



# Bridges Trade BioRes

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

**Issue: 15 April 2005**

<b>Fisheries.....</b>	<b>1</b>
WTO Members Tackle Development Aspect Of Fisheries Subsidies .....	
<b>International Standards .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Codex Considers Role Of Precaution In Risk Standard .....	
<b>Environment &amp; Trade.....</b>	<b>4</b>
Call For 'Green Growth' In Asia-Pacific Region .....	
<b>Biotechnology .....</b>	<b>5</b>
Eu, Us Battle Over Illegal Gm Corn.....	
<b>In Brief.....</b>	<b>6</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)

## Fisheries

### WTO MEMBERS TACKLE DEVELOPMENT ASPECT OF FISHERIES SUBSIDIES

The WTO Negotiation Group on Rules, meeting on 11, 13 and 15 May in Geneva, made progress in the discussion on disciplining fisheries subsidies within the WTO based on submissions by Brazil and the EC dealing with special and differential treatment (S&DT) and enforcement of fisheries subsidies rules respectively. Whereas previous

discussions have centred around the need for disciplining fisheries subsidies, the debate has now moved a step further, tackling development and enforcement concerns

### Brazil puts forward S&DT and green box proposals

In their first contribution to the debate on fisheries subsidies (TN/RL/W/174), Brazil presented an elaborated list of S&DT provisions that were widely welcomed by developing country Members. After the proposal by small vulnerable coastal states (TN/RL/W/136), the Brazilian contribution is the first in the discussions to make concrete suggestions about incorporating S&DT in fisheries subsidies disciplines. According to Brazil's submission, "developed countries should assume a higher level of responsibility and bear the greatest part of the burden resulting from a broader prohibition on fisheries subsidies aimed at restoring stocks or keeping them at a sustainable level of exploitation". New disciplines should take into account the economic difficulties facing poor economies and enable developing countries to establish a sustainable fisheries sector both within their Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs, covering the area up to 200 nautical miles from the coast) and on the high seas. They should also permit capacity-enhancing subsidies in developing countries, as long as they do not extend beyond the level compatible with a sustainable level of exploitation, nor provide incentives to illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing. The paper also suggests that fees paid by other governments to access EEZs, as well as assistance to disadvantaged regions dependent on fisheries, should be considered permissible subsidies in developing countries.

Brazil supported the introduction of a "green box" that would include subsidies which would not be challengeable under WTO rules. Subsequently, the paper put forward an exhaustive list of permissible subsidies including financial contributions to management services and support for adoption of environmentally-friendly fishing equipment and compliance with safety standards, provided that they do not have trade or production distorting effects. Under specific conditions, this category would also include subsidies to small-scale fishing and to capacity reduction. All subsidies not falling under the green box would be prohibited, "red box" subsidies. Brazil also suggested that "red box" subsidies would be made actionable for least developed countries, ie they would only be prohibited if there is a causal link between the subsidies and trade and production distortion, for a period of ten years.

### EC focuses on enforcement

The Negotiating Group on Rules also discussed an EC paper on enforcement of WTO fisheries subsidy disciplines (TN/RL/W/178). At present, the European Community has a legal system in place that aims to enforce rules regarding fisheries subsidies. Fearing a comparative disadvantage if the rules decided at the Rules Group are not enforced internationally, the EC proposed two ways in which Members may ensure that the outcome of the negotiations are followed up in reality. Drawing on its experience, the EC suggested that enforcement of WTO fisheries subsidies rules could be enhanced by a domestic control systems, where Members endorse fisheries subsidies in national law and make all subsidies awarded easily available for WTO Members. Alternatively, Members could notify the WTO before providing fisheries subsidies and subject the notification to review by other Member states. It would be up to individual Members to choose between the two control mechanisms. Chinese Taipei commented that WTO Members might be reluctant to cede sovereignty in this manner. The paper was submitted only recently and many countries stated they needed more time to study it closely in the weeks to come.

### Split response

Several developing country Members supported the strong S&DT provisions and the attention paid to the importance of fisheries for livelihoods and development. Faced with the challenge of

rebuilding their fishing industry after the 2004 tsunami, Sri Lanka said they particularly appreciated the section on natural disasters. The Brazilian paper would allow financial support to fishermen struck by natural catastrophes, in order to ensure a certain level of income. In addition, the EC, China and the 'Friends of Fish' (Argentina, Australia, Chile, Ecuador, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines and the United States) welcomed Brazil's paper.

Traditionally sceptical to the introduction of fishery subsidies disciplines to the WTO, Korea, Japan and Chinese Taipei feared that adding such a wide range of S&DT provisions might undermine the recognition from previous meetings that fisheries subsidies disciplines are needed. Chinese Taipei said that Brazil's approach contradicts the mandate of the Negotiation Group, and Japan said it was reluctant to accept most of the elements presented.

The informal session that preceded the formal meeting of the Rules Group discussed a submission from New Zealand on Fisheries Subsidies to Management Services (TN/RL/GEN/36). The paper suggests that public support to management services in fisheries should be allowed under WTO rules, and calls for Members to agree on a definition in order to establish a common understanding of what management services comprises.

The next meeting of the Rules Group to discuss fisheries subsidies disciplines is scheduled for 30 May and 2 June.

ICTSD reporting.

### International Standards

#### **CODEX      CONSIDERS      ROLE      OF PRECAUTION IN RISK STANDARD**

The Codex Alimentarius Committee on General Principles (CCGP) decided to reopen the Proposed Draft Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Food Safety for governments by discarding the current draft and starting discussions on a new one, after deadlock on the role of precaution in the principles held up discussions at its meeting from 11-15 April in Paris, France. The problem posed by the exportation of substandard food to developing countries that do not have the capacity to monitor imports was also recognised and forwarded to the

Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (CCFICS).

The decision to restart drafting on the Principles for Risk Analysis was a major step, given that negotiators have been discussing the current draft for several years. At the heart of the debate is the role of precaution in risk analysis, with the EU arguing that the precautionary principle must be clearly identified and defined with clear guidance on how to apply it to ensure food safety. Other countries, however, have said that it is not necessary to include an explicit reference to precaution in the document.

### Principles aim to guide government policy

The debate on precaution in the CCGP dates back to 2002, when negotiations on Principles for Risk Analysis for Food Safety overcame deadlock on the precaution issue and scope of the Principles by making two separate standards on Risk Analysis, with the first applying solely as guidance for Codex itself and the second to apply to governments (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 2 May 2002, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/02-05-02/story2.htm>). The decision enabled the adoption of Draft Working Principles for Risk Analysis for application within the framework of Codex in 2003 which included a reference to precaution as an "inherent element" of risk management, but no mention of the precautionary principle per se (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 17 April 2003, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/03-04-17/story1.htm>). Discussions on the second set of guidelines, which are to apply to governments, started in 2003 and have used an exact copy of the Codex-only Principles as the basis for negotiations.

Participants decided at this CCGP meeting to abandon the current draft and start from scratch. Based on a workshop held on 6 November 2004 in Paris, which was mandated by the 2004 CCGP meeting, agreement was reached that no consensus could be found on the role of precaution in the new agreement and particularly in the preamble and risk assessment section. Latin American, US and several South Eastern Asian countries argued against including mention of the term "precaution", the EU wanted to keep the current draft and more clearly specify how the precautionary principle was to be used. Some African countries said that guidance was needed on risk analysis in general but did not stake out a position on the need to include precaution in the guidelines.

Agreeing that new ideas were necessary, the CCGP's decision to restart drafting means that countries will soon be asked to submit comments on what the new draft should look like. This process will likely last until the end of September 2005 and will produce a "skeleton" of a new draft which will be considered at the CCGP's 2006 meeting.

### Code of ethics outdated?

The meeting also considered whether Codex's existing code of ethics for international trade in foods needs updating. The code, which was written in 1979 and revised in 1985, has been called "outdated" owing to its references to documents inside and outside Codex that are many decades old. For example, all countries agreed that the code as it currently stands fails to recognise or take into account the work of Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (CCFICS), which has created many agreements covering issues that the Code tries to address, and does not take into account the WTO's Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) and Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) agreements.

Some countries, including several developed countries and smaller developing countries, supported the revision of the code in order to bring it up to date and, in particular, to address the needs of developing country food importers who do not have the capacity to set and implement food standards to protect themselves against exports of substandard food from other countries. While several developing countries said that their real need was technical assistance to set up working food standards bodies and enforcement mechanisms, they said that the code would help with the problem. Although all countries agreed that the code was needed and opposed revoking the existing code, the US, New Zealand, Australia, Argentina and Mexico along with others said that revisions were not necessary. Concerns include that any update that takes into account the CCFICS, SPS and TBT agreements will leave very little for the Code of Ethics to cover.

The CCGP decided to forward the issue of sub-standard exports to developing countries without the capacity for food standards to CCFICS, given the latter's reputation for quick and efficient action on food standards issues, by asking them to develop new standards or amend their current standards to

address this challenge. The CCGP will return to the Code of Ethics issue in one year to assess CCFICS's addition to issues potentially under its scope and at that time reconsider the need for revisions.

### Background

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

### Additional Resources

Proposed Draft Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Food Safety can be accessed at  
[ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/ccgp22/cl04\\_34e.pdf](ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/ccgp22/cl04_34e.pdf)

The conclusions of the working group can be accessed at  
[ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/ccgp22/gp22\\_04e.pdf](ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/ccgp22/gp22_04e.pdf)

The Proposed Draft Revised Code of Ethics for International Trade in Food can be accessed at  
[ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/ccgp22/cl04\\_57e.pdf](ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/ccgp22/cl04_57e.pdf)

Comments on the Code can be accessed at  
[ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/ccgp22/gp22\\_05e.pdf](ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/ccgp22/gp22_05e.pdf),  
<ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/ccgp22/gp2205ae.pdf> and  
<ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/ccgp22/gp2205be.pdf>

The Consumers International Press Release on the meeting is available at  
<http://www.consumersinternational.org/news/display.asp?regionid=135&tag=C&id=467&type=news&cat=465&langid=1>

ICTSD Reporting.

### Environment & Trade

#### CALL FOR 'GREEN GROWTH' IN ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Over 500 participants meeting from 23-29 March for the Fifth Ministerial Conference on Environment and Development in Asia and the Pacific (MCED 2005) agreed that economic growth

in the region had to be made environmentally sustainable in order to relieve pressure on the carrying capacity of ecosystems in the region. However, despite acknowledgement that a paradigm shift towards such 'green growth' was necessary, several countries raised concerns that social and poverty reduction aspects of sustainability needed to be integrated into the approach.

The conference, which is held every five years and organised by its secretariat at the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific with the support of UNEP, the Asia Development Bank and UNDP, was themed "achieving environmentally sustainable economic growth (green growth) in Asia and the Pacific". The focus was driven by a secretariat paper (E/ESCAP/SO/MCED(05)/1) that reviewed the state of the environment in the region and found that rapid export-led economic growth in the region had led to increased environmental degradation. In its proposed solutions, the secretariat called for countries to focus on 'green growth' not only through enhancing environmental performance through regulatory measures to reduce pollution, but also by improving the efficiency of environmental resource use to fuel economic growth.

Tensions arose on what the term "green growth" meant, however, with India in particular saying that all three pillars of sustainability must be taken into account. Concerns that poverty reduction and social elements of sustainable development would be superseded by an agenda focused on economic tools for environmental preservation led India and Australia to propose a number of amendments to the final agreements of the conference, all of which recognised the centrality of economic growth and poverty reduction in national development strategies. The meeting of ministers on 29 March adopted the Ministerial Declaration on Environment and Development, the Regional Implementation Plan and the Seoul Initiative on Environmentally Sustainable Economic Growth (Green Growth), all of which are non-binding and instead serve as guidance to member countries.

The Ministerial Declaration recognises the three goals of ensuring environmental sustainability by reducing the pressure of economic growth on the environment; improving environmental performance through more effective laws and regulations, including on pollution; and promoting the environment as a driver of economic growth

and business opportunities, including through the promotion of environmental markets and overcoming the misconception that environmental considerations are an obstacle to economic growth. The goals are to be implemented through the Regional Implementation Plan for Sustainable Development in Asia and the Pacific 2006-2010 along with the Seoul Initiative, a program sponsored and organised by the Republic of Korea to exchange information, promote bilateral and multilateral cooperation and strengthen policy support through a network of national contact points participating in the Seoul Initiative Network on Green Growth.

Despite the cooperation and participation of many countries and several high-level representatives from major organisations, representatives showed limited enthusiasm in the "green growth" program. The uneasy balance between environmental and poverty reduction themes was combined with comments from several developing countries that increased official development assistance (ODA) from developed countries was necessary in order for them to implement multilateral environmental agreements and make the vision of 'green growth' a reality. Nonetheless, the meeting adjourned with plans for at least two Seoul initiative meetings to implement the ideas brought forward as well as agreement to hold the next MCED meeting in 2010.

### Additional Resources

Review of the State of the Environment in Asia and the Pacific, 2005, [http://www.unescap.org/mced/documents/presession/english/SOMCED5\\_1E\\_SOE.pdf](http://www.unescap.org/mced/documents/presession/english/SOMCED5_1E_SOE.pdf)

Draft Seoul Initiative on Environmentally Sustainable Economic Growth (Green Growth), [http://www.unescap.org/mced/documents/presession/english/SOMCED5\\_6E\\_Seoul\\_Initiative.pdf](http://www.unescap.org/mced/documents/presession/english/SOMCED5_6E_Seoul_Initiative.pdf)

Draft Ministerial Declaration on Environment and Development in Asia and the Pacific, [http://www.unescap.org/mced/documents/presession/english/SOMCED5\\_4E\\_Ministerial\\_Declaration.pdf](http://www.unescap.org/mced/documents/presession/english/SOMCED5_4E_Ministerial_Declaration.pdf)

For daily reporting, see IISD Linkages, <http://www.iisd.ca/sd/mced/>

ICTSD Reporting; ENB, Vol. 106 No. 1, 1 April 2005.

### Biotechnology

---

### EU, US BATTLE OVER ILLEGAL GM CORN

The European Commission on 15 April voted to introduce emergency measures restricting the import of GM corn feed from the US. The decision requires all imports to be accompanied by an analytical report issued by an accredited laboratory certifying that the import is free of illegal GM corn. The move followed the discovery that approximately 1000 metric tonnes of an unapproved biotech corn strain have been imported from the US into the EU since 2001.

The US Mission to the EU informed the Commission on 22 March that up to 10 kg of the illegal Bt10 corn seeds were shipped from the US by biotechnology firm Syngenta to test sites in Spain and France for "research purposes" and up to 1000 metric tonnes of Bt10 feed products may have entered the EU since 2001. The seed entered the EU through export channels for Bt11, a corn seed that has regulatory approval in both the US and EU unlike Bt10, which does not have approval in either area. Although the US told EU officials at the time that Bt10 and Bt11 were the same, on 31 March Syngenta told the Commission that unlike Bt11, Bt10 contained a gene conferring resistance against the antibiotic ampicillin. Ampicillin is widely prescribed for infections of the middle ear, sinuses, bladder, kidney, meningitis and other infections and it is feared that consumption of Bt10 will lead bacteria in the stomach to pick up the resistance gene and become tolerant to the antibiotic, making it less effective against infections.

Nonetheless, the European Food Safety Authority said in a statement made on 12 April that the illegal corn is unlikely to pose any threat to health or the environment given that a similar strain of Bt-10 examined last year showed that corn of this type is "unlikely to alter the existing pool of bacteria" resistant to ampicillin. Also, research so far has indicated that ampicillin-resistant genes do not spread through pollination from genetically modified corn to normal corn, the Authority noted. Syngenta said that the resistance gene is inactive in Bt10 and played down concerns about antibiotic resistance.

The new EU measure says that given the failure of Syngenta or the US authorities to deliver data requested by the EU for a full safety assessment, "emergency measures" are required "in order to achieve the high level of health protection chosen in

the Community". Under the new measures, any company importing GM corn feed or brewers' grains containing GM corn from the US into the EU must only do so if the imports are accompanied by an original analytical report issued by an accredited laboratory certifying that the product does not contain an illegal strain of GM corn. In the absence of such a report -- which is more detailed than existing EU requirements because it requires the approval by an accredited laboratory -- the importing company must either have the corn tested or not place it on the market. It also calls on EU member states to conduct spot checks of their GM corn imports, a process that is waiting on Syngenta's release of the full information about the molecular make-up of Bt10 and its distinction from Bt11, as well as the specific detection method to trace Bt10. It recognises that the measures should be "no more restrictive of trade than is required", and so limits the conditions only to corn feed and brewers' grains given that the US government has provided assurances that no GM corn food is imported into the EU from the US.

Environmental group Friends of the Earth said "this incident exposes an incompetent and complacent industry, an absence of regulation in the United States and a breakdown in Europe's monitoring of food imports. Immediate action is needed at an international level to prevent further contamination in the future." They called for an investigation into how Syngenta was able to sell unapproved GM products in the EU, and criticised the EU's slow reaction. "This is the latest in a long series of contamination events and demonstrates once again that GE crops can't be controlled, even by the companies that develop them", said Doreen Stabinsky, GE campaigner at Greenpeace, adding that the delay in making the release known -- almost four months since the US government entered into talks with Syngenta in December 2004 after four years of trade -- was particularly troubling.

The US criticised the EU measures as being unnecessarily restrictive. "We view the EU's decision to impose a certification requirement on U.S. corn gluten due to the possible, low-level presence of Bt-10 corn to be an over-reaction," said Edward Kemp, spokesman at the US Mission to the EU. "U.S. regulatory authorities have determined there are no hazards to health, safety or the environment related to Bt-10," he said in a statement. "There is no reason to expect any negative impact from the small amounts of Bt-10 corn that may have entered the EU."

## Additional Resources

The detection method for Bt-10 and the Recommendation to verify the presence/absence of BT10 maize in samples of maize, as endorsed by the European Network of GMO Laboratories, is available at <http://gmo-crl.jrc.it>

"Commission unable to stop unauthorised GMO," EU OBSERVER, 4 April 2005; "Settlement resolves biotech complaint," SWISSINFO, 9 April 2005; "EU mulls US trade ban in illegal GMO import row," REUTERS, 11 April 2005; "EU should not punish US in biotech corn case-USDA," REUTERS, 11 April 2005; "Commission seeks clarification on Bt10 from US authorities and Syngenta," EU PRESS RELEASE, 4 April 2005; "EU considers ban on US GM imports," EURACTIV, 13 April 2005; "EU Eyes Certification of US GMO Feed - Source," REUTERS, 13 April 2005; "EU RESTRICTS US MAIZE IMPORTS: De facto ban on maize-based animal feeds," FOE EUROPE NEWS RELEASE, 15 April 2005; "Syngenta sold wrong GE maize -- for four years," GREENPEACE, 24 March 2005; "U.S. calls EU move on GMO maize an over-reaction," REUTERS, 15 April 2005.

## In Brief

### GLOBAL WEEK OF ACTION ON TRADE CALLS FOR TRADE JUSTICE

The Global Week of Action was launched this week with several million people from over 70 countries joining in the call for trade justice at local events around the world. Events run from 10 to 16 April and include special church services, a global fast for trade justice, public debates, concerts, mass rallies, sending live chickens to parliament, nationwide petitions, farmers hearings and unfair football matches. Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) participating in the week of action said that they aim to challenge the "myth" that the only way to reduce poverty across the world is through more free trade, liberalisation and privatisation. Stressing that developing countries must have the right to decide which sectors to open to trade and when, the NGOs said that developing countries should not be forced to liberalise their industrial, services or agriculture sectors at the WTO and that negotiations on special and differential treatment should receive more attention. In addition, they argued that the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank should stop attaching trade liberalisation conditions on their loans and in their advice, while liberalisation through bilateral and regional agreements between regions or countries at different levels of development should not put the interest of business before the needs and rights of local people and communities. They also call on developed countries to end export subsidies.

For further information visit  
<http://www.april2005.org>.

"Media Briefing for the Global Week of Action on Trade," GLOBAL WEEK OF ACTION, April 2005.

### **INDIA RELEASES DRAFT BIOTECHNOLOGY STRATEGY**

The Indian government released a draft national biotechnology development strategy on 4 April, that describes plans to set up a National Biotechnology Regulatory Authority. The draft proposes the creation of a single authority on biotechnology regulation that would include separate divisions for transgenic crops, recombinant drugs and industrial products, transgenic food and feed, transgenic animals and aquaculture. A key aspect of the draft is the exemption of the biotech industry from restrictions limiting the percentage of foreign direct investment. Also proposed is an increase in investments in research and development, such as increased funding for university biotechnology programmes. The strategy will be subject to a six-week comment period during which suggestions from the public will be accepted.

"India Takes Aim at Biotech Sector," Pharmatechnologist, 5 April 2005; "Draft National Biotechnology Development Strategy Released," Hindu, 4 April 2005; "Draft Biotech Strategy Moots 100% FDI Via Automatic Route," Financial Express, 31 March 2005.

### **GOVERNMENTS MEET IN GENEVA TO DISCUSS WIPO DEVELOPMENT AGENDA**

The extent to which developmental concerns should figure in the work of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and scope of such concerns were the focus of a 11-13 April WIPO 'inter-sessional inter-governmental meeting' (IIM) in Geneva. The IIM was convened after fourteen developing countries, who have since described themselves as the "Friends of Development", submitted a proposal calling for the establishment of a "Development Agenda for WIPO" (WO/GA/31/11, available online at <http://www.wipo.int>). The Friends said in this document and a new one submitted at the IIM (IIM/1/4) that the mandate and governance of WIPO needs to be reviewed in order to ensure that

developmental concerns -- such as ensuring that standards are pro-development, or transfer and dissemination of technology issues -- are integrated throughout the organisation's work. Countries such as the US and Mexico rejected the idea that a substantive change in WIPO's mandate was necessary, warning against its transformation into a development agency. Instead, both the US and Mexico focused their submissions on the general improvement of WIPO's technical assistance (IIM/1/2 and IIM/1/3). The majority of developing country members, including the groups of African and Asian countries, expressed support for many of the issues raised in the Friends' submissions and stressed the importance of ensuring that the design and implementation of intellectual property rules take into account different countries' respective levels of development and that one size should not be made to fit all. After much debate, members agreed that two further sessions of the IIM, scheduled for June and July, would be necessary to examine the issues further.

For a more detailed report of the meeting, see BRIDGES Weekly, 13 April 2005,  
<http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/05-04-13/story1.htm>.

ICTSD reporting.

### **PROTECT CROPS VITAL TO FOOD SECURITY, OXFAM SAYS**

Rich WTO Member countries are threatening the livelihoods of poor farmers in developing countries by walking out on a promise to exempt vital food crops from tariff cuts, according to a new report by international charity Oxfam. The report, entitled "Kicking down the door", calls for crops vital for food security and livelihoods in developing countries, commonly referred to as "special products" in WTO parlance, to be fully exempt from tariff reduction in ongoing WTO negotiations. Oxfam notes that the World Bank and (IMF) have posed a threat to food security since the 1980s because of loan conditionalities requiring agricultural liberalisation. More recently, the WTO has become "the new battleground", putting pressure on developing countries to reduce their tariffs on imports, the report concludes. A proposed 'Harbinson' tariff-reduction formula would force developing countries to slash rice tariffs, they point out, which would add to the problems caused by tonnes of US rice which they

say has been dumped on world markets after being highly subsidised. The non-governmental organisation also backed calls for the establishment of a 'special safeguard mechanism' for developing countries to invoke in the case of harmful import surges.

The full report is available at  
[http://www.oxfam.org/eng/pdfs/bp72\\_rice.pdf](http://www.oxfam.org/eng/pdfs/bp72_rice.pdf)

"Two-pronged trade attack will destroy poor farmers," OXFAM PRESS RELEASE, 11 April 2005; "Oxfam asks India to protect farmers from WTO proposals," THE HINDU, 11 April 2005; "Protection urged for poor nations' farmers," THE FINANCIAL TIMES, 10 April 2005.

## REGIONALISATION IDENTIFIED AS TOP PRIORITY BY ICPM

The need to identify regions within countries was the top priority at the 7th session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) held in Rome from 4 to 8 April. The ICPM is the governing body of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), an international expert body setting plant and phytosanitary standards. Currently, trade restrictions imposed under the IPPC because of the discovery of plant and animal diseases are imposed on the entire country, or trading block in the case of the EU, in which the disease is found. This has raised problems because regions within the exporting country or trading block may in fact be disease and pest-free. Late or no recognition of this fact, due to the absence of provisions for recognising regions within or across national borders in the IPPC, may result in export bans being imposed where they are unnecessary or for longer than is required. The need to develop new procedures for recognising regions has been debated extensively in the WTO Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (see Bridges Weekly, 16 March 2005, <http://www.ictsd.com/weekly/05-03-16/story4.htm>), and the ICPM decided to convene a working group during the meeting to identify possible ways to recognise disease free regions. The working group's report called for standards and guidelines for the recognition of pest free regions to be "urgently developed", a process that will start with a meeting of the Standards Committee of IPPC on 25 April.

The 8th session of ICPM is scheduled for March 27-31 2006.

For more information visit  
<https://www.ippc.int/id/37390>

ICTSD Reporting.

---

## 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>.

### ICTSD Events

21 April, Geneva, Switzerland: DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS: INCORPORATING THE CBD PRINCIPLES IN THE TRIPS AGREEMENT ON THE ROAD TO HONG KONG. Under the Doha mandate (Paragraph 19), the TRIPS Council, in its review of Article 27.3 (b) and Article 71.1 TRIPS, is instructed to consider the relationship between the TRIPS Agreement and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and the protection of traditional knowledge and folklore. Much work will be needed during coming months in order to provide the necessary options and solutions for successful decision making prior to the WTO Ministerial Conference in Hong at the end of the year. This dialogue will help move this process forward by focusing on how to address the need for disclosure of the origin or source of the genetic resource and traditional knowledge used in an invention. For further information contact Andrew Stevenson, tel: (+41 22) 917 8664; 917-8093; email: [astevenson@ictsd.ch](mailto:astevenson@ictsd.ch)

21 April, Geneva, Switzerland: BOOK LAUNCH RECEPTION FOR THE ICTSD-UNCTAD "RESOURCE BOOK ON TRIPS AND DEVELOPMENT". This reception will launch the new resource book, conceived as a guide to provide background and technical information on the main issues under discussion at the WTO and elsewhere regarding intellectual property rights from a development perspective. It is a practical tool for negotiators, policymakers, and others to enhance their informed participation in negotiations and decision-making processes. For further information contact Andrew Stevenson, tel: (+41 22) 917 8664; 917-8093; email: [astevenson@ictsd.ch](mailto:astevenson@ictsd.ch); Internet: [www.iprsonline.org](http://www.iprsonline.org)

22 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO COMPATIBILITY AND THE ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS: COHERENCE FOR AN ACP DEVELOPMENT AGENDA. This roundtable held at the WTO Symposium will examine the interaction



between the WTO and Economic Partnership Agreements that are currently being negotiated by the EU and African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries. Sessions include "Challenges, options and strategies for addressing the development dimension of EPAs through GATT Article XXIV" and "Ensuring Coherence in EPAs and the DDA: the treatment of commodities and the erosion of preferences in EPAs and the WTO". For further information contact Yvonne Apea, tel: (+41 22) 917-8442; fax: 917-8093; email: yapea@ictsd.ch; Internet: <http://www.ictsd.org/issarea/africa/docs/EPA%20-WTO%20Symposium%20draft%20programme.pdf>

### Coming up in the next two weeks

18 April, New York, USA: SPECIAL HIGH-LEVEL MEETING OF ECOSOC WITH THE BRETTON WOODS INSTITUTIONS AND WTO. The UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) is holding a special high-level meeting with the Bretton Woods Institutions, World Trade Organization and UN Conference on Trade and Development. This is the eighth meeting between ECOSOC and the Bretton Woods institutions, and it will take place immediately after the spring meetings of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. The meeting will focus on "coherence, coordination and cooperation in the context of the implementation of the Monterrey Consensus." For further information contact Sarbuland Khan, tel: (+1 212) 963-4628; fax: 963-1712; email: [khan2@un.org](mailto:khan2@un.org); Internet: <http://www.un.org/docs/ecosoc/meetings/bwi2005/>

19 - 20 April, Brussels, Belgium: THIRD ANNUAL BRUSSELS CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE. The conference, themed "EU climate change policy beyond Kyoto: Building a global climate change agreement". The will consider, among others, EU climate change policy after the upcoming Spring Council meeting, transport and aviation issues, the development of the EU Emissions Trading Scheme, and impact mitigation and technology solutions. For further information contact Mark Kinloch, tel: (+44 1495) 300-012; fax: 309-372; email: [info@euconferences.com](mailto:info@euconferences.com); Internet: [http://www.euconferences.com/climatechange05\\_intro.htm](http://www.euconferences.com/climatechange05_intro.htm)

19-20 April, Bern, Switzerland: ITTO WORKSHOP ON PHASED APPROACHES TO CERTIFICATION. This workshop of the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) will seek to promote the use of phased approaches to certification in tropical timber exporting developing countries. For further information contact Manoel Sobral Filho, ITTO Executive Director, tel: (+81) 45-223-1110; fax: 45-223-1111; email: [itto@itto.or.jp](mailto:itto@itto.or.jp); Internet: <http://www.itto.or.jp>

20-22 April, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO ANNUAL PUBLIC SYMPOSIUM 2005. The World Trade Organization's 2005 annual public symposium will take

as its theme "The WTO After 10 Years: Global Problems and Multilateral Solution". Participants from governments, parliaments, civil society, the business sector, academia and the media are expected to reflect on the WTO's first ten years and discuss the challenges the organization faces looking forward. The WTO's annual symposia are intended to stimulate public debate on the WTO. For further information contact Bernard Kuiten, tel: (+41 22) 739-5676; email: [PublicSymposium2005@wto.org](mailto:PublicSymposium2005@wto.org); Internet: [http://www.wto.org/english/news\\_e/events\\_e/symposium\\_2005\\_e.htm](http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/events_e/symposium_2005_e.htm)

26-29 April, Bordeaux, France: CONFERENCE ON BIODIVERSITY AND CONSERVATION BIOLOGY IN PLANTATION FORESTS. This Conference is organised by IEFCE (Institut Européen de la Forêt Cultivée) and INRA (Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique) under the auspices of IUFRO, WWF, and the European Forest Institute. It will raise biodiversity issues related to the conservation of natural forests at the species, community and ecosystem levels. For further information contact Hervé Jactel, INRA, email: [Herve.Jactel@pierroton.inra.fr](mailto:Herve.Jactel@pierroton.inra.fr); Internet: <http://www.pierroton.inra.fr/IEFC/manifestations/IUFROD82005.html>

### Other Upcoming Events

9-13 May, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia: 33RD SESSION OF THE JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD LABELLING. For further information contact the Secretariat of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme; tel: (39 06) 57051; fax: 5705 4593; email: [codex@fao.org](mailto:codex@fao.org); Internet: [http://www.codexalimentarius.net/download/report/642/fl33\\_01e.pdf](http://www.codexalimentarius.net/download/report/642/fl33_01e.pdf)

17-25 May, Geneva, Switzerland: 15TH MEETING OF THE CITES PLANTS COMMITTEE AND 21ST MEETING OF THE CITES ANIMALS COMMITTEE. The Animals Committee and Plants Committee of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) will address the resolutions and decisions directed to them by the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties of CITES in Bangkok, Thailand, in October. They will also undertake periodic reviews of species, in order to ensure appropriate categorisation in the CITES Appendices; advise when certain species are subject to unsustainable trade and recommending remedial action; and draft new resolutions on animal and plant matters for consideration by the Parties at the next COP, to be held in the Netherlands in 2007. For further information contact the CITES Secretariat, tel: (+41-22) 917-8139; fax: 797-3417; email: [cites@unep.ch](mailto:cites@unep.ch); Internet: [www.cites.org](http://www.cites.org)

25-27 May, Montreal, Canada: FIRST MEETING OF THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP

ON LIABILITY AND REDRESS UNDER THE BIOSAFETY PROTOCOL. This meeting is organised by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Secretariat. For further information contact the CBD Secretariat, tel: (+1-514) 288-2220; fax: 288-6588; email: [secretariat@biodiv.org](mailto:secretariat@biodiv.org); Internet: <http://www.biodiv.org/meetings/default.aspx>

30 May - 3 June, Montreal, Canada: SECOND MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY (COP/MOP-2). Organised by the Convention on Biological Diversity. For further information contact the CBD Secretariat, tel: (+1-514) 288-2220; fax: 288-6588; email: [secretariat@biodiv.org](mailto:secretariat@biodiv.org); Internet: <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.asp?mtg=MOP-02>

## 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).

CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE CONFLICT OVER AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY. By Thomas Bernauer in *International Journal of Biotechnology* 7 (1/2/3) (2005). This article explores why and how differences across countries in agri-biotech regulation create tensions in the world trading system and examines how these tensions could develop into full-blown trade conflicts. It also assesses the consequences of such trade conflicts for biotechnology and for developing countries. To access the article visit [http://www.inderscience.com/search/index.php?action=record&rec\\_id=6442&prevQuery=&ps=10&m=or](http://www.inderscience.com/search/index.php?action=record&rec_id=6442&prevQuery=&ps=10&m=or)

UNCULTIVATED FOOD: FOOD THAT MONEY CAN'T BUY (South Asia Network on Food, Ecology and Culture (SANFEC), January 2005). The presence of uncultivated food in the food systems of South Asia is a survival issue for many of the poorest families, some of whom rely on uncultivated food for all of their dietary needs, the article notes. It underlines the critical connection between the conservation of the local diversity of food sources and the broader social goals of poverty alleviation, livelihood enhancement and sustainable development. To access the article visit <http://www.grain.org/seedling/?id=317>

"NAMIBIANISATION", EXPORTS AND DOMESTIC VALUE ADDITION IN THE NAMIBIAN FISHING INDUSTRY. CHANCES AND RISKS OF INCLUDING FISHERIES INTO A FREE TRADE AGREEMENT WITH THE EU. By Mareike Meyn (NEPRU Research Report n. 33, March 2005). Namibia is one of the few African countries that has

been able to establish its own fishing industry, attracting considerable investment over the last 15 years and involving formerly disadvantaged Namibian citizens in the fishing sector. This report seeks to analyse the chances and risks the Namibian fishing industry faces in light of the possibility to include fisheries in the Economic Partnership Agreement that is being negotiated between Namibia and the EU, the biggest export market for Namibian fish. To access the paper visit <http://www.nepru.org.na/publications/NRR/PDF/nrr3.3.pdf>

AN EXAMINATION OF US FDI INTO MEXICO AND ITS RELATION TO NAFTA: UNDERSTANDING THE EFFECTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION AND THE FACTOR ENDOWMENTS THAT AFFECT THE LOCATION DECISION. By Elizabeth T. Cole and Prescott C. Ensign in *The International Trade Journal*, 19 (1) (Spring 2005). This article analyses the impact of the NAFTA signing on US foreign direct investment in Mexico with respect to environmental expenditures and factors including capital, technology and skilled and unskilled labour. Distinguishing between environmental standards and environmental compliance costs, the article finds little evidence that industries are moving from the US to Mexico due to American environmental standards. To access the article visit <http://taylorandfrancis.metapress.com/app/home/contribution.asp?wasp=156c1e4cd1a6448f94374dd47c3b6bc3&referrer=parent&backto=issue,1,4;journal,1,24;linkingpublicationresults,1:102460,1>

STATUS OF THE WORLD'S FISHERY GENETIC RESOURCES. By Devin M. Bartley (FAO, March 2005). With fish and fisheries products constituting a major and increasing part of human protein supply across the world aquaculture production is increasing to keep pace with human consumption. This paper considers increasing the food supply through increased development of aquaculture or through improved management of natural resources, taking into account genetic stock structure and the resilience and resistance that genetic resources may give to national populations. To access the paper visit <http://www.fao.org/biotech/docs/bartley.pdf>

REPORT TO PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF BIOTECHNOLOGY. By Stephen Rule and Zakes Ianga (Public Understanding of Biotechnology (PUB) Programme and the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), April 2005). This survey on public perceptions of biotechnology involved a sample of 7000 adults from across South Africa and found that eight out of ten South Africans have no knowledge about biotechnology and well over half have never even heard of the term before. Despite this lack of understanding, an average of 57 percent indicated that different applications of biotechnology should continue. To access the survey visit [http://www.pub.ac.za/resources/docs/survey\\_pub\\_feb\\_2005.pdf](http://www.pub.ac.za/resources/docs/survey_pub_feb_2005.pdf)

PLANTING THE RIGHT SEED: A HUMAN RIGHTS PERSPECTIVE ON AGRICULTURE TRADE AND THE WTO. (Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy and 3D: Trade-Human Rights-Equitable Economy, March 2005). This report argues that the WTO's agriculture agreement threatens human

rights by promoting a trade liberalisation agenda that overrides efforts to improve livelihoods. It is the first in a series of reports that aim to analyse the WTO's Agreement on Agriculture. To access the report visit <http://www.tradeobservatory.org/library.cfm?refid=69823>

*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 Heike Baumüller. Contributors to this issue were Trineesh Biswas, Hilde Ludt, Sarah Mohan and Anne Simson. 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 2004 through the generous support of the Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape (BUWAL) and the State Secretary for Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment of The Netherlands (VROM). It also benefits from ICTSD's core funders: the Governments of Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden; Christian Aid (UK), the Rockefeller Foundation, MISEREOR, NOVIB (NL), Oxfam (UK) and the Swiss Coalition of Development Organisations (Switzerland). ISSN 1682-0843

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

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