



INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR  
TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE  
DEVELOPMENT

# Bridges

## Weekly Trade News Digest

26 October 2005

Volume 9 Number 36

### LEAD STORIES

AG: FIPS MINISTERS' MEET ENDS ABRUPTLY; EU  
TO MAKE NEW OFFER ON MARKET ACCESS? 1

MARKET ACCESS FLEXIBILITIES UP FOR  
DISCUSSION IN WTO FARM TALKS 3

TRIPS COUNCIL REMAINS DIVIDED ON PUBLIC  
HEALTH AMENDMENT 5

### OTHER NEWS

UNESCO OVERWHELMINGLY APPROVES  
CULTURAL DIVERSITY TREATY 6

### IN BRIEF

AFRICA SUFFERS FROM TEXTILE QUOTA PHASE-  
OUT, SAYS ILO 8

### WTO IN BRIEF

ANTI-DUMPING ACTIVITY CONTINUES DECLINE:  
WTO SECRETARIAT 8

DSU REVIEW EFFECTIVELY ON HOLD 9

SPS COMMITTEE LOOKS AT WAYS FORWARD ON  
S&D 9

### EVENTS & RESOURCES

VACANCIES 9

EVENTS 10

RESOURCES 11

CORRIGENDUM 12

### LEAD STORIES

#### **AG: FIPS MINISTERS' MEET ENDS ABRUPTLY; EU TO MAKE NEW OFFER ON MARKET ACCESS?**

The Doha Round negotiations risk collapse, warned the US and the EU on 19 October, after meetings among major trading powers broke down over farm trade reform. The chair of the WTO agriculture negotiations, Ambassador Crawford Falconer of New Zealand, warned Members on 21 October that if they failed to resolve their major differences within ten days, it would be impossible for them to reach agreement at the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference in December.

Ministerial-level talks in Geneva among the US, the EU, Brazil, India and Australia (the Five Interested Parties, FIPs) fell apart on 19 October, after they were unable to narrow their differences on tariff reduction. The EU's offer on market access remains significantly less ambitious than those from the other FIPs countries. The FIPs ministers' talks scheduled for the following day were cancelled, as was a session with ministers from six other states, including Canada, Japan, and Switzerland. These high-level gatherings coincided with an 'agriculture week' at the WTO during which Members remained far apart on how to reduce tariffs (see BRIDGES Weekly, 19 October 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/05-10-19/story1.htm>).

The breakdown last week is considered a grave setback to the talks, and indicates that Members may be unable to agree on modalities including numerical targets for tariff cuts before Hong Kong. Some sources have gone so far as to express concerns that the Ministerial Conference may be cancelled, while others have dismissed such suggestions as calculated to motivate progress. Members are now expecting a revised offer by the EU towards the end of the week.

#### **EU under increasing pressure from US, Cairns group, G-20**

US Trade Representative Rob Portman blamed the EU's failure to come up with a new, deeper proposal on market access for the breakdown in Geneva. Australian

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

If you require any assistance setting up your BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest subscription, please contact Trineesh Biswas, Editor, by email at: [bridges\\_weekly@ictsd.ch](mailto:bridges_weekly@ictsd.ch), or by telephone at: (41-22) 917-8498

Trade Minister Mark Vaile also claimed that the EU was jeopardising the talks, warning that "other areas such as industrials and services, will remain stalled" until the EU makes a significant market access offer. Similar views were voiced by the G-20 group of major developing countries, which includes Brazil, China and India, as well as the 17-country Cairns Group of farm exporters.

Portman told a 20 October press conference in Geneva that an EU proposal would "not be credible" unless it is between the 75 percent average tariff cut for developed countries proposed by the US and the 54 percent average reduction sought by the G-20. The Cairns Group has also urged the EU to come up with a proposal in that range. In contrast, the EU's most recent proposal would have rich countries cut tariffs by an average of 24.5 percent (see BRIDGES Weekly, 12 October 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/05-10-12/story2.htm>).

In spite of the heavy pressure from its trading partners to produce a more ambitious offer, opposition to further tariff cuts from within the EU has limited EU Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson's ability to negotiate. Mandelson maintains that the EU would have to see satisfactory progress on non-agricultural market access (NAMA) and services before offering any further concessions in agriculture. In a 19 October letter addressed to WTO Director-General Pascal Lamy and circulated to FIPs trade ministers, Mandelson said that while progress on agriculture might "unlock" the rest of the negotiations, "it is equally true that a combination of inactivity in non-agricultural sectors and unreasonable demands on agricultural market access can also keep the negotiations completely 'locked'."

Brazil, India and the US, however, saw the sequencing differently, and maintained that progress on agriculture was necessary before there could be movement in other areas.

### **G-10, ACP in EU camp on market access**

However, not all Members would like to see the EU offer to make deeper tariff cuts. A number of countries have taken positions in favour of the EU on market access. A delegate from a country belonging to the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) group expressed grave concern that the emerging concept of a "middle ground" is migrating towards the US and Cairns group positions, rather than taking G-10 and ACP positions into account.

On 21 October, the ACP countries tabled a new proposal on market access that calls for the overall average tariff reduction by developing countries not to exceed 24 percent, coupled with progress on the

development aspects of the agriculture negotiations (see related story, this issue). While presenting the proposal to WTO Member delegations, the Ambassador of Mauritius pointed to the size of the constituency that supported it -- the ACP Group accounts for 79 of the WTO's 148 Member states.

Though it strikes many of the same notes as the ACP paper on development, the G-20 proposal provides for a maximum average cut of 36 percent by developing countries.

The G-10, a group of net food importers with heavily protected agricultural sectors that includes Japan, Switzerland, and Norway, supported the flexibility provided for in the ACP proposal. They expressed opposition to the proposals from major trading nations calling for deep cuts on farm import tariffs. According to the group, the EU should seek to find a middle ground between agricultural exporters and the "friends of flexibility," namely countries such as the ACP and G-10. The G-10 also said that it wanted to see progress in other areas of the negotiations.

### **Internal Schisms Over Agriculture Dogging The EU**

The EU is expected to circulate a revised market access offer towards the end of the week. However, EU member states are deeply divided on how to proceed, and are engaged in intense internal discussions on the Doha Round. Mandelson told EU development ministers on 24 October "If we want the US to reform its own domestic subsidy regime and if we want the Brazilians to cut industrial tariffs and open up on services, we have to move on agricultural tariffs, there's no other way."

On 25 October, France circulated a text among EU agriculture ministers that called for the EU's executive European Commission not to present a new market access offer. France has previously threatened to block the negotiations over the issue. Nevertheless, that same day EU Commissioners expressed their full support to Mandelson to put forward a new offer on farm subsidies -- one that would be explicitly linked to progress in other areas of the negotiations. "This offer would be a conditional offer which would enable other WTO members to make further moves in relation to agriculture, industrial goods and services," said EU Commission spokesperson Peter Powers. The offer is likely to elaborate on farm tariff cuts under a four-tier approach. In addition, it would include a list of sensitive products and their import tariffs. US Trade Representative Rob Portman has cautioned, however, that the new offer may not be enough to break the deadlock in the agriculture negotiations.

Sources report that any new EU proposal will probably not be circulated before a 27 October meeting of EU heads of state outside London. A 27 October senior officials meeting in Geneva has been cancelled. However, trade negotiators remain permanently 'on call,' and the FIPs have reportedly scheduled a teleconference for 28 October.

In light of the state of the talks, Falconer has indicated that 25 November is the earliest that Members could hope for a draft Hong Kong text, rather than at the mid-November target date.

ICTSD will provide an update on the negotiations in the next issue of BRIDGES Weekly.

ICTSD reporting; "US, EU warn WTO deal in danger as talks fail", REUTERS, 19 October 2005; "Australian Trade Minister says EU putting WTO talks at risk", AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 20 October 2005; "EU under pressure over slack pace of WTO talks", AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 20 October 2005; "WTO members remain far apart on farm trade liberalization", Kyodo News, 21 October 2005; "Blame game follows failure of FIPs Ministers' meeting", THIRD WORLD NETWORK INFORMATION SERVICE, 21 October 2005; "Statement by EU Trade Commissioner following WTO talks in Geneva", EU Trade News, 21 October 2005; "Pressure mounts on EU to break WTO deadlock", REUTERS, 21 October 2005, "Food importers warn over WTO summit", AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 21 October 2005; "WTO chief says EU, US position in trade talks too far apart", AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 22 October 2005; "Mandelson says EU has to cut farm tariffs as trade talks balance on knife edge", ASSOCIATED PRESS, 24 October 2005, "USTR Portman says signs 'Not Encouraging' that EU will come up with solid Ag proposal", WTO REPORTER, 26 October 2005; "EU faces crunch week to save global trade talks," REUTERS, 24 October 2005.

---

## **MARKET ACCESS FLEXIBILITIES UP FOR DISCUSSION IN WTO FARM TALKS**

Even as ministerial-level talks between five influential WTO Members fell apart in Geneva last week (see related story, this issue), trade negotiators continued to hold informal meetings. Market access remains a major point of contention, and not just from countries that would like to see steeper reductions in farm tariffs. The group of African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries made a new market access proposal that highlighted the vulnerability of many developing countries to the unrestrained opening of markets.

Many groups of Members have come forward with specific proposals outlining the flexibilities that they

would like to be accorded in the application of the tariff reduction formula.

### **ACP countries call attention to development issues**

The ACP group tabled its new proposal at a 21 October informal meeting of the Special (negotiating) Session of the Committee on Agriculture. Its formula would classify tariffs into four tiers for reduction: for developing countries, products with tariffs of 0-50 percent, 50-100 percent, 100-150 percent and over 150 percent; the corresponding tiers for developed countries would be 0-20, 20-50, 50-80 and over 80 percent. Developing countries would make tariff cuts ranging from 15 to 30 percent; those required of developed countries were not specified.

While the pressure mounts on the EU to come forward with a more ambitious market access proposal, the ACP Group noted that a large number of developing countries -- including its 79 WTO Members -- actually favour a more cautious approach to farm tariff reduction.

The ACP proposal also provides for special consideration for developing countries that bound their tariffs at a very high uniform rate during the Uruguay Round -- otherwise, these countries' tariffs would fall into high tiers in all of the current market access proposals, where they would be slated for steep percentage reductions.

The ACP Group expressed the view that negotiations among the Five Interested Parties (FIPs) were racing ahead without paying adequate heed to issues of importance to many developing countries, and called for a transparent and inclusive negotiating process.

ACP countries promised to table a more detailed proposal on the erosion of long-standing preferences -- one of their key concerns. Their request that "products relating to long-standing preferences shall be designated as sensitive products" -- which would allow developed countries to somewhat mitigate the extent of preference erosion -- ran up against the G-20's suggestion that developed countries be prohibited from listing tropical products as sensitive. At the 21 October meeting, a number of developing countries looking for expanded market access for tropical products said that the ACP's proposed approach might hurt their exports both to developing and developed countries.

### **Different groups put forward views on sensitive products**

The issue of sensitive products, which both developing and developed countries may designate for tariff cuts more lenient than those required by the formula, has

pitted relatively protectionist Members like the EU and G-10 (net food importing, mainly developed countries), against the US and Cairns Group countries, which are looking for expanded market access. Following its recent paper on market access (see BRIDGES Weekly, 12 October 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/05-10-12/story2.htm>), the G-20 tabled a new proposal on sensitive products on 19 October.

The new G-20 paper would allow developed country Members to designate a maximum of one percent of their tariff lines as 'sensitive.' Overall, a reduction 30 percent lower than the regular tariff cut within a tier would be the maximum permitted deviation. However, all sensitive products would be subject to tariff rate quota (TRQ) expansion, and the more lenient the tariff cut applied, the greater the TRQ expansion. Similarly, the more tariff lines a country chooses to designate as sensitive, the less flexible their treatment would be. Sensitive products would, as all other products, be subject to tariff caps, and Members would be prohibited from creating new TRQs for products that do not currently have any. The paper also requested Members to table their "wish lists" for sensitive products before the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference in December.

The G-20 paper also spelled out principles for special and differential treatment (S&D) with regard to sensitive products. Developing countries would be able to designate 50 percent more sensitive products than developed countries, i.e., 1.5 percent of tariff lines. Their particular situations -- including features such as the importance of subsistence farming to domestic consumption -- would be taken into account when considering TRQ expansion. Developing countries would also be allowed to create a limited number of TRQs for products without them that they choose to designate as sensitive. Least-developed countries would be exempted from TRQ expansions.

Australia also presented a paper on sensitive products on 19 October, seeking a simple approach with flexibility for sensitive products built directly into the tiered market access formula. For each tier, a standard combination of a tariff reduction and TRQ expansion would apply; the higher the tier, the larger the combined tariff cut and TRQ expansion required for a sensitive product in the tier. Sensitive products would be limited to "a limited number of total dutiable agricultural tariff lines covering no more than a small proportion of imports."

The US, in its recent market access proposal, had called for a "minimal number of 'sensitive products' subject to lesser tariff reductions: one percent of tariff lines, with full compensation via TRQ expansion."

The EU, on the other hand, had suggested allowing up to eight percent of tariff lines to be designated as sensitive and made subject to lesser tariff cuts within their respective tariff tier, albeit in combination with TRQ expansion. It would exempt such products from a tariff cap.

The G-10 proposal outlined two options for market access, and required Members to choose between a more flexible formula and designating more products as sensitive. Members opting for the flexible formula would be allowed to make constrained deviations from the average cut for products within each tier, but would be allowed fewer sensitive products than countries that choose the less flexible formula.

According to this proposal, market access for sensitive products would be expanded through a standard combination of a tariff cut and TRQ expansion. Lower tariff cuts for such products would have to be compensated for by larger TRQ expansions, and vice versa. The G-10 would give special consideration to products with TRQs that already are large as compared to domestic consumption. It would also grant Members with a large number of tariff lines in the highest tiers additional sensitive products, in order to account for differences in tariff structures. The G-10 opposes any tariff caps.

### **G-33 outlines thinking on Special Products**

The G-33, which supports allowing developing countries to designate 'Special Products' (SPs) for low tariff cuts based on food security, livelihood security and rural development criteria, tabled a paper on 12 October on how SPs could be identified. The paper went on to be endorsed by the ACP countries' market access proposal, which called for SPs to be completely exempt from tariff cuts and TRQ commitments.

Noting that each country's situation is unique and that Members will apply their own set of indicators when designating their respective SPs, the paper elaborated on indicators under each of the three broad sets of criteria. National level food security concerns included access to food across regions and in individual households, as well as the share of a product in average caloric intake. International ones included countries' vulnerability to supply interruptions.

With regard to assessing the importance of products to livelihood security, the paper focused heavily on the role of small and resource-poor farmers in the production of particular crops that may be displaced by imports. It also said that the needs of special groups, such as tribal communities or women, or products from disadvantaged geographical regions could be taken into account. On rural development, the paper noted the

need for options to improve the living conditions of rural populations, based both on existing products and the potential for value addition in rural areas. The G-33 noted that countries should have the flexibility to designate new SPs in place of existing ones as circumstances change.

Notably, the G-33 paper contended that products whose world market prices are distorted by rich country subsidies should be automatically eligible for SP status.

Although discussions in Geneva have slowed down in anticipation of a new market access offer by the EU, negotiators are permanently on call. Agriculture Chair Ambassador Crawford Falconer of New Zealand has committed to holding briefings for the full Membership on a regular basis, and is planning what he terms an information 'clinic' early next week.

ICTSD will provide an update on the negotiations in the next issue of BRIDGES Weekly.

ICTSD reporting.

---

### **TRIPS COUNCIL REMAINS DIVIDED ON PUBLIC HEALTH AMENDMENT**

WTO Members remain divided on how to formally amend the Agreement on Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) in order to facilitate the export of drugs produced under compulsory licence. No substantive discussions took place on the issue during the 25-26 October meeting of the TRIPS council. Members, whose positions are largely unchanged since the last meeting in June, focused on process-related issues (see BRIDGES Weekly, 22 June 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/05-06-22/story3.htm>). Chair Ambassador Choi Hyuck of Korea suspended the TRIPS Council's session on 26 October. It is set to reconvene on 28 October, when Members will discuss the relationship between the TRIPS Agreement, the Convention on Biological Diversity and traditional knowledge.

The '30 August 2003 Decision' by the General Council spelled out the circumstances under which countries lacking pharmaceutical manufacturing capabilities can import generic versions of drugs still under patent. The Decision temporarily waives Members' obligations under TRIPS Articles 31(f) and (h) by allowing them to export pharmaceuticals produced under compulsory licence, albeit subject to a large number of conditions in both the exporting and importing country. This waiver, it stipulates, will remain valid until the TRIPS Agreement is permanently amended. The Decision's adoption was accompanied by a statement from the Chair of the General Council ('Chair's statement') assuring that it

would not be misused, for example to divert low-cost medicines into developed country markets.

Members have missed several deadlines for agreeing upon a permanent amendment, most recently in March 2005. Countries differ on the content of the potential amendment as well as whether it should be a footnote, annex, or a change to the body of the text of the agreement. Developing and developed countries also broadly disagree on the legal status of the Chair's statement. Since December 2004, discussions have centred around the African Group's proposed permanent amendment (IP/C/W/437), which would insert a modified version of the 30 August Decision waiver into the body of the TRIPS Agreement and leave out the Chair's statement.

WTO Director-General Pascal Lamy has been urging Members to resolve the matter in time for the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference in December.

### **Countries still far apart on amendment**

Sources report that in recent weeks Hyuck has chaired informal meetings among the EU, the US, and the African Group to discuss how to convert the waiver into a permanent amendment. At the 25 October session of the TRIPS Council, countries including Switzerland and Malaysia, expressed support for this trilateral process, and indicated that they were willing to contribute if and when the Chair deemed it necessary. Brazil, India and Argentina, however, objected to the central role of those consultations in discussions on the TRIPS amendment, arguing that they were neither representative nor transparent. Their delegates argued that all countries with an interest in the matter -- including their own -- should be able to participate in a consultative process that involves the Chair.

Discussions on the content of the waiver echoed past meetings to a great extent (see BRIDGES Weekly, 16 March 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/05-03-16/story1.htm>). Delegates report that several developing countries, including Argentina, Brazil, India, and the Philippines expressed support for the African Group proposal -- the only formal proposal for the TRIPS Agreement amendment currently on the negotiating table -- as a basis for discussion.

### **Waiver remains unused**

During the TRIPS Council session, the EU and Korea indicated that their legislation to implement the waiver should be ready before Hong Kong. China has also started to develop laws that would allow it to export drugs produced under compulsory licence. Canada, Norway, and India already have legislation in place to produce and export eligible drugs. However, in the two



years since its adoption not a single country has used the waiver to import low-cost drugs. Civil society health activists have expressed serious doubts about the 30 August Decision's practical value, arguing that cumbersome procedures and political pressure mean that it may never be used.

#### **Amendment: role of Chair's statement still questioned**

A July draft version of an EU 'non-paper' on the TRIPS amendment that has not been formally tabled in the WTO argues that there is a "legal relationship" between the Chair's statement and the 30 August Decision. It calls for the General Council Chair to reiterate the Chair's statement when Members are in the process of adopting an amendment. The document also contends that the Chair's statement "constitutes a shared agreement accepted by all Members and context for the interpretation" of the 30 August Decision, and says that this 'shared agreement' should be confirmed at the time of the amendment's adoption.

This approach is said to have raised the ire of some developing countries, which argue that it would inappropriately give the Chair's statement legal standing. They fear that accepting such a proposal would risk establishing the Chair's statement as part of this basis from which the TRIPS Agreement would subsequently be interpreted.

Some trade observers have suggested that the EU might be pushing hard for an agreement on the TRIPS amendment in an attempt to draw attention away from criticism it has been receiving for impeding progress in the agriculture negotiations. During the formal meeting on 25 October, Brazil and Malaysia reminded Members that the TRIPS amendment was not part of the Doha Round single undertaking, and thus did not need to be approved in Hong Kong. They urged Members to focus on the content and quality of the amendment rather than the speed with which it is agreed upon.

ICTSD reporting; "Concern over bird flu drugs dominates WTO," FINANCIAL TIMES, 24 October 2005.

### **OTHER NEWS**

#### **UNESCO OVERWHELMINGLY APPROVES CULTURAL DIVERSITY TREATY**

The UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) voted overwhelmingly on 20 October to approve a new global convention for the protection of cultural diversity, in spite of staunch

opposition from the US. Supporters of the treaty hailed it as a victory for free expression, claiming that it will help governments protect national cultural identities and traditions from the homogenising pressures of foreign competition. Opponents charged that it could curb free speech and serve as a pretext for arbitrary protectionism, particularly in the entertainment industry. However, the accord's implications for existing and future trade law remain far from clear.

The product of two years of sometimes acrimonious negotiations, the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions received the support of 148 countries during the UNESCO General Assembly in Paris. Only the US and Israel voted against it. Australia, Honduras, Liberia and Nicaragua abstained. The convention will enter into force once ratified by 30 governments.

France and Canada, the treaty's sponsors, believe that its affirmation of countries' "sovereign right" to promote diversity in "cultural expressions" will give them ammunition to counter demands that they renounce the use of subsidies, quotas, and other measures to support domestic cultural products such as movies, broadcasting, and publications. Certain such measures are currently permissible under the so-called "cultural exception," the exemption of audiovisual goods and services from some trade disciplines, championed by France during the Uruguay Round.

Washington argues that governments could use the new convention to place limits on imports such as Hollywood movies and US-produced music and television programming. Louise Oliver, the US ambassador to UNESCO, has criticised the convention for being "open to misinterpretation," arguing that it threatens the free flow of ideas and could even be used to justify government censorship, particularly against ethnic minorities. The US also contends that governments could abuse the treaty to impose arbitrary trade restrictions on purported cultural grounds, say, on coffee, textiles, or foie gras.

The US' view, however, is not shared by most of its traditional allies. Even the UK, which had withdrawn from UNESCO alongside the US in 1984 (both subsequently rejoined the organisation), endorsed the convention wholeheartedly. The UK's ambassador to the summit, Timothy Craddock, proclaimed it "a great day for UNESCO" on behalf of the EU, saying that they had "agreed to disagree" with "one country" on the matter.

#### **Trade effects unclear**

Contradictory statements from different governments about how the treaty will affect existing and future trade

agreements -- especially WTO rules on services, goods, and subsidies -- suggest that the picture is blurred (see BRIDGES Weekly, 8 June 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/05-06-08/inbrief.htm>). This lack of clarity is embodied in Article 20 of the convention, which deals with its relationship to other treaties. Some countries have argued that the article's clause that "nothing in this convention shall be interpreted as modifying rights and obligations of the parties under any other treaties" means that the treaty will not take precedence over trade agreements including the WTO. However, the same article also stipulates that countries "shall take into account" the UNESCO treaty "when interpreting and applying the other treaties to which they are parties or when entering into other international obligations." France says that the latter clause bolsters the legal case of countries that are resisting pressure in future trade negotiations to open their cultural sectors to foreign imports.

Korean cultural organisations believe that the adoption of the accord will buttress the country's case for maintaining a quota system that requires cinemas to dedicate 40 percent of shows to domestically produced films, according to the Korea Times. The US has been putting pressure on Korea to weaken the domestic content requirement as a prelude to bilateral trade and investment negotiations.

Other countries such as India, one of the world's biggest film exporters, have maintained that the convention pertains to culture, not trade.

Manon Ress, director of the Consumer Project on Technology's (CPTech) Information Society Project, described the convention's provisions with regard to future international trade agreements as "a safety valve at best," suggesting that it might be of use to countries such as France, Canada, and Korea, but perhaps not to smaller countries engaged in bilateral trade negotiations with the US.

Many trade analysts have suggested that the convention is more symbolic than anything else. They point to the treaty's weak dispute settlement provisions -- non-binding mediation and conciliation without any mechanism for sanctions -- as further evidence that the US's anxieties are overblown. CPTech's Ress said that the deal was certainly symbolic, but that it was also important, since it "pushed back the idea that anything comes under trade rules" and recognised that "there is some difference between cultural products and other goods."

**US angry about process, will lobby against ratification elsewhere**

The 28-odd amendments to the agreement proposed by the US were also rejected by the UNESCO's membership, although they did receive support from countries including Australia, Libya, and Rwanda. This came in spite of an all-out diplomatic offensive by Washington to modify the accord or delay its approval, including a letter from US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice warning governments that the accord would "sow conflict rather than cooperation."

Nevertheless, US lobbying is thought to have significantly influenced the evolution of the convention, specifically with regard to its explicit link to existing treaties, which includes trade agreements. France and Canada had initially hoped to secure a wholesale exemption of cultural products from the WTO.

The US, for its part, has vowed to lobby countries to not ratify the deal, and to convince them not to seek its mention at the WTO's December Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong. In Rome for meetings with Italian counterparts, senior US State Department official Kristin Silverberg said "the biggest thing we can do is get countries to agree not to misuse [the UNESCO convention], that they not cite it in the Hong Kong talks in support of 'cultural exceptions.'"

The penultimate draft of the convention (the final version is not yet public) is available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001403/140318e.pdf>.

"Next lone U.S. dissent: Cultural diversity pact," INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 12 October 2005; "UNESCO Adopts Cultural Diversity Pact," KOREA TIMES, 21 October 2005; "US 'Pulls Out All Stops' As UNESCO Backs Culture Treaty," INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY WATCH, 17 October 2005; "A Global Culture War Pits Protectionists Against Free Traders," NEW YORK TIMES, 5 February 2005; "Dimwitted Nod to 'Diversity,'" WASHINGTON POST, 12 October 2005; "A Thousand Flowers," OUTLOOK INDIA, 24 October 2005; "Unesco Adopts New Plan Against Cultural Invasion," NEW YORK TIMES, 21 October 2005; "Hollywood Lobbyist Concerned About Protectionism," REUTERS/HOLLYWOOD REPORTER, 23 October 2005; "UN to back France against US culture," THE AUSTRALIAN, 21 October 2005; "US isolated over cultural diversity," FINANCIAL TIMES, 19 October 2005; "US Stands Alone on Unesco Cultural Issue," NEW YORK TIMES, 13 October 2005; "General Conference adopts Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions," UNESCOPRESS, 20 October 2005; "US official heads to France for talks on UNESCO convention," AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 21 October 2005.

---

**IN BRIEF**

---

---

**AFRICA SUFFERS FROM TEXTILE  
QUOTA PHASE-OUT, SAYS ILO**

---

Countries in Sub-Saharan Africa have been the main losers from the end-2004 phase-out of trade quotas on textiles and clothing, according to a new report from the International Labour Organization (ILO).

The report suggests that countries such as Lesotho and Kenya, where trade quotas coupled with preferential access to the US market through the 2000 African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) had spurred investment in textile production, are suffering from factory closures and the resulting job losses. Foreign investors, particularly Asian ones, have been moving their operations elsewhere. The erosion of AGOA trade preferences has seen African textiles and apparel exports to the US drop by 25 percent. Latin American countries, Mexico in particular, are also losing market share around the world.

Bangladesh, which was once widely expected to suffer greatly from the liberalisation of textile trade, has in fact expanded its capacity as well as its exports to the US. Cambodia has also increased its exports to the US and been able to maintain its share in the global textiles trade, as its reputation for decent working conditions has helped attract and retain investment. Turkey's textile exports increased 12 percent and its clothing exports by 9 percent in the first half of 2005.

The ILO carried out the study for a 24-26 October meeting of labour unions, businesses and governments that examined socially responsible ways of dealing with the altered situation in the textile and clothing industry.

The ILO Report, entitled "Promoting fair globalisation in textiles and clothing in post-MFA environment," is available at <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/dialogue/sector/techmet/tmtc-pmfa05/tmtc-pmfa-r.pdf>.

ICTSD reporting; "US says textile talks with China fail to reach resolution," AFX, 13 October 2005; "ILO to host wide-ranging talks on global textile and clothing trade," ILO NEWS, 11 October 2005.

---

**WTO IN BRIEF**

---

---

**ANTI-DUMPING ACTIVITY CONTINUES  
DECLINE: WTO SECRETARIAT**

---

The number of anti-dumping investigations as well as that of anti-dumping measures actually imposed continued a pattern of decline over the first half of 2005, according to the WTO Secretariat. According to the 24 October report, only 96 new anti-dumping investigations were launched between January and June 2005, compared to 106 over the same period for the previous year. A similar decline was seen in the number of cases where anti-dumping measures were implemented, which fell from 58 cases to 53.

The WTO Secretariat report is the latest in a series of announcements that have shown anti-dumping activity to be decreasing since 2003 (see BRIDGES Weekly, 30 October 2003, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/03-10-30/wtoinbrief.htm>; and 22 April 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-04-22/wtoinbrief.htm>).

Countries in Asia led the pack as the target of new anti-dumping investigations with China, Taiwan and India placed as first, second and third respectively. The developed country most often accused of dumping its exports was the US, which placed fourth on the list of countries facing anti-dumping investigations. The report cited plastics, chemicals and base metals as the most frequent subject of new investigations.

South Africa led Members by launching 17 new anti-dumping investigations -- twelve more than reported for the same period in 2004. However, an increase in the value of the country's currency may be partly responsible for this increase.

While the number of anti-dumping measures actually applied by Members during the first half of 2005 declined, the figure for both the US (13 measures) and China (10 measures) more than doubled. Out of the 53 newly initiated measures, 29 came from developing countries.

Trade analysts suggest that the decrease in anti-dumping activity -- particularly new anti-dumping investigations -- in recent years may be attributable to the fact that a round of negotiations is currently underway.

ICTSD reporting, "WTO Secretariat Reports Continuing Declines in Both New Anti-Dumping Investigations and New Final Anti-Dumping Measures," WTO PRESS RELEASE, 24 October 2005.



---

## DSU REVIEW EFFECTIVELY ON HOLD

Negotiations to improve and clarify the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) are effectively on hold, according to trade diplomats who attended the 24 October session of the Dispute Settlement Body Special Session (DSB-SS).

Delegates reported that more pressing areas of the ongoing talks, such as agriculture, non-agricultural market access (NAMA) and services have drawn Members' attention away from the Doha-mandated DSU review. This was reinforced at the meeting when the sponsors of a proposal on special and differential treatment (S&D) indicated that they would be unable to initiate a discussion on it until after the WTO's December Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong, because their resources would be dedicated to other issues until then.

As in past meetings, Chair Ambassador David Spencer of Australia reiterated that delegates need to focus on a text to be submitted to ministers in Hong Kong. No such text has been drafted thus far, and any eventual report is not expected to contain substantive issues. A compilation of Members' proposals has been put together, but it is only meant for use in discussions in the DSB-SS and is not likely to be submitted to the Ministerial Conference. In the end, the report from the Chair that is eventually presented in Hong Kong may simply be a description of discussions that have taken place in the group.

The next meeting of the DSB-SS has been scheduled for 14 November. Delegates do not anticipate that it will prove to be very substantial. However, they are not ruling out the possibility that acceleration in the other negotiating areas might lead to an increased focus on the DSU review. Nevertheless, expectations for progress on the matter at Hong Kong remain very low.

ICTSD reporting.

---

## SPS COMMITTEE LOOKS AT WAYS FORWARD ON S&D

The WTO Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) held a short session on 24 October that looked at special and differential treatment (S&D), EU standards for cinnamon imports, and China's compliance with SPS commitments.

Chair Gregg Young of the US attempted to re-start work on Paragraph 43 of the committee's June report on S&D to the General Council (G/SPS/35), which identified specific ways for Members to address

developing country concerns related to SPS measures (see BRIDGES Weekly, 6 July 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/05-07-06/story3.htm>). India and the African Group, sponsors of the five S&D proposals that have been referred to the SPS Committee, said the revised versions of their texts should serve as the basis for the next round of talks on the matter. However, the US and Young suggested that the course of action outlined in Paragraph 43 should form the basis of talks at the next meeting, since the SPS Committee had agreed upon the paragraph in June.

Sri Lanka, the world's biggest exporter of cinnamon, argued that the EU's ban on traces of sulphur dioxide in cinnamon was restricting imports and hurting over 200,000 producers. It requested the EU to suspend the ban, at least until a new international standard could be agreed upon. The EU responded that it was consulting with experts on the matter.

As part of the 'transitional review' of China's implementation of WTO rules, a process mandated by China's terms of accession, the EU and the US highlighted their concerns regarding the China's compliance with the SPS Agreement's demands on transparency, risk assessment and management (G/SPS/W/178). In response, China pointed out that it was working hard, had improved notification practices, and was in compliance with the commitments made under its accession protocol.

The SPS committee is scheduled to meet at the end of January 2006.

ICTSD reporting.

---

## EVENTS & RESOURCES

---

---

### VACANCIES

---

The International Policy Council on Agriculture, Food And Trade is currently recruiting for two positions: President and Chief Executive Officer, and Policy Associate.

- The President and Chief Executive Officer will be required to represent the council to stakeholders, direct the organisation's substantive agenda, and lead its operations. For this position, US citizenship or the right to work in the US is highly desirable. For further information contact [agritrade@agritrade.org](mailto:agritrade@agritrade.org). The closing date for this position is 1 December 2005.

- The Policy Associate will be responsible for conducting policy-oriented research in areas such as

international and regional trade negotiations, agricultural and rural development and environmental sustainability. He/she would also write manuscripts and policy briefs, prepare presentations and manage task forces and study groups. For further information contact Kyle Chapman, Program Manager at [chapman@agritrade.org](mailto:chapman@agritrade.org). US citizenship or the right to work in the US is required for this position. The closing date for this position is 15 November 2005.

## EVENTS

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

### Upcoming Events: 27 October - 2 November

28 October, Paris, France. **TRADE FOR DEVELOPMENT: THE FUTURE OF SPECIAL AND DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**. This international conference is jointly organised by the trade policy unit of the Institut Français des Relations Internationales (IFRI) and the Agence Française de Développement (AFD). The conference will focus on two key topics: the future of non-reciprocal trade preferences and differentiation among developing countries under Special and Differential Treatment rules. Discussions will be in both English and French and are expected to contribute to public debate on the Doha Agenda in the months before the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference. For further information contact Anne-Sophie Novel, tel: (+33) (0)1-40-61-72-88; fax: (+33) (0)1-40-61-60-60; e-mail: [novel@ifri.org](mailto:novel@ifri.org); Internet: [http://www.ifri.org/frontDispatcher/ifri/manifestations/interventions\\_ext\\_rieur\\_1031842993962/publi\\_P\\_manifestation\\_eco\\_trade\\_and\\_dev\\_1127477193712?language=us](http://www.ifri.org/frontDispatcher/ifri/manifestations/interventions_ext_rieur_1031842993962/publi_P_manifestation_eco_trade_and_dev_1127477193712?language=us)

28 October, Bangkok, Thailand. **FEMINISTS TALK TRADE: HOW TO GET THE BIG BOYS TO LISTEN**. In this Skills Building Workshop, representatives from the International Gender and Trade Network (IGTN) will train participants on how best to speak out on substantive feminist issues in trade talks. This workshop is organised as a component of the Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID) International Forum on Women's Rights and Development (27-30 October). For further information contact AWID, tel: (+1) 416-594-3773; fax: (+1) 416-594-0330; e-mail: [awidforum@awid.org](mailto:awidforum@awid.org); internet: [http://www.awid.org/forum/forum\\_programme.htm](http://www.awid.org/forum/forum_programme.htm).

31 October-2 November, Cape Town, South Africa. **AFRICAN REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT IN AGRICULTURE**. This workshop, co-organised by the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) the Trade Law Centre for Southern Africa (TRALAC), targets government officials, academics, practising lawyers, industry advisers and all others whose knowledge of the WTO dispute settlement mechanism on agriculture could contribute to meeting development targets. For further information contact Chitra Radhakishun, tel: (+41) 22-917-5695; fax: (+41) 22-917-0247; e-mail: [chitra.radhakishun@unctad.org](mailto:chitra.radhakishun@unctad.org); internet: <http://www.unctad.org/Templates/Meeting.asp?intlItemID=2068&lang=1&m=11067&year=2005&month=10>.

31 October, Hanoi, Vietnam. **INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL TRADE POLICY COUNCIL SEMINAR**. The seminar will be split into two main themes: issues in agricultural trade and the progression of multilateral negotiations, with specific attention to Vietnam's accession to the WTO; and domestic issues including rural development, building local competitiveness into global value chains, and environmental concerns. The meeting will also highlight projects on sustainable agricultural production. There is a fee to attend this event. For further information contact Kyle Chapman, tel: (+1) 202-328-5117; fax: (+1) 202-328-5133; e-mail: [agritrade@agritrade.org](mailto:agritrade@agritrade.org); Internet: <http://www.agritrade.org/Plenary/Hanoi/Hanoi05.htm>.

31 October - 2 November, Geneva, Switzerland. **EXPERT MEETING ON POSITIVE CORPORATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF HOST DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**. This UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) expert meeting will discuss corporate contributions to developing countries in relation to investment, the provision of goods and services, employment creation, the enhancement of skill levels of the local workforce, technology transfer, ethical business behaviour, contributions to public revenue generation, and minimising the negative effects of business restructuring. This meeting is not open to the public. For further information contact UNCTAD, tel: (+41) 22-917-5809; fax: (+41) 22-917-0051; e-mail: [info@unctad.org](mailto:info@unctad.org); internet: <http://www.unctad.org/Templates/meeting.asp?intlItemID=2068&lang=1&m=10494>.

### WTO Events

An updated list of forthcoming WTO meetings is posted at: [http://www.wto.org/english/news\\_e/meets.pdf](http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/meets.pdf). Please bear in mind that dates and times of WTO meetings are often changed, and that the WTO does not always announce the important informal meetings

of the different bodies. Unless otherwise indicated, all WTO meetings are held at the WTO, Centre William Rappard, rue de Lausanne 154, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland, and are open to WTO Members and accredited observers only.

27 October: COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT - SPECIAL SESSION

27-28 October: COUNCIL FOR TRADE-RELATED ASPECTS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS - SPECIAL SESSION

27 October: COMMITTEE ON SUBSIDIES AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES - SPECIAL MEETING

27-28 October: COMMITTEE ON SUBSIDIES AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES

28 October: SERVICES - WORKING PARTY ON DOMESTIC REGULATION

28 October: SUB-COMMITTEE ON COTTON

28 October: WORKING PARTY ON THE ACCESSION OF SAUDI ARABIA

31 October: COMMITTEE ON ANTI-DUMPING PRACTICES - WORKING GROUP ON IMPLEMENTATION

31 October: COUNCIL FOR TRADE IN SERVICES - SPECIAL SESSION

31 October : COMMITTEE ON ANTI-DUMPING PRACTICES

1 November: TRADE POLICY REVIEW BODY - BOLIVIA

1 November: NEGOTIATING GROUP ON RULES - REGIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

1 November: COMMITTEE ON ANTI-DUMPING PRACTICES

2 November: COMMITTEE ON TECHNICAL BARRIERS TO TRADE

#### Upcoming Events

3 November, Washington, DC: CATO INSTITUTE 23RD ANNUAL MONETARY CONFERENCE: MONETARY INSTITUTIONS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. This conference, co-sponsored by the Cato Institute and The Economist, will discuss issues related to monetary institutions' role in poverty reduction. Topics will include suggestions for the most

effective monetary institutions for emerging market economies to achieve sustainable development. For further information contact the Cato Institute, tel: (+1) (202) 218-4633; fax: (+1) 202-371-0841; e-mail: [monetary@cato.org](mailto:monetary@cato.org); internet: <http://www.cato.org/events/monconf23/program.html>.

12 December, Hong Kong, China. SEMINAR ON COMMODITIES AND DEVELOPMENT. The purpose of this seminar, organised by the South Centre, is to raise awareness about problems related to commodity dependency in the South and the related implications for the trade and development of commodity-dependent developing countries. Simultaneous language interpretation in English, Spanish and French will be available. For further information contact Luisa Rodriguez, tel: (+41) 22-791-8050; fax: (+41) 22-798-8531; e-mail: [rodriguez@southcentre.org](mailto:rodriguez@southcentre.org); internet: <http://www.southcentre.org/commoditiesseminar.htm>.

13-17 December, Hong Kong, China: HONG KONG TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT SYMPOSIUM. The goal of this symposium, co-convened by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD) and the University of Hong Kong in collaboration with the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP), is to encourage innovative thinking on issues related to trade and development that could be subsequently be translated into constructive inputs for the ongoing Doha Round negotiations. The main topics for discussions will be drawn from key development-related issues in the trade policy and trade rules arena. For further information contact Patrick Lunt, e-mail: [plunt@ictsd.ch](mailto:plunt@ictsd.ch); internet: <http://www.ictsd.org/ministerial/hongkong/tds/>.

---

## RESOURCES

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN WORLD TRADE LAW. Edited by Dr. Markus W. Gehring and Marie-Claire Cordonier Segger. Kluwer Law International, 2005. This collection of papers aims to demonstrate how sustainable development serves as a unifying concept with the potential to facilitate much-needed respect for international law and the timely implementation of diverse and overlapping international commitments. The book builds on the substance of a rich and complex debate at the intersections among economic, social, and environmental law, bringing together a broad cross-section of viewpoints and voices. The authors discuss various aspects of sustainable development and world trade law such as recent developments and decisions in WTO negotiations, procedural innovations, dispute settlement reform and new developments in trade and economic agreements. The papers also explore sustainable development aspects of key issues in recent trade

negotiations such as investment and competition law, intellectual property rights, investment arbitration, health and trade law, and the linkages between the WTO and multilateral environmental accords (MEAs). More information can be found at [www.kluwerlaw.com](http://www.kluwerlaw.com).

**INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION, REMITTANCES, AND THE BRAIN DRAIN.** Edited by Maurice Schiff and Caglar Ozden. World Bank, 2005. This volume presents the results of a set of studies carried out on the economic effects of migration, especially its impact on economic development, in order to expand knowledge on migration, and identify policies and reforms that would lead to superior development outcomes. The book is divided into two parts. Part One examines migration and remittances while Part Two focuses on the brain drain – issues related to the migration of skilled workers. This volume deals essentially with economically motivated South-North migration, whose principal cause is, in most cases, the difference in (the present value of) expected real wages, adjusted for migration costs. Available online at [http://econ.worldbank.org/external/default/main?pagePK=64165259&theSitePK=469372&piPK=64165421&menuPK=64166322&entityID=000012009\\_20051021094619](http://econ.worldbank.org/external/default/main?pagePK=64165259&theSitePK=469372&piPK=64165421&menuPK=64166322&entityID=000012009_20051021094619).

"WTO Case Review 2004." By Professor David A. Gantz and Professor Raj Bhala, *ARIZONA JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW*, October 2005. This review is the fifth article in the authors' annual series on the jurisprudence of the WTO Appellate Body. The series analyse each year's Appellate Body decisions adopted by the WTO Dispute Settlement Body, as they are the world's most important single source of trade law adjudication and the principle contributor to the emerging body of case law on trade. The review seeks to provide a thorough and entertaining discussion of each adopted report, focusing on significant substantive arguments and rulings without ignoring major procedural developments. It also offers critical legal scrutiny of major rulings. Available online at <http://www.law.arizona.edu/journals/AJICL/AJICL2005/vol222/Formatted%20Galleyproofed%20Gantz.pdf>.

**PUTTING DEVELOPMENT FIRST: THE IMPORTANCE OF POLICY SPACE IN THE WTO.** Edited by Kevin P. Gallagher. Zed Books, 2005. The authors of the pieces in this book argue that the WTO is shrinking the ability of nations to put proper policies in place for sustainable development. Indeed, many of them argue that the economic rationale for preserving policy space in trade negotiations is justified now more than ever. During the 20th century, nations in East Asia, Latin America and elsewhere successfully balanced states and markets to grow from lower to middle income countries. Today, in the face of increasing

poverty, inequality and environmental degradation, states need as many tools as possible to raise the standards of living of their people. This book includes original contributions by an impressive range of Northern and Southern authors. More information about this book is available online at [http://www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae/policy\\_research/PuttingDevelopmentFirst.htm](http://www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae/policy_research/PuttingDevelopmentFirst.htm).

**KEY ISSUES IN WTO DISPUTE SETTLEMENT - THE FIRST TEN YEARS.** Edited by Rufus Yerxa and Bruce Wilson. WTO Analysis and Special Reports, 2005. This book is a unique view of the operation and evolution of the WTO dispute settlement system by WTO Secretariat professionals and outside experts, covering the first ten years of the WTO. Each chapter is based on the individual author's personal experience with, or study of, the system. The book is useful for those who wish to gain further insights into how WTO dispute settlement has operated in practice since 1995. Further information is available online at [http://onlinebookshop.wto.org/shop/articles.asp?Id\\_Rayon=News](http://onlinebookshop.wto.org/shop/articles.asp?Id_Rayon=News).

## CORRIGENDUM

In the 19 October 2005 issue of *BRIDGES Weekly* (Volume 9, Number 35), the article "Venezuela To Fully Join Mercosur, Abandon Andean Bloc?" reported the member states of the Andean Community to be Venezuela, Peru, Bolivia and Chile. The actual member states are Venezuela, Peru, Bolivia and Ecuador. The *BRIDGES Weekly* team regrets the error.

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

*BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest*© is published by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), <http://www.ictsd.org/>.

Contributors to this issue of *BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest*© are Andrew Aziz, Trineesh Biswas, Marie Chamay, Sarah Mohan, Daniel Robinson, Malena Sell and Knirre Sogaard. Editor: Trineesh Biswas, [bridges\\_weekly@ictsd.ch](mailto:bridges_weekly@ictsd.ch). Director: 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 Weekly Trade News Digest*© may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and should be directed to the Editor or the Director.

*BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest* is made possible in 2002 – 2004 through the generous support of the Government of the United Kingdom (DFID). Additional support is provided by ICTSD's core donors: the Governments of Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden; Christian Aid (UK), MISEREOR, NOVIB (NL), Oxfam (UK) and the Swiss Coalition of Development Organisations (Switzerland). The *Weekly* also benefits from support for the *BRIDGES* series of publications including: the Rockefeller Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and Swiss Development Cooperation. ISSN 1563-0

