistance programmes. However, as it was introduced after the negotiations, the G-20 proposal was not negotiated on and will be discussed later.

ICTSD Reporting.

## **UNESCO DECIDES ON DRAFT CONVENTION ON CULTURAL, ARTISTIC DIVERSITY**

The third session of the intergovernmental meeting of experts of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) on 3 June decided to forward a draft Convention on the Protection of the Diversity of Cultural Contents and Artistic Expressions to an upcoming UNESCO General Conference in October 2005 for approval. The third session of the intergovernmental meeting of experts, gathering from 25 May to 3 June, reviewed a "clean" version of the draft produced by

chair Kader Asmal in April based on negotiations of the second session of the group in February (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 4 March 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/05-03-04/inbrief.htm#1>). The agreed draft text, in new Article 20 (old Article 19) aims to resolve controversy at that meeting regarding the compatibility of the right of Parties to "adopt measures aimed at protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions within its territory", as set out in Article 6, which could potentially include subsidies to promote cultural activities, goods and services as defined in Article 4 of the draft Convention, with the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures. The compromise on Article 20 recognises that all international agreements, including the WTO, are complementary and mutually supportive and that, while the Convention should not be interpreted as modifying the rights and obligations of the Parties under other Conventions, Parties shall take into account the relevant provisions of this Convention when entering into other international obligations. While welcoming this compromise language, some countries said that they had yet to check with their capitals on the proposed wording. While countries such as the EU, Canada and some African countries have advocated for a strong Convention, other countries including the US, UK and Japan have raised concerns about its potential implications.

ICTSD Reporting; "Where's Our Culture Headed? Not Overseas, That's for Sure," EPOCH TIMES, 31 May 2005; "Cultural diversity: a major step towards the adoption of a UNESCO Convention," EU PRESS RELEASE, 6 June 2005.

### **WIPO: NO AGREEMENT AT PATENT HARMONISATION TALKS**

Differences between developed and developing countries on how to multilaterally harmonise patent law and related procedures widened at a 1-3 June meeting of the World Intellectual Property Organisation's (WIPO) Standing Committee on the Law of Patents (SCP). The SCP is the central body in WIPO that moves ahead patent law harmonisation. Its central purpose is to negotiate a draft 'Substantive Patent Law Treaty' (SPLT), which would set standards, among others, for patentability criteria, examination process, and granting and recognition of rights, etc. At the SCP meeting, developing countries claimed success in the talks, which saw the derailment of developed countries' agenda to limit SCP negotiations on harmonisation of national patent rules to a 'priority list' of issue that are primarily of importance to developed

countries, such as prior art examination, grace period, novelty and inventive step. Two other issue areas that are of concern to many developing countries -- namely genetic resources and sufficiency of disclosure (i.e. requiring patent applicants to supply enough information to allow others to replicate the invention) -- would also receive priority consideration. However, the proposal suggested that these two issue areas be negotiated within WIPO's Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore (IGC). Developing countries, especially a group of 14 countries known as the "Group of Friends of Development", objected to this separation, as the IGC is of a more technical nature and has less political weight than the SPC (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 28 May 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/04-05-28/story1.htm>). In this sense Brazil submitted a statement to the meeting on behalf of the Group of Friends of Development in which it specifically called for an "inclusive approach" to patent harmonisation.

ICTSD reporting; "Agreement Out Of Reach in WIPO Patent Harmonisation Talks," IP WATCH, 3 June 2005.

### **UNFF FAILS TO AGREE ON STRENGTHENED FOREST ARRANGEMENTS**

Delegates meeting in New York from 16-27 May for the fifth session of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF-5) were unable to agree on a strengthened International Arrangement on Forests (IAF) that, it had been hoped, would bring much-needed improvements in the international governance of forestry issues after many years of talks. A number of countries, including the EU, entered the meeting hoping for the creation of a legally binding instrument (LBI) on sustainable forestry management (SFM). However, after opposition from countries who suggested that the creation of an LBI in the limited two-week scope of the conference was unrealistic, moderated their position to advocate for the adoption of "global goals" that could include quantitative targets for progress in forest sustainability worldwide. For example, one target proposed was to cut deforestation in half by 2012. The US and Brazil argued against the creation of both an LBI and quantitative targets. The US did not support adopting quantitative goals, saying that they would be a set-up for failure and were, regardless, hard to measure. Possible concerns regarding national sovereignty in the management of the nation's

Amazon forest drove Brazil's position against any LBI, goals or targets.

Despite optimism in the lead-up to the meeting, UNFF-5 was unable to agree on strengthening the IAF and was not able to produce a ministerial statement or a negotiated outcome. Instead, it forwarded negotiating text, which was bracketed in its entirety, to UNFF-6 which will be held in February 2006. Delegates were able to reach agreement "ad referendum" on four global goals on increasing the area of protected and SFM; reversing the decline in official development assistance for SFM; reversing the loss of forest cover; and enhancing forest-based economic, social and environmental benefits. However, these goals are non-binding. A number of delegates as well as NGOs present expressed frustration at the failure of the two-week meeting to produce any results. Daily coverage provided by IISD Linkages, <http://www.iisd.ca/forestry/unff/unff5/>.

ICTSD Reporting; ENB Vol. 13 No. 133, 30 May 2005.

## CONTROVERSY ON JAPANESE WHALING PROPOSAL IN LEAD-UP TO IWC

A leaked document suggesting that Japan will seek to expand its quotas for scientific whaling dominated a heated debate in the run up to the 57th Annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC). According to the leaked document, Japan will try to get approval at the 20-24 June meeting to double their current minke whale take in the Antarctic and to extend their whaling to larger species of humpback and fin whales. This has angered ecologists and countries that oppose commercial whaling who have accused Japan of using research as an excuse for pursuing hunting on a commercial basis banned since 1986.

The IWC's Scientific Committee, which includes more than 200 whale biologists nominated by member governments, is meeting behind closed doors from 30 May to 12 June to discuss statistical information and trends in whale populations in order to provide scientific advice to the commission related to conservation measures. The committees' findings will be revealed at the IWC's annual meeting later in the June and are likely to affect the decision on an increase of Japan's scientific whaling.

The main duty of the IWC is to keep under review and revise as necessary the measures required to ensure the proper conservation of whale stocks and thus make possible the orderly development of the

whaling industry. The Commission also encourages, co-ordinates and funds whale research. For more information on IWC visit <http://www.iwcoffice.org/>. Full coverage of the 57 Annual meeting will be provided in the next issue of BRIDGE Trade BioRes.

"Experts consider Japanese whaling proposal", ABC News 30 May 2005; "Scientific Committee of IWC convenes Monday in S Korea" Japan Today 30 May 2005, "Japan whaling seen as threat to Tonga", Matangi Tonga Magazine 7 June 2005, "Australia Courts Island Nations to Stop Whaling" REUTERS NEWS SERVICE 7 June 2005.

---

## Events & Resources

### EVENTS

For a more comprehensive list of events in trade and sustainable development, please refer to ICTSD's web calendar, <http://www.trade-environment.org/page/calendar.htm>.

### Coming up in the next two weeks

10-19 June, Online: THE PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE IN BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. This e-conference is organised by the Precautionary Principle Project, a joint initiative of Flora & Fauna International, IUCN, TRAFFIC and ResourceAfrica. It aims to gain input and comments on draft "Best Practice Guidance" on applying the precautionary principle in biodiversity conservation and management of biological resources. This draft guidance is based on extensive research, consultation, and a series of regional workshops. For further information contact Rosie Cooney, tel: (+44 1) 223 579 020; fax: 1223 461 481; email: [rosie.cooney@fauna-flora.org](mailto:rosie.cooney@fauna-flora.org); Internet: <http://www.pprinciple.net/econference.html>

10 June, Geneva, Switzerland. WTO NEGOTIATING GROUP ON MARKET ACCESS. For further information contact the WTO Information and Media Relations Division, Geneva; tel: (41-22) 739- 5007; fax: 739-5458; email: [enquiries@wto.org](mailto:enquiries@wto.org); Internet: [http://www.wto.org/english/news\\_e/meets.pdf](http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/meets.pdf)

14-17 June, Lisbon, Portugal: 6TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE EUROPEAN SOCIETY FOR ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS. This Conference will provide a forum for scientific debate and discussion on theoretical and practical issues in the field of ecological economics, focusing on the links between science, society and policy. The general theme of ESEE 2005 will be Science and Governance -- The Ecological Economics Perspective. For further information contact the Conference Secretary, Renata Cardoso, email: [esee2005@fct.unl.pt](mailto:esee2005@fct.unl.pt); Internet: <http://www.esee2005.org/>



14-17 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COUNCIL FOR TRADE-RELATED ASPECTS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS (TRIPS). For further information contact the WTO Information and Media Relations Division, Geneva; tel: (41-22) 739- 5007; fax: 739-5458; email: [enquiries@wto.org](mailto:enquiries@wto.org) ; Internet: [http://www.wto.org/english/news\\_e/meets.pdf](http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/meets.pdf)

16-17 June, London, UK: EMERGING CARBON MARKETS: CAN THEY DELIVER? This conference is sponsored by Canada's CDM & JI Office, Foreign Affairs Canada in association with The International Emissions Trading Association. Chatham House's eighth event in its climate change series aims to explore how the emerging carbon market can deliver the emissions cuts required of it; examine the role of the EU ETS on the international climate agenda; how the EU and other emerging emissions markets may develop in the future; and the politics and policies that will shape their evolution. For further information, contact Chatham House, tel: (+44 20) 7957 5700; fax: 7957 5710; email: [contact@chathamhouse.org.uk](mailto:contact@chathamhouse.org.uk); Internet: <http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/index.php?id=5&cid=72>

16-17 June, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COMMITTEE ON TECHNICAL BARRIERS TO TRADE. For further information, contact the WTO Information and Media Relations Division, Geneva; tel: (41-22) 739- 5007; fax: 739-5458; email: [enquiries@wto.org](mailto:enquiries@wto.org); Internet: [http://www.wto.org/english/news\\_e/meets.pdf](http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/meets.pdf)

16-24 June, New York, US: 15TH MEETING OF STATES PARTIES TO THE 1982 UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA. For further information, contact the Secretary of the Meeting of States Parties, Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, tel: (+1 212) 963-3972; fax: 963-5847; email: [doalos@un.org](mailto:doalos@un.org); Internet: [http://www.un.org/Depts/los/meeting\\_states\\_parties/fifteenthmeetingstatesparties.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/meeting_states_parties/fifteenthmeetingstatesparties.htm)

18-22 June, Brazzaville, Republic of Congo: 38TH SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TROPICAL TIMBER COUNCIL AND ASSOCIATED SESSION OF THE COMMITTEES. This session is organised by International Tropical Timber Organization and will discuss CITES listing, phased approaches to certification of timber, forest law enforcement, and other topics. For further information contact Manoel Sobral Filho, tel: (+81 45) 223 1110; fax: 223 1111; email: [itto@itto.or.jp](mailto:itto@itto.or.jp); Internet: <http://www.itto.or.jp/live/PageDisplayHandler?pageId=179&id=920>

22-23 June, Quebec City, Canada: 12TH REGULAR SESSION OF THE COMMISSION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION COUNCIL AND MEETINGS OF THE JOINT PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE (JPAC). This session is

organized by The North American Commission For Environmental Cooperation (CEC), established with the NAFTA to address regional environmental concerns, help prevent potential trade and environmental conflicts, and to promote the effective enforcement of environmental law. For further information contact Nathalie Daoust, tel: (+1 514) 350-4300; fax: 350-4314; email: [ndaoust@cec.org](mailto:ndaoust@cec.org); Internet: <http://www.cec.org/calendar/details/index.cfm?varlan=english&ID=1963%20>

22-25 June, Rome, Italy: 31ST SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD FOOD SECURITY. This working group will meet during the 128th Session of the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) Council. For further information contact FAO, tel: (+39) 06 57051; fax: 06 570 53152; Internet: [http://www.fao.org/unfao/bodies/cfs/cfs31/cfs2005\\_en.htm](http://www.fao.org/unfao/bodies/cfs/cfs31/cfs2005_en.htm).

### Other Upcoming Events

18-22 July, Hammamet, Tunisia: FIRST MEETING OF THE CONTACT GROUP FOR THE DRAFTING OF THE STANDARD MATERIAL TRANSFER AGREEMENT FOR THE ITPGRFA. This meeting will build upon the work of an earlier expert group to outline the contract that will set the minimum standards for access to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA) for the 64 crops covered by the FAO's International Treaty on PGRFA. For further information contact José Esquinas-Alcázar, tel: (+39 06) 570 54986; fax: 570 53057; email: [Jose.Esqinas@fao.org](mailto:Jose.Esqinas@fao.org); Internet: <http://www.fao.org/ag/cgrfa/cgmta1.htm>

10-13 August, Kottayam, India: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. Organised by St Berchmans College at Mahatma Gandhi University, this conference recognises that in the context of growing awareness of environmental issues in a globalised world, there is a great need for practical communities supporting an affordable environmental lifestyle that will not compromise modern expectations of personal comfort and social stability. The move towards sustainable development requires the integration of economic, social, cultural, political, and ecological factors. The conference will be a forum for meaningful exchange of views and formulation of new ideas for interdisciplinary, multicultural, and multicriteria-based evaluation of the challenges of globalisation. For further information contact the General Coordinator, tel: (+91 481) 242-0025; fax: 240-1472; email: [mail@conferencesbc.org](mailto:mail@conferencesbc.org); Internet: <http://www.conferencesbc.org/> on sustainable development

7-9 September, Helsinki, Finland: HELSINKI CONFERENCE 2005. The Helsinki Conference 2005 is a multi-stakeholder dialogue and networking event for

addressing the challenge of making ambitious targets of the world community a reality. As the finale of the Helsinki Process on Globalization and Democracy, the Conference aims to mobilise political will. For further information contact Pieni Roobertinkatu, Helsinki Conference Secretariat, tel: (+358 9) 698-7024; fax: 612 7759; email: [secretariat@helsinkiprocess.fi](mailto:secretariat@helsinkiprocess.fi); Internet: <http://www.helsinkiconference.fi>

## 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 [hbaumuller@ictsd.ch](mailto:hbaumuller@ictsd.ch).

**WHO DECIDES? GM CROPS IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD.** By the Panos Institute, June 2005. Government decisions about genetically modified (GM) food are having far-reaching consequences on food production and farmers, the environment and possibly even human health. Scientific evidence of the long-term impact of GM crops remains inconclusive, and media coverage is often polarised between the pro-GM industry lobby and anti-GM campaigners. This report asks who has access to the people with the power to decide, who is being left out of the GM debate and explores how the media is covering the GM controversy. To access this report visit [http://www.panos.org.uk/PDF/reports/gmdebate\\_report.pdf](http://www.panos.org.uk/PDF/reports/gmdebate_report.pdf).

**AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY 2005: REGIONAL TRENDS IN ADOPTION AND ACCEPTANCE.** By Bio Economic Research Associates, 2005. This report provides an assessment of the recent developments affecting the adoption and acceptance of agricultural biotechnology on a regional basis, as well as, the business outlook for genetically modified crops within each regional market. The report evaluates commercial, technical, and regulatory factors that characterize the business environment for each of these five regions: Asia-Pacific, Latin America, Africa, Europe and North America, and for key countries within Africa, Asia, and Latin American. To access this report visit [http://bio-era.net/research/add\\_research\\_21.html](http://bio-era.net/research/add_research_21.html).

**TACKLING GMO CONTAMINATION: MAKING SEGREGATION AND IDENTITY PRESERVATION A REALITY.** By the Friends of the Earth, June 2005. This report examines several cases of GMO contamination and describes the current experience with segregation and Identity Preserved (IP) systems in North America. The paper analyses the challenges and costs of implementing such systems and discusses how to make segregation and IP a reality. It challenges the myth that segregation and IP systems are not feasible or too expensive to consider, and that the burden of the costs will fall mainly on the importing countries or the IP non-GM operator. To access this report visit

<http://www.foei.org/publications/pdfs/contamination3.pdf>.

**THE ROLE OF BIOTECHNOLOGY FOR THE CHARACTERISATION AND CONSERVATION OF CROP, FOREST, ANIMAL AND FISHERY GENETIC RESOURCES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.** By UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), June 2005. This document aims to provide an easy to understand overview of biotechnology and conservation of genetic resources for food and agriculture in developing countries. It gives an overview of the current status of genetic resources in the different food and agricultural sectors; a description of relevant biotechnologies; and a discussion of some potential factors that may influence applications of biotechnology in developing countries in this area. To access this report visit <http://www.fao.org/biotech/C13doc.htm>.

**THE DOHA ROUND AND THE WTO: A NEW AGENDA FOR DEVELOPMENT.** Edited by Bernard M. Hoekman and Simon J. Evenett, World Bank, June 2005. This book includes essays of the current thinking by leading practitioners and analysts of the WTO that focus on the question how the Doha negotiating agenda could help to increase the development relevance of the WTO, addressing both the traditional domain of trade negotiations—market access—and efforts to extend the coverage of the WTO to "behind-the-border" regulatory policies that may only have an indirect link to trade. The essays assess and draw lessons from the body of research that has emerged in the last 5 years on the role of the WTO and the economics of the issues that were put on the negotiating table, as well as the negotiating experience to date, to provide specific suggestions and ideas for moving forward on development in the WTO. To access this book visit [http://publications.worldbank.org/ecommerce/catalog/product?item\\_id=4521403](http://publications.worldbank.org/ecommerce/catalog/product?item_id=4521403)

**THE REGULATION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE (3RD EDITION).** By Robert Howse and Michael Trebilcock, June 2005. Drawing on prior highly-praised editions, this comprehensive text is an invaluable guide to individuals involved in economics, law, politics and international relations. Fully updated, this new edition includes full coverage of new developments including the Doha Round and the growing body of WTO dispute resolution case law.

**DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.** By the German Advisory Council on Global Change, June 2005. The Millennium+5 Summit, which will take place in New York this September, will review progress towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and take stock of the United Nations' capacity to act. The Summit offers the opportunity to set a new course in international poverty reduction and initiate a reform of the United Nations. This report argues that the current poverty debate ignores environmental problems exacerbating

poverty in many developing countries and proposes ways of overcoming these deficits. To access this report visit [http://www.wbgu.de/wbgu\\_pp2005\\_engl.pdf](http://www.wbgu.de/wbgu_pp2005_engl.pdf).

**CURRENT TRENDS IN ORGANIC AGRICULTURE MARKETS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR FARMERS.** By South Center, May 2005. By reviewing current trends in organic markets and discussing the implications for farmers, this paper concludes that the reversal of current trends towards conventionalisation of organic agriculture is urgent but also difficult since it requires a change of paradigm to put sustainable development and people's need at the centre of policy decisions. To access this report visit [http://www.southcentre.org/tadp\\_webpage/research\\_papers/agriculture\\_project/organicag\\_may05.doc](http://www.southcentre.org/tadp_webpage/research_papers/agriculture_project/organicag_may05.doc).

**THE PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE IN BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: AN ISSUES PAPER FOR POLICY-MAKERS, RESEARCHERS AND PRACTITIONERS.** By Rosie Cooney (IUCN, 2004). The objective of this paper is to examine and discuss issues arising in the translation of the precautionary principle into operational measures in the specific field of biodiversity conservation and natural resource management. The study also examines and discusses issues of sustainable development, poverty reduction and livelihoods as they relate to the precautionary principle. To access this report visit <http://www.pprinciple.net/publications/PrecautionaryPrincipleIssuesPaper.pdf>.

**COLOMBIA'S BIODIVERSITY UP FOR GRABS.** By John Edward Myers (Americas Program, June 2005). The author asserts that Colombia's immense contribution to the planet's biodiversity is being undercut at an alarming rate by policies that deny funding for environmental protection and promote destructive development. Compared to many nations, Colombia is well behind in safeguarding its natural resources, he notes. Constitutional reforms and market-based

instruments show potential to reverse this trend, but are currently insufficient to effectively defend the country's ecosystems. Available online at <http://americas.irc-online.org/reports/2005/0506colombia.html>.

## VACANCIES

**SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW ON CLIMATE CHANGE, TRADE AND COMPETITIVENESS, CHATHAM HOUSE.** The researcher will have sufficient experience to take overall responsibility for developing, fundraising and overseeing cutting-edge research on climate change. The research will place particular emphasis on the economic and business aspects of the climate change agenda, including competition and trade policy. The researcher will also produce reports and publications, organise meetings, and raise project funding. Successful candidates will have a background in economics, politics, law or other related field. The position will be for an initial two-year period with potential for renewal. Interested applicants should email their CV and the names of three referees to Julie Martin at [jmartin@chathamhouse.org.uk](mailto:jmartin@chathamhouse.org.uk).

**SECRETARY, TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, SOUTH CENTRE.** The South Centre, an intergovernmental organization of developing countries based in Geneva and mandated to assist developing countries on various issues on the international agenda, is looking for candidates that are nationals of countries that are members of the Group of 77 and China that have two to three years of experience in secretarial/administrative work and knowledge of written and spoken English and French. Tasks will include general secretarial work, meeting/workshop organisation, assistance in dissemination of publications and other administrative tasks. Candidates should send their applications and CVs to Ms. Caroline Menang N. at [menang@southcentre.org](mailto:menang@southcentre.org) before 13 June. The position starts 1 July 2005.

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.iucn.org/themes/ceesp/index.html>. This edition of BRIDGES Trade BioRes was edited by Sarah Mohan, [smohan@ictsd.ch](mailto:smohan@ictsd.ch). The Managing Editor is Heike Baumüller, [hbaumuller@ictsd.ch](mailto:hbaumuller@ictsd.ch). Contributors to this issue were Heike Baumüller, Hilde Ludt, Sarah Mohan, Johanna von Braun and Paul Quinlan. The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz, [rmelendez@ictsd.ch](mailto:rmelendez@ictsd.ch). ICTSD is an independent, not-for-profit organisation based at: 7, ch. de Balexert, 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 2005 through the support of the Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape (BUWAL). ISSN 1682-0843

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

To become a member of the CEESP Working Group on Environment, Trade and Investment, please send an email to: [hbaumuller@ictsd.ch](mailto:hbaumuller@ictsd.ch)