



# Bridges Trade BioRes

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

**Issue: 20 January 2006**

<b>Hong Kong Ministerial.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Environment @ Hong Kong: Momentum On Fish, Little Progress Otherwise .....	
Commentary On The WTO Ministerial Meeting (By Doeke Eisma and Pieter van der Gaag) .....	
<b>Biotechnology .....</b>	<b>5</b>
GMO Update: WTO Biotech Case, ISAAA, EU, APEC .....	
<b>In Brief.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Events &amp; Resources.....</b>	<b>11</b>

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

## Hong Kong Ministerial

### ENVIRONMENT @ HONG KONG: MOMENTUM ON FISH, LITTLE PROGRESS OTHERWISE

Environment-related negotiations clearly took a backseat vis-à-vis the main negotiating priorities in at the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference on 13-18 December in Hong Kong (see In Brief, this issue). Nevertheless, environment-related discussions cropped up in a number of informal, green room and plenary discussions, as well as on the sidelines of the conference. While fisheries subsidies were not negotiated at the WTO meeting, a high-level press conference succeeded in raising public attention around the issue and may help to stimulate negotiations after the Hong Kong

meeting. Despite valiant attempts to place environmental goods and services and the intellectual property rights-biodiversity linkage higher on the political agenda, virtually no progress was achieved in these areas, putting pressure on the proponents of these negotiations to mobilise support over the next few months.

### Fisheries subsidies

The 7 December draft Ministerial text on fisheries subsidies -- along with the rest of the text on WTO rules (anti-dumping, subsidies and countervailing measures) -- was left unchanged in the final Ministerial Declaration (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 9 September 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/05-12-09/story1.htm>). The Ministerial Declaration calls on Members to strengthen disciplines on fisheries subsidies, including by identifying and prohibiting subsidies that contribute to over-capacity and over-fishing. It notes that "appropriate and effective special and differential treatment" should form an integral part of the negotiations, highlighting the sector's importance to poverty reduction, livelihood and food security concerns. The text for the first time explicitly links subsidies to over-capacity and over-fishing and acknowledges the need for addressing this link, overcoming strong resistance from Japan and Korea in the early stages of the Doha Round on negotiating fisheries subsidies disciplines.

Some observers, including several small vulnerable coastal states, expressed concern in the corridors over the scope of the text given that it does not explicitly restrict discussions to trade-distorting subsidies. Others also voiced concerns that the WTO should not become the arbitrator defining and deciding about the condition of a fishery, calling for other institutions, such as the UN Food and Agriculture Organization and regional fisheries

management bodies, to be involved in the negotiations and resulting disciplines.

On the sidelines of the Ministerial meeting, a high-level press conference managed to keep the issue on the table. Senior officials from the US, EU, New Zealand, the Philippines, Brazil, Chile and Senegal joined forces with the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) and the environmental group WWF to call for urgent action on disciplining fisheries subsidies in the WTO. Pointing to the dire state of global fisheries, they urged Members to take advantage of the opportunity provided by the Doha mandate to promote trade liberalisation that also safeguards environmental and social objectives. New Zealand, the US and Chile -- all members of the so-called 'Friends of Fish' group which is the driving force behind the negotiations -- emphasised the environmental dimension of the talks. Brazil, Senegal and the Philippines stressed the need for effective special and differential treatment to account for the particular needs of developing countries. Many saw the fact that the EU and US (and other Friends of Fish) as well as Senegal came together to push for intensified negotiations as an important symbolic push for the talks.

### Environmental goods and services

Under the trade and environment negotiating mandate in paragraph 31 of the Doha Declaration, only environmental goods and services (EGS) made a noticeable appearance in Hong Kong. These discussions related to the mandate embodied in paragraph 31(iii) which calls for the reduction (or possibly elimination) of tariff and non-tariff barriers to EGS. Discussions reflected ongoing divisions over the approach to take to liberalising EGS trade. Developed and newly industrialised countries, such as the US, New Zealand, the EU, Chinese-Taipei and Korea, favoured a 'list approach', i.e. identifying a list of environmental goods for liberalisation, and were looking for language that would steer talks in that direction. Many developing countries, on the other hand, would like to keep options open for other approaches, such as India's 'environmental project approach' which would allow countries to temporarily liberalise trade in EGS associated with self-designated environmental projects.

During informal meetings in Hong Kong, the list supporters and India managed to agree on common text that would have instructed Members to clarify the coverage of goods and their relation to services, taking into account the capacity constraints of

developing countries and the centrality of the environmental rationale of the negotiations. However, a number of Members -- including South Africa, Colombia, Egypt and other Latin American countries -- opposed the text. These countries feared that the proposed language could be seen as favouring the list approach and could change the mandate of the negotiations.

Due to time constraints and a general reluctance to move the negotiations to the Green Room level given the relative importance of the issue, countries in the end agreed on brief, non-committal language that simply instructs Members to "expeditiously complete the work" under paragraph 31(iii). While this solution is unlikely to provide the impetus to the negotiations that some delegations had been looking for, some felt that the informal discussions had at least served to help build greater understanding of the respective perspectives among the negotiating parties. Others also expressed satisfaction with the fact that the virtual agreement on the alternative text had shown a growing acknowledgement of the capacity constraints that developing countries face as well as the centrality of environmental objectives.

### Intellectual property and biodiversity

Ahead of and during the Ministerial meeting, India was the driving force behind efforts to place discussions on the relationship of the Agreement on Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) high on the political agenda (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 9 December 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/05-12-09/story2.htm>). India would have liked to see an explicit negotiating mandate to be included in the Ministerial Declaration calling for an amendment to the TRIPS Agreement that would require patent applicants to disclose the origin of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, along with evidence of prior informed consent and benefit-sharing in their application. Brazil, Kenya and Peru also joined in the effort, albeit with various degrees of forwardness. Brazil raised the issue in the Heads of Delegation meeting, but generally kept a comparatively low profile. Kenya circulated a written proposal that would have narrowed down work on the TRIPS-CBD relationship to the three requirements in the TRIPS Council, but did not raise the issue in the negotiations.

Peru's proposal provided the weakest language of the ones put forward by simply suggesting intensifying discussion on the three requirements. Some observers were surprised at the proposal's low level of ambition given the central role that Peru has so far played in pushing the issue in the WTO and implementing related obligations at the national level. Speculations were raised over a possible link between the Peruvian stance and the recently concluded free trade agreement with the US which includes a side-letter that highlights the use of contracts on access to genetic resources or traditional knowledge.

The EU would have been willing to support an explicit reference to negotiations on the CBD-TRIPS relationship if it had been coupled with a similar mandate for negotiations to extend the additional protection already provided to geographical indications for wines and spirits to other products (GI extension). However, in the end -- to the great frustration of both India and the EU -- neither of the two negotiating mandates found mention in the Declaration due to stiff resistance from the US and others, including Canada and Australia. These countries have repeatedly argued that no conflict existed between the TRIPS Agreement and the CBD and thus no amendment to the TRIPS Agreements was needed.

The text in the Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration remained the same as included in the 7 December draft Declaration, simply taking note of the work undertaken on the TRIPS-CBD relationship and GI extension under Paragraph 12(b) of the Doha Declaration (on implementation issues). Nevertheless, the proponents of negotiations on the CBD-TRIPS relationship can claim some modest progress, given that the Hong Kong text for the first time adds the CBD-TRIPS relationship as one of the issues explicitly mentioned under the implementation mandate (along with GI extension).

ICTSD Reporting.

#### **COMMENTARY ON THE WTO MINISTERIAL MEETING (BY DOEKE EISMA AND PIETER VAN DER GAAG)**

By Doeke Eisma, Chairman, and Pieter van der Gaag, Project Leader Policy Coherence, IUCN National Committee of the Netherlands

The preamble of the WTO agreement puts sustainable development at the heart of the organisation. So how well did the WTO Members do at the Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong? Based upon the poor progress made on environmental issues, one minister suggested that countries for now do not seem ready to add the element of sustainability to their work, the preamble of the WTO agreement notwithstanding. Certainly, increasing the complexity of what is in front of negotiators now might make achieving success in the trade round nearly impossible, especially in the middle of a WTO crisis in which the world's largest blocks seem unable to find common ground, even in high-profile negotiations such as those on agriculture. This might lead one to presume that, for the time being, negotiators consider including sustainable development in their agenda as 'something' for the 'next time'.

However, short-term gains that may result from trade liberalisation may prove devastating to achieving long-term sustainability. For example, the proposal submitted in October 2005 by Canada, Hong Kong China, New Zealand, Thailand and the US to reduce tariffs on forest products argues that such liberalisation will probably increase the value of exports for producer countries, increase the volume of trade and as such increase revenue, resulting in positive social impacts in the short term and a greater ability to invest in proper management. However, these predictions can be juxtaposed with the conclusions of the UN Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, which warns that increased trade in forest products coming from badly managed forests will exacerbate deforestation and biodiversity loss to an extent that the long term effects will likely result in a loss of this economic base. As the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment shows, the problems our ecosystems are facing are urgent and WTO negotiators need to deal with these issues this time.

#### **Why Trade?**

Many biodiversity effects can be linked to 'trade'. The increased demand for soy-based fodder for hogs in Europe can be linked to the conversion of Amazon Forests to soy plantations, with devastating impacts on deforestation, desertification, biodiversity and carbon sequestration. The increasing demand for vegetable oils, not only in food products but also soon for bio-energy, can clearly be linked to the conversion of South-East

Asian forests to palm-oil plantations. The dumping of milk-powder onto markets impacts -- through the inability of local dairy producers to invest in suburban dairy farms -- on desertification in sub-Saharan countries that is linked to grazing cattle herds.

### **So what did happen around the environment in Hong Kong?**

In the non-agricultural market access negotiations, discussions took place on the side on how to address non-tariff barriers, including standards relating to the environment, but nothing was agreed on. The series of environment-related negotiating issues under Paragraph 31 of the Doha mandate have all been left unresolved. The negotiators simply agreed to continue to work on addressing the relationship between multilateral environment agreements (MEA) and WTO rules, but at least negotiators did not drop this discussion. The same holds true for the negotiations focusing on the relationship between the TRIPS Agreement and the Convention on Biological Diversity. The negotiations on environmental goods and services did not move forward one inch from where they were left prior to the Hong Kong meeting. What this clear lack of progress may signify is a view amongst trade negotiators that the environment is a secondary issue, and that the negotiations had more important issues to tackle first. Regretfully, it shows that there is still little understanding of the direct link between ecosystems and trade policy, and thus the importance of considering and addressing the environment/trade policy linkage.

In this context, environmentalists must play a more active role in researching and clarifying the relationships between trade regimes and ecosystem degradation and biodiversity loss. They need to understand what the industrial goods and agriculture negotiations will mean for natural resource use and ecosystem services in order to be able to better safeguard these resources and services. Environmentalists still lack some of the basic understanding -- a few environmental economists amongst us aside -- what the liberalisation of trade means for quantities of trade flows; how and if producers can re-invest revenues earned from trade into sustainable management of resources, including in environmental technology for those sectors; and whether trade liberalisation will enhance the ability to produce goods more efficiently and to use natural resources sustainably. Environmentalists must do more to link their

knowledge about commodity chains and ecological footprints to economic rule-making. Let the lack of priority given to environmental issues in Hong Kong result in more interaction between environmental groups and trade policy makers at home and in Geneva.

Yet tucked away in a small corner of the negotiations something important did happen. In the Negotiating Group on WTO Rules the unsustainable exploitation of fisheries was cause for consensual movement on disciplining fisheries subsidies based on their contribution to overfishing. Thus, environmental protection is no longer only a justified cause for deviating from the rules (as embodied in Article XX of the GATT) but an agreed goal worth pursuing.

We believe this decision is a truly fundamental watershed in WTO thinking. The importance of the idea of using the protection of the natural resource base as a basis for long-term sustainable economic development cannot be overstated. Sustainably managed resources can continue to be distributed and can thereby continue to support the creation of wealth. The negotiators on fisheries subsidies understood this. Now the rest of the negotiators must understand and reflect this in their disciplines.

This understanding also opens up possibilities for the negotiators in the Committee on Trade and Environment as they try to grapple with the relationship between MEAs and their secretariats and the WTO. When natural resource protection as a goal is included in the WTO disciplines, it becomes a must to involve expert institutions, also in dispute settlement. Qualitative judgements, for example on the state of a fishery, should be left to those institutions that understand the biological dynamics of fish populations in their ecosystems. When the WTO is confronted with a need to understand an environmental problem, expert institutions should be their best ally.

The consensus on how to move forward on fisheries shows that environmental protection has something to offer to economic development. Understanding what that offer really is urgently requires more study and more involvement from environmentalists.

**Biotechnology****GMO UPDATE: WTO BIOTECH CASE, ISAAA, EU, APEC****WTO Biotech Case Panel Report Delayed Again**

The Chair of the WTO dispute panel considering the case brought by the US, Canada and Argentina against the alleged EU moratorium on the approval of new biotech products announced on 3 January that the panel would not distribute its interim preliminary report to the parties to the dispute before early February 2006. The report had been expected on 5 January. Some trade sources speculated that this, the most recent in a series of delays in the delivery of the report (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 14 October 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/05-10-14/story2.htm>), could simply be a result of delays in the legal translation of the hundreds of pages of complex analysis because of the more immediate demands placed on WTO staff by the December Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong.

In a 21 December 2005 letter to the parties (WT/DS291/30, available online at <http://docsonline.wto.org>), Panel Chair Christian Haeblerli (Switzerland) said that the final panel would not be available before the end of March 2006. Unlike the interim report, which is circulated only to the parties for comment, this final report -- which has been delayed four times already -- will be publicly available and will take into account parties' views on the preliminary report. The letter repeated some of the justifications for previous delays, such as the large number of issues to be addressed by the panel, adding that "since much more time and effort was required for this case than originally planned for, some of the Secretariat staff is no longer available to the Panel."

Until recently, interim reports in WTO disputes were eagerly anticipated, since they largely matched the eventual final ruling. The significance of these reports as a barometer of the panel's eventual decision has been diminished by Korea and Indonesia's dispute over anti-dumping duties on certain Indonesian paper imports, where the final ruling differed substantially from the interim report. Nevertheless, the parties are eagerly awaiting the release of the interim report, as are the biotechnology industry and civil society. Owing to the extensive commenting, translation and appeal process that is likely to ensue, however, the final word on the dispute, which was launched in May

2003, is not likely to be conclusively delivered for some time.

**ISAAA Report: Developing-Country Biotech Plantings Continue To Expand**

The latest annual report of the International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA) indicates that the global area planted with genetically modified (GM) crops continued to grow in 2005. In total, 90 million hectares (222 million acres) of GM crops were grown in 2005, amounting to an eleven percent increase since 2004. Although the ISAAA pointed to these numbers as signs of the ongoing growth in adoption of GM technologies, some pointed to the fact that the rate of growth in 2005 was lower than the 20 percent growth seen the year before.

GM crops were grown by approximately 8.5 million farmers in 21 countries, including (in order of hectage) the US, Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, Paraguay, India, South Africa, Uruguay, Australia, Mexico, Romania, the Philippines, Spain, Colombia, Iran, Honduras, Portugal, Germany, France and the Czech Republic. The top five countries planting of GM crops accounted for 94 percent of global GM area, with the US planting 55 percent, Argentina 19 percent, Brazil ten percent, Canada seven percent and China three percent. The report confirms that soybean, maize, cotton and canola continue to be the four main commercialised crops and the two main biotechnology traits continue to be herbicide tolerance (71 percent) and insect resistance (18 percent), although crops with multiple traits, from "stacked" genes, are becoming more popular.

The area of land dedicated to planting GM crops expanded in developing countries by 23 percent over the last year, marking a rate of growth higher than that of developed countries. Since adopting a new legal framework for the approval of GM crops, thereby legalising and supporting GM soy production, Brazil almost doubled the coverage of GM crops nationally from five million hectares to 9.4 million. Similarly, India had almost a three-fold increase from 500,000 hectares in 2004 to 1.3 million hectares planted to GM crops in 2005. The ISAAA report indicates that of the four new countries that grew biotech crops in 2005, compared with 2004, three were EU countries -- namely Portugal, France and the Czech Republic -- whilst Iran as the fourth country planted GM rice for the first time on a commercial basis. The planting of Bt maize in the three EU countries

brings the total number of EU countries now commercialising modest areas of Bt maize to five, including Spain and Germany.

### EU approves three new GMOs

Three GM maize varieties were approved by the European Commission on 13 January, bringing the total number of GM products approved since the new European traceability and labelling regulations entered into force in April 2004 to nine. The first two varieties, known as GA21 and MON 863, have been approved for use as food and food ingredients, while MON 863x810 has been approved for use for industrial processing and animal feed. All three varieties have "stacked" genes that are both pest-resistant and herbicide-tolerant, and have been approved by the European Food Safety Agency. The Commission decision came after EU member states in the Council of Ministers were not able to reach a qualified majority either in favour of or against approval of the varieties. Although the right of the Commission to approve a variety when member states are unable to decide is stipulated by EU legislation, Friends of the Earth described it as an "undemocratic" system.

On 10 January the European Commission ordered Greece to end its ban on GM maize varieties that have been approved in the EU. Under articles 18 and 23(3) of the European Council Directive 2002/53/EC, EU member countries can notify the Commission of their intention to not adopt EU-wide GM crop approvals using the national safeguard clause allowing countries to prevent commercialisation they believe to be harmful from the point of view of plant health, or if they feel the variety presents a risk for the environment or for human health. Greece did exactly that in April 2005 when it notified the Commission of its ban on the 17 maize seed types for the 2005 and 2006 growing seasons. After the EU Council of Ministers in October 2005 failed to reach a consensus on whether to request Greece to repeal its bans, however, the decision reverted to the Commission. Should Greece disagree with the decision, it could choose to appeal the move at the European Court of Justice. The ban, and others like it across the EU, is one of the key issues in the current EU-biotech dispute at the WTO (see above).

### APEC conference prepares for high-level dialogue

Members of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meeting on 16-18 January for

a Conference on Bio-safety Policy Options for APEC Economies agreed that APEC should continue to work on harmonisation of regulations on GM crops to ensure human and environmental protection as well as food security in the region. Participants noted the need for the harmonisation process to enable policy-makers to take "responsible" and careful importing decisions while respecting the point of view of exporters of GMOs. The participants also agreed on the need to carefully weigh trade impacts on both importing and exporting countries and impacts on research and technology development investments in coming up with biosafety regulations, noting that imposing such regulation may entail costs that might exceed the benefits offered by genetically modified crops.

The message from the meeting, held in Makati City, the Philippines, will be transmitted to the APEC High-Level Policy Dialogue on Agricultural Biotechnology, which will be held in Hanoi, Vietnam, from 25 to 27 February. The Hanoi meeting is expected to focus on the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in the region and biotechnology policy development, implementation and communication.

### Additional Resources

For more information on the WTO biotech dispute, see <http://www.trade-environment.org/page/theme/tewto/biotechcase.htm>

The ISAAA report is available at <http://www.isaaa.org/kc/>

ICTSD reporting; "WTO again delays ruling in row over EU GMO policy," REUTERS, 4 January 2006; "EU Tells Greece to Lift Ban on Monsanto Maize Seeds," REUTERS, 11 January 2006; "EC Approves Three GMO Corn Products After Member States Again Fail to Concur," WTO REPORTER, 17 January 2006; "Global Status of Commercialized Biotech/GM Crops: 2005," ISAAA Brief 34, 11 January 2006; "APEC gears up for next policy dialogue," Mindanao Daily Mirror, 20 January 2006; "APEC to Continue Rationalizing Biotechnology Regulations," ASIA PULSE, 19 January 2006.

### In Brief

#### HONG KONG MINISTERIAL ADOPTS DECLARATION, TALKS TO CONTINUE

WTO Members meeting for the Sixth Ministerial Conference on 13-18 December in Hong Kong were able to agree on a Ministerial Declaration that, while making some marginal progress, was in line with the low expectations for the Conference. In the Declaration, WTO Members agreed, among

other things, to eliminate agricultural export subsidies by 2013 and provide duty- and quota-free market access to 97 percent of products originating from least-developed countries by 2008 (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 9 December 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/05-12-09/story3.htm>). While Members expressed relief and satisfaction that Ministers attending the meeting were able to agree on a Declaration, thereby avoiding the collapse of the meeting and negotiations in general similar to the last Ministerial Conference in Cancun in 2003 (see Bridges Daily, 15 September 2003, [http://www.ictsd.org/ministerial/cancun/wto\\_daily/ben030915.htm](http://www.ictsd.org/ministerial/cancun/wto_daily/ben030915.htm)), sources suggested that the failure to decide upon significant, commercially valuable changes to trade rules would challenge the ability of negotiators to reach agreement on the Doha round by the end of the year as mandated in the Declaration.

Although the EU's agreement to eliminate agricultural export subsidies by 2013 was widely cited as a key achievement of the meeting by the mainstream press, some Members noted the relatively small commercial significance of these subsidies, and that such subsidies have already been scheduled to be phased out by that time under the EU's 2003 reform of its agricultural sector. In addition, sceptics noted that the agreement on duty- and quota-free market access for LDC exports could be of limited developmental and commercial value, given that the EU already grants such access and that the US could use the three percent exemption to maintain barriers on the main products of export interest to LDCs, such as textiles. Although Members were able to agree on a few other issues -- including to let developing countries choose themselves, using a set of indicators, which agricultural products ("special products") to designate for stronger protection -- they were as expected unable to agree on crucial make-or-break issues in the talks, such as the formula for tariff reduction under non-agricultural market access (NAMA) or reducing domestic support for agriculture.

The Declaration sets an April 2006 deadline for finalising 'modalities' in the agriculture and NAMA negotiations, i.e. general parameters to guide the development of specific numbers and formula structures for cutting subsidies and tariffs (see Bridges Weekly, 18 January 2006, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/06-01-18/story1.htm>). Some trade sources have speculated that this deadline may be unrealistic since countries are

unlikely to shift their positions fundamentally enough to achieve the needed progress in just four months.

For more analysis, see Bridges Daily, 19 December 2005, [http://www.ictsd.org/ministerial/hongkong/wto\\_daily/19\\_December/en051219.htm](http://www.ictsd.org/ministerial/hongkong/wto_daily/19_December/en051219.htm) and

The Ministerial Declaration is available at [http://www.wto.org/english/thewto\\_e/minist\\_e/min05\\_e/fin\\_al\\_text\\_e.htm](http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min05_e/fin_al_text_e.htm)

ICTSD Reporting.

## **CITES STOPS TRADE IN WILD CAVIAR TO SAVE STURGEON**

Legal trade in wild sturgeon caviar between the Parties to the UN Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) was suspended on 3 January owing to concerns over the impact of trade in the species on its survival. The CITES Secretariat's decision to stop issuing the certificates required by the agreement for trade to take place came in response to concerns that the caviar export quotas proposed by sturgeon-producing states were too high given low levels of fish stocks and the fact that the proposed quotas did not take into account the magnitude of illegal fishing. The Secretariat noted that the caviar exporters had failed to prove that illegal harvesting and trade was not adversely affecting the species. In addition, the exporters had not provided satisfactory information about the effectiveness of management and the sustainability of their sturgeon catch based on scientific surveys and a regional conservation strategy. While countries sharing sturgeon stocks agree amongst themselves on catch and export quotas, the quotas subsequently have to be approved and published by the CITES Secretariat.

In 1998, the 169 CITES member states decided to place all sturgeon species on Appendix II of the Convention, which includes species that Parties have agreed to subject to trade controls in order to ensure their survival. In deciding to not issue any certificates for 2006 for all beluga sturgeon, including Black Sea and Caspian varieties, the Secretariat thereby effectively shut down all legal trade amongst Parties to the Convention. It also called on importing countries to ensure that border officials require proper CITES registration and labelling to ensure that imports are from legal sources. Although the Secretariat has in the past decided not to grant certificates to authorise caviar

trade from certain regions because of the lack of conservation information, this is the first time it has decided not to grant certificates for any sturgeon caviar worldwide (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 10 September 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/04-09-10/inbrief.htm#4>).

"Ban on trade in wild caviar as sturgeon stocks plunge", The Guardian, 4 January 2006; "Caviar trade shut down to save sturgeon", New York Times, 4 January 2006; "International caviar trade suspended", WWF International, 3 January 2006; "No Legal Caviar Exports This Year" ENS, 5 January 2006; "Caviar Smugglers Seen Foiling 2006 Export Rules", Reuters News Service, 29 December 2005; "Caviar Exporters Urged to Strengthen Controls and Promote Sustainable Fishing", UNEP Press Release, 3 January 2006; "UN Moves to Block 2006 Caspian Sea Caviar Exports", Reuters News Service, 4 January 2006.

## **GREENPEACE: WTO "CHILLS" MEASURES TO CONSERVE FORESTS**

Plans to liberalise trade in forest products as part of WTO non-agricultural market access (NAMA) negotiations need to be abandoned, Greenpeace demanded in a new report released on 11 December. "Trading Away Our Last Ancient Forests: The Threats to Forests from Trade Liberalisation Under the WTO", a 2005 update to a 2001 paper, concludes that WTO rules on Technical Barriers to Trade, and ongoing negotiations on non-tariff barriers to trade (NTBs) as part of the NAMA negotiations, have a "chilling" effect that discourages governments and private actors from taking actions to conserve ancient forests. Trade bans on illegally logged timber and wood products, independent timber certification schemes, government procurement policies for sustainable timber, import/export bans, labelling requirements and sustainable forest management practices are all affected by fears that such measures could be deemed barriers to trade and WTO incompatible, Greenpeace argues. In addition, the report asserts that tariff reductions or elimination under the NAMA negotiations would make timber cheaper, and could consequently lead to increases in demand that will result in more pressure on forests, with potentially adverse impacts on forest resources. Gaps in governance and unsustainable forest management practices could be exacerbated by this liberalisation, according to the advocacy group, and the imperative to reduce the use of sustainability-

supporting measures or 'barriers to trade' could lead to a reduction in controls to prevent illegal trade in forest products.

In related news, a recent WWF report entitled "Failing the Forests: Europe's Illegal Timber Trade" urged the EU to adopt binding measures to prohibit the import of illegally harvested timber and forest products into the region. Forest Industries Intelligence Limited, an independent UK-based consultancy to the international forest products sector, sharply criticised the report. They alleged that the statistics and conclusions in the report fail to acknowledge a lack of agreement on the definition of illegal logging and the paucity of statistics on its extent.

The Greenpeace report is available at <http://www.illegal-logging.info/papers/Tradingawayancientforests.pdf>

The WWF report is available at [http://www.illegal-logging.info/papers/fo\\_failingforests.pdf](http://www.illegal-logging.info/papers/fo_failingforests.pdf)

The Forest Industries Intelligence review is available at <http://www.illegal-logging.info/papers/wwfailingforestassessment.pdf>

## **MODEST CUTS TO EU FISH QUOTAS ENOUGH TO SAVE COD?**

EU ministers on 22 December agreed after relatively smooth talks to cut catch quotas for cod by 15 percent and to reduce the days of fishing at sea by 3 percent in 2006. While the 15 percent decrease in cod quota corresponds to the European Commission's original proposal, reductions in fishing quotas for other species such as haddock and monkfish vary between 5 and 10 percent and are smaller than the proposed quota reduction of 15 percent. For fleets that target these species, cod is an accidental by-catch but they are nevertheless responsible for 60 percent of cod catches. To gain the support of countries with strong fishing interests such as the UK, Spain and France, the Commission also reduced seasonal closures of waters from a proposed 15 per cent cut in days at sea to only 3 percent for cod and other species. While the Commission called the state of cod stocks "truly alarming", pelagic species (i.e. living in open oceans or seas rather than waters adjacent to land or inland waters) are in relatively good condition. Therefore, allowances of prawns were increased by more than 30 percent. The 10 percent cut in days spent at sea hunting for Europe's exotic but threatened deepwater fish species, which are particularly vulnerable to overfishing due to their



slow reproduction rates, was only half of what the Commission had wanted. In order to win support from Mediterranean countries, Fisheries Commissioner Joe Borg also granted a small annual quota of anchovy of 5,000 tonnes in the Bay of Biscay trawling ground, mainly to Spain, in spite of the closure of this depleted area until March 2006.

Scientists have for four years told policy-makers that a blanket ban on cod trawling is needed in areas like the North Sea and western Scottish waters to prevent the species from collapsing following years of over-fishing. However, according to WWF, the 2006 quotas for fish stocks, taking into account significant accidental catches of cod, are even higher on average compared to last year.

"Joe Borg: Council agreement on fishing possibilities for 2006 confirms gradual but sustained approach to stocks recovery," EU PRESS RELEASE, 22 December 2005; "2006 Fish Quotas: Greater Stability Requires Long-term Commitment to rebuilding depleted stocks," EU PRESS RELEASE, 30 November 2005; "EU Strikes Deal on Fish Quotas, Aims to Save Cod," REUTERS, 23 December 2005; "EU Fish quotas are bad news for cod," WWF, 22 December 2005; "EU deal is good compromise, say Ministers," FISHUPDATE.COM, 22 December 2005.

## GOVERNMENTS SPEED UP PHASE-OUT OF OZONE-DEPLETING SUBSTANCES

During the seventeenth Meeting of the Parties (MOP) of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer held in Dakar from 12-16 December 2005, the 189 Parties reached agreement on a wide range of issues such as the elimination of remaining ozone-depleting substances (ODS) in developed countries, support of continued phase-out in developing countries and illegal trade in ODS. Most observers and participants viewed the conference as a success. Despite an extensive agenda that included many controversial issues, all items were resolved in time, preventing the need to have an extraordinary MOP for the third year in a row. A number of exemptions were made to enable developed countries to continue to produce or use listed ODS for "critical" uses, such as for chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) contained in the metered dose inhalers commonly used to treat asthma. However, as the Protocol's disciplines on production, use and trade of listed chemicals begin to come into effect for developing countries, the capacity of the Protocol to provide flexibilities such as exemptions for necessary use in these countries was called into question. Nonetheless, the exemptions agreed amount to some 7,466 tonnes in

total -- of which the US alone takes up 6,749 -- and represent a 45 percent decline from the amounts granted the previous year. In addition, Parties to the treaty agreed to a budget of \$470 million to be disbursed between 2006 and 2008 to promote the transfer of ozone-friendly technologies and skills.

Other issues addressed in Dakar included the challenge of reducing illegal trafficking in ODS and of how to take into account existing stockpiles. As a first step, Parties decided to conduct a feasibility study on developing a system for tracking the movement of ODS.

For daily updates and a full summary of the meeting, see IISD's Earth Negotiations Bulletin at <http://www.iisd.ca/ozone/mop17/>

ICTSD reporting; "Brief summary of the MOP-17," UNDP; "Governments Take Forward Fight to Save Ozone Layer," UNEP, 16 December 2005; ENB Vol. 19 No. 47, 19 December 2005; "Developing Countries Funded for Ozone Safe Technology", ENS, 16 December 2005; "Millions for Developing Countries Sought to Extend Ozone Recovery", ENS, 13 December 2005.

## EU-CAPE VERDE FISHERIES AGREEMENT SIGNED

The European Commission on 21 December announced the signing of a new five-year fisheries partnership agreement (FPA) between the EU and Cape Verde that will in September 2006 replace the previous agreement that ended last June. Under the agreement, the quantity of fishing access for the European fishing fleet to Cape Verde's tuna stocks will be reduced by 29 percent while the private sector will bear a higher percentage of the financial costs of access. While in the previous agreement the EU had paid 75 Euro and the private-sector European fishing fleet 25 Euro per tonnes of fish taken from Cape Verde's water, under the new agreement the EU will pay 65 Euro and the private sector 35 Euro per tonne fished. As the agreement provides for 5,000 tonnes of fishing -- down from the previous agreement's 7,000 tonnes -- the total amount that will be handed over from the EU to Cape Verde on the basis of the quantity of fish taken will be 325,000 Euro, of which 248,000 Euro will be earmarked for the implementation of the country's sustainable fisheries management policy. In addition, the agreement provides for an additional 60,000 Euros to be given to the government of Cape Verde to assist in the implementation of policy. In order to ensure that these funds are used to support the sustainability of

fishing in the area, a joint committee will meet annually to determine how these funds are used, for example, to strengthen scientific research and the development of the small-scale fishing fleet.

The agreement also prohibits EU boats from fishing within 12 miles from the shoreline in order to improve protection of local fishermen, and also includes measures to promote fish landings in Cape Verde harbours. The Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation ACP-EU pointed to the fact that while EU fishing effort had been reduced, the financial contribution had been reduced even further. The agreed payments would be insufficient to promote sustainable fishing, they added, running counter to the stated aim of the FPAs to transform access agreement from the simple 'buying' of fishing rights into investment in the promotion of sustainable fisheries.

ICTSD Reporting; "The EU and Cape Verde conclude a fisheries partnership agreement," EU PRESS RELEASE, 21 December 2005; "The EU and Cape Verde conclude an FPA," AGRITRADE, December 2005.

## **SIX NATIONS COUNT ON TECHNOLOGY TO FIX THE CLIMATE**

During the inaugural meeting of the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate in Sydney on 11 and 12 January, the United States, China, Japan, India, South Korea and Australia launched a multi-million dollar fund to promote clean energy technologies, adopted a charter and established a work plan. The six signatories of the Asia-Pacific Partnership, which was announced in July last year, have not ratified the Kyoto Protocol. Although the pact was presented as a complement to the Protocol rather than its rival, Australian Industry Minister Ian Macfarlane forecasted that technological solutions under the Partnership would outstrip any Kyoto contributions to address climate change. At the meeting, private/public taskforces were set up to examine the potential for cleaner technology deployment in eight industry sectors, namely cleaner fossil energy, renewable energy, power generation and transmission, steel, aluminium, cement, coal mining and buildings and appliances. The partner countries will work with multilateral development banks on financing for initiatives and programs identified by the task forces. Australia has committed US\$ 75 million to the multilateral fund over five years while the US announced that it will request US\$ 52 million from its national budget.

While the six-nation group claimed to have agreed on a "ground breaking new model for international climate change and energy collaboration", critics say it offers little apart from 'business as usual'. A report from an Australian government research agency projected that the pact could lead to 23 percent lower greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2050 compared to levels projected if no action was taken. However, the environmental group WWF points out that the same report shows that global emissions will in fact increase by 100 per cent by 2050 under the Partnership plan despite these savings. The Partnership is voluntary and non-binding and does not set any targets for GHG reductions.

"Six nations launch 'clean energy' fund to rival Kyoto," EURACTIV, 12 January 2006; "Clean Energy is Life or Death for Planet - Australia," REUTERS, 12 January 2006; "Asia-Pacific pact will only slow GHG emissions growth," Environmental Finance, 12 January 2006; "Asia Pacific partnership focus on voluntary targets slated," EDIE NEWS, 13 January 2006; "Asia-Pacific Partnership Sets New Path on Climate", AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT, 13 January 2006; "US leads six nation pact to develop clean technologies," EDIES NEWS, 29 July 2005; "Asia-Pacific Partnership sets world up for massive global warming," WWF, 12 January 2006.

## **STATE OF THE WORLD REPORT 2006 PUTS SPOTLIGHT ON CHINA AND INDIA**

The impact of China and India as major consumers of resources and polluters of local and global ecosystems form the focus of the Worldwatch Institute's State of the World Report 2005. While the threats stemming from the dramatic economic rise of the two countries to the survival of the planet are laid out in detail, the report also highlights innovative and progressive developments in the two economies such as recent commitments to develop large wind power and solar energy industries, South-South sharing of ideas and the development of independent environmental NGOs in China. Accordingly, the report views this colossal shift in global geopolitics as an opportunity rather than a threat and calls for broader cooperation to develop new energy and agricultural systems between China, India, Europe and the US who together claim 75 percent of the Earth's "biocapacity", i.e. its bioproductive supply of natural resources. Notably, influential Chinese and Indians themselves call for a new path of industrialisation based on technology, low consumption of resources and low environmental pollution. As Sunita Narain of India's Centre for Science and Environment notes in the foreword to

the report, "the South - India, China, and all their neighbours - has no choice but to reinvent the development trajectory".

The full report can be accessed at  
<http://www.worldwatch.org/pubs/sow/2006/toc/>.

"State of the World 2006: China and India Hold World in Balance," WORLDWATCH PRESS RELEASE, 11 January 2006.

## Events & Resources

### EVENTS

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

#### Coming up in the next two weeks

23 January, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. SUSTAINABLE INVESTMENT AND GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE. This seminar, coordinated by the Institute for Environmental Studies (Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam) and the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation Institute for Water Education (UNESCO-IHE), will address the issue of how multilateral agreements can be designed to foster sustainable development while also promoting and providing protection for investment in the context of the Concerted Action on Trade and Environment (CAT&E). For further information contact Kyla Tienhaara, tel: (+31) 20-598-8257; e-mail: [kyla.tienhaara@ivm.falw.vn.nl](mailto:kyla.tienhaara@ivm.falw.vn.nl); Internet: [http://www.sense.nl/SENSE\\_INCLUDES/060123poster.pdf](http://www.sense.nl/SENSE_INCLUDES/060123poster.pdf)

23-27 January, Granada, Spain: AD HOC OPEN-ENDED INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUP ON ARTICLE 8(j) AND RELATED PROVISIONS OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY. Organised by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). For further information contact the CBD, tel: (+1-514) 288-2220; fax: 288-6588; email: [secretariat@biodiv.org](mailto:secretariat@biodiv.org); Internet: <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.aspx?mtg=WG8J-04>

23-27 January, Paris, France: THIRD GLOBAL CONFERENCE ON OCEANS, COASTS AND ISLANDS. The Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts and Islands serves as a platform for cross-sectoral information sharing and dialogue on issues affecting oceans, coasts and islands, with the goal of achieving sustainable development in these areas. The Forum also seeks to improve global, regional, and national policies related to oceans, coasts and islands. For further information contact Catherine Johnston, tel: (+1 302) 831-8066; fax: 831-3668; e-mail: [johnston@udel.edu](mailto:johnston@udel.edu); Internet: <http://www.globaloceans.org>

30 January- 3 February, Granada, Spain: FOURTH MEETING OF THE AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING. Organised by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). For further information contact the CBD, tel: (+1-514) 288-2220; fax: 288-6588; email: [secretariat@biodiv.org](mailto:secretariat@biodiv.org); Internet: <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meeting.aspx?mtg=ABSWG-04>

30 January - 2 February 2006, St Lucia, South Africa: WETLANDS, WATER AND LIVELIHOODS WORKSHOP. This workshop, organised by Wetlands International and the Wetlands and Livelihoods Working Group, hopes to strengthen partnerships among government, non-government, academic and private environment and development/aid agencies in sharing knowledge and experiences in the integration of livelihoods, poverty and environment issues. While the workshop will largely focus on wetland conservation, water, poverty reduction and livelihoods issues in sub-Saharan Africa, Southeast Asia and Latin America, it will also strive to influence inter-sectoral development for poverty reduction and sustainable wetland management in all regions of the world. For further information contact Cobus Meiring, tel: (+27 (0)836) 267 619; e-mail: [wetlands.livelihoods@wetlands.org](mailto:wetlands.livelihoods@wetlands.org); Internet: <http://www.wetlands.org/news.aspx?id=702583bf-64d6-4c2c-8595-852e2aa45b46>

2-4 February 2006, New Delhi, India: DELHI SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT SUMMIT. With intent to foster hope and stimulate action towards respectable standards of living for the world's poorest and a responsible pattern of production and consumption among the richest, TERI organises the DSDS (Delhi Sustainable Development Summit) annually. The 2006 event will focus upon Linking across MDGs: Towards innovative partnerships and governance. For further information, contact Marcel Engel; e-mail: [engel@wbcsd.org](mailto:engel@wbcsd.org); web: <http://www.teriin.org/dsds>

#### Other forthcoming events

23 February - 2 March 2006, Perth, Australia: SHARING THE FISH CONFERENCE. The concept of allocation issues is one of increasing national and international interest to those involved in fisheries management. The conference will focus on a broad spectrum of allocation issues presented by speakers from around the world who represent government, industry and various stakeholder interest. Organised by the Western Australian Department of Fisheries (DoF) in cooperation with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations and supported by the Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) and New Zealand Ministry of Fisheries. For further information, contact [info5@eventedge.com.au](mailto:info5@eventedge.com.au). Web: <http://www.fishallocation.com.au>

6-10 March, Treviso, Italy: **INTRODUCTION TO BIOSAFETY AND RISK ASSESSMENT FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL RELEASE OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS (GMOs): THEORETICAL APPROACH AND SCIENTIFIC BACKGROUND.** This workshop is being organised by the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Bio technology (ICGEB) in collaboration with the Istituto Agronomico per l'Oltremare. The workshop will be aimed at those scientists who are interested in issues related to risk assessment and management for the environmental release of GMOs. The main goal of the workshop is to provide the participants with an overview of the current research in biosafety, the applicable regulation in a number of countries and different risk assessment approaches used for the environmental release of GMOs. For further information, tel.: +39-040-3757333; fax: +39-040-226555; email: [courses@icgeb.org](mailto:courses@icgeb.org)

8-9 March, Sao Paulo, Brazil: **BIOTECHNOLOGY AND BRAZIL: IMPLICATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR GLOBAL AGRICULTURE.** Biotechnology and Brazil is the first major international conference to focus on Brazil's recently approved seed legislation and the effect it will have on the prospects in Brazil itself and around the world. The conference is an opportunity to meet and discuss biotechnology issues with people who are actively involved in the subject. Biotechnology and Brazil will examine the implications of biotech regarding cost of production of soybeans and future GMO crops; the positions and policies that Europe has taken with regard to GMO soybeans, cotton and corn, and consumer concerns surrounding GMO labelling

13-17 March 2006, Dakar, Senegal: **FIRST TRAINING WORKSHOP ON BUILDING CAPACITY TO SET PRIORITIES FOR AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY IN WEST AND CENTRAL AFRICA.** The motivating question for this workshop is how to allocate biotechnology and other crop-improvement investments to maximise poverty reduction and environmental sustainability. Organised by West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development (CORAF). For further information, contact e-mail: [marcel.nwalozie@coraf.org](mailto:marcel.nwalozie@coraf.org). Web: <http://www.scidev.net/events/index.cfm?fuseaction=readevents&itemid=797&language=1>

16-22 March 2006, Mexico City, Mexico: **4TH WORLD WATER FORUM - LOCAL ACTION FOR A GLOBAL CHALLENGE.** The main theme of the 4th World Water Forum is Local Actions for a Global Challenge. The organizers of the 4th Forum share the belief that, regardless of their root causes, water related problems have their greatest impacts at the local level. As a result, local actions are key for generating concrete results that, when amalgamated across sectors and regions, will move us closer to meeting the water-related targets set by the Millennium Development Goals, the WSSD

Implementation Plan and Local Agenda 21. For further information, e-mail: [feedback@worldwaterforum4](mailto:feedback@worldwaterforum4)

28-30 March, Edinburgh, Scotland: **AQUACULTURE TODAY 2006.** Aquaculture Today 2006 will explore the key issues affecting the aquaculture industry in a national, European and international context. Leading figures from the industry will participate in formal presentations, discussion sessions, exhibitions and networking. For further information contact Claire Anderson, tel.: +44 (0) 131-312-4550, email: [canderson@specialpublications.co.uk](mailto:canderson@specialpublications.co.uk)

13-18 August, Beijing, China: **INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF PLANT TISSUE CULTURE AND BIOTECHNOLOGY (ICPTC&B).** More than 2,000 foreign and Chinese plant biologists, including four Nobel Prize winners, are expected to attend the meeting to discuss topics like the industrial uses of genetically modified (GM) plants, intellectual property in biotechnology, biosafety, and GM plants. For more information, visit <http://www.genetics.ac.cn/IAPTCS1/Intvitation.htm>

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

### ICTSD Resource

**AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.** By Thomas Lines (International Institute on Environment and Development (IIED) and ICTSD, December 2005). The crisis in agricultural commodities is closely linked to issues of poverty and environmental degradation. Dealing with entrenched rural poverty and major impacts from agriculture on ecosystem viability requires a new look at how commodity markets succeed or fail. There is a need for better understanding of how commodity markets work and how policy makers and businesses can intervene to introduce fairness, justice and sustainability into these markets. This challenging context provides the background for this book, which brings together an edited selection of papers prepared for two strategic dialogues on commodities, trade and sustainable development, jointly convened by IIED and the ICTSD.

### Other Resources

**US VS. EU: AN EXAMINATION OF THE TRADE ISSUES SURROUNDING GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD.** By the Pew Initiative on Food Biotechnology, December 2005. The Pew Initiative on Food and Technology has released an updated brief on the United States (U.S.)-European Union (EU) trade dispute over genetically modified crops. Several updates include the new EU laws on approval of GM crops, labeling, and traceability. The new issue brief provides an

overview of the history of the dispute; and estimates of the impacts that the EU de facto moratorium on GM crop approvals has had on U.S. trade, among others. To access this paper, visit <http://pewagbiotech.org/resources/issuebriefs/useu.pdf>

**THE POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF NANO-SCALE TECHNOLOGIES ON COMMODITY MARKETS: THE IMPLICATIONS FOR COMMODITY DEPENDENT DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.** By the ETC Group (South Centre, November 2005). This report by the ETC Group, presented at a South Centre meeting in advance of the Sixth WTO Ministerial Conference, examines the potential impacts of nanotechnology on the agricultural and mining sectors of commodity dependent developing countries. Case studies on rubber, textiles, platinum and copper provide early examples of how economies and workers in the global South could be affected by nanotech's emerging research and development and products. The report concludes that "history shows that there will be a push to replace commodities such as rubber, cotton and strategic minerals with cheaper raw materials that can be sourced or manufactured by new processes closer to home. Nanotech's new designer materials could topple commodity markets, disrupt trade and eliminate jobs." To access this paper, visit <http://www.southcentre.org/publications/researchpapers/ResearchPapers4.pdf>.

**GENETIC RESOURCE POLICIES: WHAT IS BIODIVERSITY WORTH TO FARMERS?** By Melinda Smale and Amanda King (International Food Policy Research Institute, 2005). This volume contains the third of a series of IFPRI briefs on genetic resource policies. The first set, published in January 2003 and containing Briefs 1 through 6, focuses on intellectual property rights issues, the second set, published in December 2003 and containing Briefs 7 through 12, focused on issues related to ex situ genebanks and their collections, and this third set sheds light on questions regarding who maintains diversity, where it is maintained, and how farmers value this diversity as societies and economies change. To access these briefs, visit <http://www.ifpri.org/pubs/rag/br1003.asp>

**STATE OF THE WORLD 2006 - SPECIAL FOCUS: CHINA AND INDIA.** Worldwatch Institute, January 2006. This year, Worldwatch Institute's annual State of the World report provides a special focus on China and India, examining the global impact as these two nations join the United States and Europe as major consumers of

resources and polluters of local and global ecosystems. The report explains the critical need for both countries to "leapfrog" the technologies, policies, and even the cultures that now prevail in many western countries for the sake of global sustainability -- and reports on some of the strategies that China and India are starting to implement. To access this paper, visit <http://www.worldwatch.org/pubs/sow/2006/> **WHO BENEFITS FROM GM CROPS? MONSANTO AND THE CORPORATE-DRIVEN GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROP REVOLUTION.** Friends of the Earth International, January 2006. This report analyses the way in which GM crops have been introduced between 1996 and 2005. It describes how the rapid penetration of GM crops in a limited number of countries has largely been the result of the aggressive strategies of the biotech industry, particularly pushed by top GM crop leader Monsanto, rather than the consequence of the benefits derived from the use of this technology. The authors argue that the biotech industry and industry-sponsored organisations have lauded the benefits that have accompanied the introduction of GM crops while conveniently ignoring the negative impacts and other problems. To access this paper, visit [http://www.biosafetyafrica.net/\\_DOCS/GMcropsbenefit.pdf](http://www.biosafetyafrica.net/_DOCS/GMcropsbenefit.pdf).

**SUSTAINABLE USE AND MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES.** By Stephan Moll, Mette Skovgaard and Philipp Schepelmann (European Environmental Agency, January 2006). This report focuses on our ability to continue to provide for our needs by drawing on the natural world. Given the broad coverage of the term 'natural resources', a decision was made at the outset to focus the analysis on a selection of natural resources: fisheries, forestry, water, fossil fuels, metals and construction minerals, and land use. The factors behind this choice included ensuring a mix of renewable and non-renewable resources, the policy relevance and political importance of the resources and the ability to illustrate the various policy approaches. To access this report visit [http://reports.eea.eu.int/eea\\_report\\_2005\\_9](http://reports.eea.eu.int/eea_report_2005_9)

**THE TYRANNY OF FREE TRADE: WASTED NATURAL WEALTH AND LOST LIVELIHOODS.** By Friends of the Earth International, December 2005. This paper looks at interactions between trade, natural resources and livelihoods in subjects such as fisheries, seeds, water, indigenous rights, minerals, desertification and energy. To access this paper, visit <http://www.foei.org/publications/pdfs/tyranny.pdf>

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. This edition of BRIDGES Trade BioRes was edited by Sarah Mohan, [smohan@ictsd.ch](mailto:smohan@ictsd.ch). The Managing Editor is Heike Baumüller, [hbaumuller@ictsd.ch](mailto:hbaumuller@ictsd.ch). Contributors to this issue were Andrew Aziz, Heike Baumüller, Ruth Fend and Sarah Mohan. 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. ISSN 1682-0843

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

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