



INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR  
TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE  
DEVELOPMENT

# Bridges

## Weekly Trade News Digest

13 June 2007

Volume 11 Number 21

### LEAD STORIES

NAMA DIVISIONS COME TO THE FORE AS NEW  
MODALITIES PUSH BEGINS IN EARNEST 1

G-20, G-33 MINISTERS UNDERLINE PRIORITIES  
BEFORE "DECISIVE PHASE" IN DOHA TALKS 3

US TRADE POLICY STUCK IN NEUTRAL AS TPA  
MANDATE WINDS DOWN 5

### OTHER STORIES

TRIPS: MEMBERS STILL DIVIDED ON BIODIVERSITY,  
GIs, AND ENFORCEMENT 7

TRADE FACILITATION TALKS AIM TO MOVE  
TOWARDS DRAFT AGREEMENT TEXT 8

SVEs AND ACP GROUP WEIGH IN ON FISH  
SUBSIDIES DEBATE 10

### IN BRIEF

WIPO DEVELOPMENT AGENDA COMMITTEE GETS  
TO GRIPS WITH TRICKY ISSUES 11

### WTO IN BRIEF

CANADA REQUESTS PANEL IN US FARM SUBSIDY  
DISPUTE 12

WTO REPORTS SLIGHT INCREASE IN ANTI-  
DUMPING INVESTIGATIONS 12

### EVENTS & RESOURCES

EVENTS 13

RESOURCES 14

### LEAD STORIES

#### NAMA DIVISIONS COME TO THE FORE AS NEW MODALITIES PUSH BEGINS IN EARNEST

WTO Members appear set to make their most concerted attempt yet to reach an agreement in the troubled Doha Round negotiations. Although differences on farm trade have hogged the limelight since the talks began in 2001, negotiators say that it has now become apparent that divisions on industrial tariffs are no less serious.

In fact, while there have recently been hints of rapprochement on some agriculture issues, similar shifts were pointedly absent from last week's discussions on non-agricultural market access (NAMA) at WTO headquarters in Geneva. Substantial new concessions will be necessary for Members to strike a framework deal on agriculture and NAMA by the end of July, which is widely considered necessary to conclude the round by the end of this year or early 2008.

Nevertheless, in the past week, heads of state from the Group of Eight major industrialised nations, as well as ministers from the G-20 and G-33 negotiating blocs of developing countries repeated their commitment to meeting this target, insisting that it remained possible.

The G8 in particular called on trade ministers "from leading developed countries and major emerging economies to provide in the coming weeks a solid platform for a multilateral negotiation leading to an agreement on modalities." A modalities deal would include formulae and figures for subsidy and tariff cuts, as well as the often-contentious exceptions to these.

Of course, innumerable statements of this sort have been made since the negotiations were launched. The G8 itself made a similar exhortation last July – only to have the talks break down two weeks later. Will the most recent round of declarations amount to anything? Only if negotiators are given more wiggle room to compromise.

**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

WTO Director-General Pascal Lamy seems to think that this could happen. He told the leaders from the G8, the EU, and major developing countries including Brazil, China, and India that “an agreement is now within our reach.” “Your positions have moved closer to each other,” he explained. “With an added political effort from each and every one of you, we should be able to cover the remaining ground.”

Lamy claimed that the additional concessions necessary – from the US on farm subsidies; the EU, Japan, and, to a lesser extent, developing countries on agricultural market access; and the emerging economies on industrial tariffs – amounted to no more than a few billion dollars. A modest price, he implied, to pay for reinforcing the international rules-based system. The WTO chief urged the heads of state “to avoid weighing out the final concessions on an apothecary’s weight-balance, and to focus on the overall world economic landscape and on the enormous risks involved in failure.”

Members will be presented with a potential set of terms for a Doha Round deal in the upcoming weeks; based on delegations’ input, the chairs of the agriculture and NAMA negotiations are expected to issue draft modalities texts with formulae and figures during the last week of June.

Prior to this, ministers from the EU, India, Brazil, and the US – the so-called G-4 – will try to iron out their differences at a meeting in Potsdam near Berlin from 19-22 June. Senior officials from the four trading powers are meeting in Paris this week to prepare for the summit in Germany. Any agreement the G-4 manages to reach would likely contribute to the chairs’ papers. Nevertheless, the draft texts will be issued even if the four fail to converge.

In the absence of clear signals from Members, the chairs will have to speculate about where an acceptable compromise might lie if they want to present delegates with comprehensive modalities texts.

### **NAMA: little consensus**

On the basis of a last week’s NAMA discussions, negotiations Chair Ambassador Don Stephenson (Canada) will have to engage in at least some speculation. He said on 8 June that there was simply no consensus on some of the critical issues in the talks.

Members remain deeply divided on the depth of industrial tariff cuts. Several developing countries complain that industrialised nations are demanding tariff cuts far deeper than those that they are willing to undertake themselves.

The US and the EU, along with several other developed countries, have called for a ‘Swiss’ tariff reduction formula with a ‘coefficient’ of 10 for themselves and 15 for developing countries. Under the ‘Swiss’ formula, a Member’s coefficient effectively becomes its new tariff ceiling: all duties fed through the formula are slashed to below the level of the coefficient, with lower ones reduced less steeply.

Since developed countries in general have tariffs averaging about 6 percent, while the figure for developing countries is closer to 30 percent, coefficients of 10 and 15 would demand substantially more effort from the latter. Many developing countries argue that requiring them to cut bound tariffs by greater percentages than industrialised countries would violate the Doha mandate’s stipulation for “less than full reciprocity in reduction commitments.” Industrialised countries counter that they need “real market access” – i.e., cuts to applied tariffs – and that developing countries would in any case be left with higher overall tariff levels.

In a new paper released last week (TN/MA/W/86), the NAMA-11, which comprises ten countries including Argentina, Brazil, India, Indonesia, and South Africa, argued once again that the developing country coefficient should be at least 25 points higher than that for developed countries. Using WTO data, they calculated that a coefficient of 10 would slash rich country bound tariff ceilings by an average of 40.4 percent. In comparison, a coefficient of 15 would cut NAMA-11 countries’ bound tariffs by 69.6 percent, while a coefficient of 35 would entail a 49.5-percent reduction.

As for the duties actually levied by the two groups, coefficients of 10 and 35 would require a roughly equal cut of between 25 and 26 percent. A coefficient of 15, on the other hand, would force NAMA-11 countries’ average applied tariff down by 44.9 percent.

The NAMA-11 noted that developed countries apply relatively high tariffs on products such as textiles, clothing, footwear, hides, and skins – in which developing countries tend to be competitive exporters.

Earlier in the week, Brazilian Ambassador Clodoaldo Huguene flatly rejected the notion of coefficients of 10 and 15. It “is not attainable, is not possible and it’s out,” he said, insisting that developing countries should not have to shoulder disproportionate adjustment costs.

In an exchange that has become almost a tradition, the US and the EU criticised the NAMA-11’s demands as unreasonable.

Notably, some developing countries such as Chile, Colombia, and Uruguay suggested that greater flexibility would be necessary in order to reach an agreement at this juncture in the talks. Chile said that a coefficient of 35 was unlikely to garner consensus.

### The end of the beginning

Stephenson emphasised that the draft text that he will give to Members would mark the start, not the finish, of real negotiations. He suggested that many revisions of the text would be possible, based on their responses. Agriculture negotiations Chair Ambassador Crawford Falconer (New Zealand) has also suggested that his modalities text would be open to modification.

Speaking to reporters in Geneva on 13 June, Lamy noted that even a so-called 'low-ambition' outcome on NAMA -- with cuts to bound industrial tariff rates that do not force down applied duties across the board -- would be valuable for "stability and security." Years of autonomous liberalisation have left countries like India and Brazil with wide gaps between their bound and applied tariffs. Removing these gaps -- thus making market-opening irrevocable -- would amount to "real concessions," he said, according to the Associated Press.

Lamy has long maintained that even the more modest proposals currently on the Doha Round negotiating table would give rise to far greater new trade volumes than the previous Uruguay Round -- as much as three times more.

The WTO chief also spoke to fears about the G-4's prominent role, saying that the four, which represent a wide range of interests in the negotiations, could contribute to a deal -- but not determine it. "There is no such thing as a special G-4 entry key," he said, reports Agence France Presse.

Lamy also suggested that the WTO might have to cancel its traditional August holiday if Members are unable to finalise a modalities deal by the end of July.

ICTSD reporting; "WTO chief lowers trade deal ambitions," ASSOCIATED PRESS, 13 June 2007; "Four trading powers can help but not conclude WTO deal: Lamy," AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 13 June 2007.

## G-20, G-33 MINISTERS UNDERLINE PRIORITIES BEFORE "DECISIVE PHASE" IN DOHA TALKS

Ministers and top officials from a wide range of developing countries came to Geneva on 11 June to express solidarity and call for action on their countries' concerns, as the troubled Doha round talks enter what they described as a "decisive phase." They reiterated calls for rich countries, especially the US, to offer deeper farm subsidy cuts; several warned that they would not accept disproportionate demands to reduce their own industrial tariffs.

Representatives from the G-20, the leading group of developing countries, met to discuss the 'state of play' of the agriculture negotiations. This came ahead of a meeting in Potsdam next week at which ministers from G-20 members India and Brazil will try to hash out differences with their counterparts from the EU and the US. Senior officials from the four trading powers -- together dubbed the G-4 -- are meeting in Paris this week to prepare for the 19-22 June summit in Germany.

Also present in Geneva was the G-33 group, a coalition that wants developing countries to be allowed to shield some commodities from liberalisation in order to respond to rural development and food and livelihood security needs. The group includes several countries that are also part of the G-20, including China, India, Indonesia, and the Philippines.

The G-20 met with the coordinators of other developing country regional alliances such as the African Group and the African, Caribbean, and Pacific (ACP) Group, as well as with interest-specific blocs such as the G-33, the least-developed countries (LDCs), the small and vulnerable economies (SVEs), and the 'Cotton-4' group of West African nations seeking cotton trade reform. Also present was the coordinator of the NAMA-11 alliance on industrial tariffs.

### Talks shift into new gear

Trade diplomats report that the agriculture talks have shifted into a new gear as the chair of the negotiating group, Ambassador Crawford Falconer (New Zealand), seeks to shepherd Members towards agreement by the end of July. After issuing a two-part 'challenges' paper that tried to identify the terms of a plausible agreement on many issues in the talks, Falconer held a series of intensive consultations to gauge delegations' reactions (see BRIDGES Weekly, 6 June 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/07-06-06/story2.htm>).

In statements issued after their respective meetings, the G-20 and G-33 indicated that they believed that the round could be concluded by the year's end, and emphasised their willingness to work constructively towards this goal. Most observers say that meeting this timeframe would require an end-July deal on modalities – the contentious formulae and figures for calculating tariff and subsidy cuts, and exceptions to these. At the same time, both blocs served notice that they would not yield on some negotiating positions. They called for the 'development round' to respond to developing country needs, with the G-33 highlighting the fact that these countries represent more than two-thirds of the WTO membership.

The G-20 suggested that there was "growing support for the view" that the bloc's positions on market access, domestic support, and export competition constitute the "balanced centre of gravity in the agricultural negotiations."

### **Domestic support**

The G-20 called for "real and effective cuts" to farm subsidies, signalling that they would not let the US get away with capping subsidies far above current spending levels.

The group declared that a "low-teen" number in billions of US dollars reflects the "only possible outcome" for the limit on overall trade-distorting support (OTDS) by the US. This announcement came in response to Falconer's assessment that a realistic 'centre of gravity' for an agreement lies "certainly below 19 [billion USD] and somewhere above the very low teens." The chair later clarified that by "low teens" he meant anything in double digits.

Washington has offered to bind its OTDS at roughly USD 22.5 billion, already well above the USD 19 billion it paid out to farmers in 2001, let alone the USD 11 billion that some governments estimate it spent last year. (The decline in spending was due to subsidy programmes that cut payments when commodity prices rise.)

Sources familiar with the G-33's discussions said that participants agreed that further concessions would be impossible without progress on levels of overall trade-distorting support.

### **Market access**

The G-20 argued that their proposal represents "the most balanced possible outcome" on market access, "combining ambition together with respect for the sensitivities of developing countries." The bloc's call for developed countries to slash farm tariffs by an average

of 54 percent falls between the EU's formal proposal for a 39-percent cut and the US' favoured 66-percent reduction, and thus in the middle of the 'centre of gravity' zone identified by the chair. In recent weeks, there have also been suggestions that the Cairns Group farm exporters and even the US might be able to water down their demands to accept the G-20's proposal for developed countries to cut tariffs above 75 percent by three-quarters.

Notably, G-33 members insisted that some special products should be completely exempt from tariff reduction, rebutting Falconer's suggestion that all tariff lines should be subject to some minimum cut. They emphasised that the mandate on special products does not require developing countries to guarantee exporters a minimum level of new market access, whether through tariff cuts or new import quotas.

The G-33 welcomed the US' newly expressed willingness to engage on indicators relating to rural development and food and livelihood security, which are meant to help guide developing countries' selection of 'special products'. Washington had earlier refused to debate this issue, insisting instead that Members agree first on the permitted number of tariff lines, which it said should not exceed five. However, the US now argues that these indicators must be based on 'internationally-verifiable data'. This has prompted some G-33 Members to counter that this standard far exceeds that which is usually required for other data on tariffs and subsidies at the WTO. While the US favours using data collected by bodies such as the UN's Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), they say that these statistics are in any case based on national data, and may not be comprehensive. Some Members, such as Canada and New Zealand, were reported to be moving towards a less demanding standard of 'publicly available data'.

The G-33 reiterated its belief that the indicators that its member governments agreed at a March meeting in Jakarta should form the basis for discussions (see BRIDGES Weekly, 28 March 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/07-03-28/story1.htm>). That list, a trimmed-down version of an earlier one, included considerations such as a product's share in the total value of agricultural production or household agricultural income.

The bloc also reiterated the importance of a relatively easy-to-invoke 'special safeguard mechanism' (SSM) that developing countries will be able to use to raise tariffs temporarily above their bound ceiling levels to protect farmers from import surges and price depressions. The group stressed that the new mechanism should be "more favourable" than the

existing 'special safeguard', which most developing countries have been unable to use.

The group's statement reaffirmed its unity and shared commitment to common goals, following an April proposal by G-33 member Pakistan that suggested that Members should be allowed less flexibility to protect special products than what the coalition had previously agreed.

The chair is now widely expected to issue a draft 'modalities' paper some time in the last week of June, after the Potsdam meeting. This document would in principle be a basis for finalising an overall agriculture deal, setting out formulae and figures for subsidy and tariff cuts, and exceptions. Falconer would thus have to try to fill the gaps that Members have failed to bridge. Delegations will be given a chance to react to this paper, which might lead to a revised version in July.

ICTSD reporting.

---

## US TRADE POLICY STUCK IN NEUTRAL AS TPA MANDATE WINDS DOWN

One month after the Bush administration and leading Democrats struck a much-touted compromise on trade, the immediate future of US trade policy remains murky. Persistent scepticism in sections of Congress about the benefits of economic globalisation means that support for some bilateral trade deals is far from clear. So too is willingness to renew the president's negotiating authority – necessary for the Doha Round WTO talks.

The compromise, under which the administration agreed to boost protections for the environment, labour standards, and access to medicine in its free trade agreements (FTAs), was expected to smooth the way for Congressional approval of pending bilateral deals with Panama and Peru.

More significantly, it was expected it to pave the way for "restoring the bipartisan consensus on trade," after fears that the Democratic victory in last November's Congressional elections would bring US trade policy to a standstill. It was also seen as a sign that Democrats and Republicans could cooperate on trade despite profound differences on other issues, such as Iraq.

Progress on trade deals, however, is "proving to be a little bit tougher than some of us expected," said Kim Elliott, a joint fellow with the Peterson Institute for International Economics and the Center for Global Development in Washington.

Much of the toughness is the result of the Democratic Party's divisions on trade policy. In the early 1990s, Democrats supported the Uruguay Round accord and the North American Free Trade Agreement, albeit after a wrenching internal debate. Support for trade agreements within the party has since weakened, particularly after the Republicans took control of the White House in 2001. Last fall, anxieties about jobs moving overseas and the soaring trade deficit helped propel the party to power. Indeed, many newly elected Democrats highlighted trade-related concerns during their campaigns.

Despite support from senior lawmakers such as House Ways and Means Committee Chair Charles Rangel (New York), some rank-and-file Democrats expressed dissatisfaction about the recent compromise with the administration.

## Korea, Colombia talks bogged down

Experts still expect the Peru and Panama FTAs to win Congressional support, once they are altered to meet the new template for labour, environment, and intellectual property provisions. More economically significant deals with South Korea and Colombia, however, have become bogged down. They were left out of the concord on trade policy, in part due to mighty opposition from organised labour, a traditional Democratic constituency.

Critics in Congress had already been slamming the Korea deal, concluded in April following ten months of intense negotiations, for failing to adequately open the Korean market to US automobiles, as well to clear the path for exports of US beef (see BRIDGES Weekly, 4 April 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/07-04-04/story1.htm>). With strong support from labour groups, many Democrats have said that in order for the Colombia FTA to win Congressional approval, the country must first take steps to improve its record on human rights, ensure greater worker protections, and resolve the alleged death-squad killings of hundreds of union organisers. Sources say that the agreement met a hostile reception in a House subcommittee meeting on 13 June, with administration officials defending the deal from criticism.

The race for the White House next year is also affecting trade politics. Prospects for the Korea deal took another blow last week when Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, a leading Democratic presidential candidate, denounced the pact on the grounds that it would hurt American workers. Speaking to an audience in Detroit, Michigan, home of the struggling US auto industry, the New York senator said the deal would "hurt the US auto industry, increase our trade deficit, cost us good middle-class jobs and make America less competitive." Former

Senator John Edwards has already announced his opposition to the deal, which would be the US' biggest since NAFTA in 1994. Senator Barack Obama has yet to take a position.

As for the US-Colombia deal, officials in Bogota remain hopeful that both sides will be able to resolve their differences. Colombian President Alvaro Uribe, one of Washington's rare staunch allies in the Andean region, was in the US last week on a charm offensive aimed at winning over Democrats reluctant to assent to the FTA. The Peterson Institute's Elliott suggested that if Uribe is able to demonstrate "concrete progress" on the peace process and at prosecuting suspects arrested for the murder of trade unionists, it is possible that Democrats may support the deal later. Although Colombia remains the world's least safe country for labour activists, killings have decreased this year.

### **End-June important for bilateral FTAs**

A crucial deadline for all of these bilateral trade agreements is 1 July, when the Bush administration's trade promotion authority (TPA) will expire. This mandate allows the White House to require Congress to vote either for or against trade agreements without the possibility of amendments. Its imminent expiry does not, however, mean that Congress needs to vote on trade agreements submitted under TPA by the end of June. President George W. Bush simply needs to sign final trade agreements by this time. After that, he will be able to submit them to Congress at a moment of his choosing – this fall, for instance – with lawmakers still subject to TPA rules expediting debate and restricting amendments. The trick, of course, is to ensure that the deals are acceptable to a sufficient number of Democrats to secure their passage. To do this, US trade officials will have to find a way to make the pacts fit the new FTA template in a legally binding fashion.

Washington publication Inside US Trade reported on 12 June that US Trade Representative Susan Schwab said that lawyers from Congress and the administration were close to finalising legal text for modifying the FTAs. The administration inked the pacts with Colombia and Peru well before last month's agreement with the Democrats. The FTAs with Panama and Korea remain to be signed.

Even if the Colombia FTA goes unapproved in the short term, the country may not lose the near-unrestricted access to the US it currently enjoys under a soon-to-expire unilateral preference system for Andean nations (along with Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador). Influential members of Congress, including Rangel, have called for extending the scheme beyond its scheduled expiry at the end of this month.

### **Ramifications for TPA extension unclear**

Some economists argue that the Democrats' concerns about freer trade are more a result of the US' domestic social policy system than of increased cross-border trade. They suggest that the prospect of jobs moving overseas seems especially threatening in the US because employers provide so much of the social safety net – large chunks of healthcare, life insurance, and retirement benefits. These costs can also serve as an incentive against investing in the US. Thus, the argument goes, the US should fret less about erecting barriers to trade and undertake reforms to invest more in human capital and guarantee social benefits independently of employers.

Nevertheless, Democratic scepticism about bilateral trade agreements is both real and politically significant. What remains unclear is whether it will extend to the party's policies in the multilateral arena.

The Bush administration has indicated its intention to seek a new TPA mandate from Congress. This will be critical to concluding a deal in the Doha Round talks: trading partners are not likely to agree to a deal that could later be picked apart by US lawmakers.

Any new TPA mandate will require bipartisan support, as some Democrats will likely oppose all trade deals. Indeed, seven senators have vowed to "aggressively oppose" the White House's proposal to extend the mandate (see BRIDGES Weekly, 14 February 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/07-02-14/story2.htm>). This is further complicated by the fact that hesitation about the effects of unfettered trade is hardly limited to the Democratic Party. Prominent Republicans have been at the forefront of bipartisan demands for the Bush administration to pressure China to revalue its currency, blaming an artificially low renminbi for the US' yawning bilateral trade deficit. Even in the previous Congress, trade legislation passed by razor-thin margins.

On the other hand, prominent Democrats such as Representative Rangel have already called for a Doha-specific TPA extension. No attempts at developing new TPA legislation are likely before after Congress' August recess.

Elliott noted that Democrats are generally far more wary of bilateral FTAs, particularly with low-wage countries, than of multilateral negotiations. She suggested that more Democrats might have voted in favour of TPA for the Bush administration in 2002 had it not been for concerns about their ability to include environmental and labour issues in bilateral pacts. The recent deal with the administration may have helped assuage such fears. Some analysts believe that the Democrats would



be relatively reluctant to be seen to sink a potential multilateral accord, as compared to bilateral ones.

US trade officials have maintained that a negotiating 'breakthrough' that puts a Doha Round agreement within grasp would help convince Congress to agree to extend the administration's TPA.

WTO Director-General Pascal Lamy warned on 12 June that some other countries might take a different view of the absence of clear signs that TPA renewal is in the works. "Many US trading partners will consider that no movement to renew trade promotion authority would signal that the US might have lost faith in the round, and this would certainly have an impact on the dynamics of the negotiations," he told an annual meeting of the Bretton Woods Committee in Washington, reports Reuters.

Many powerful US politicians and commodity lobbies have declared their opposition to the deeper farm subsidy cuts that several other WTO Members say that Washington must make in order to make a Doha agreement possible.

The so-called G-4 -- the US, the EU, India, and Brazil -- are set to meet in Potsdam, Germany from 19 June, in another attempt to bridge their differences. Meanwhile, the WTO Membership at large has been trying to pick up the pace of efforts to strike a deal in Geneva.

ICTSD reporting; "Hillary Clinton slams proposed US-Korea trade pact," REUTERS, 10 June 2007; "USTR Schwab defends Korea FTA from auto industry criticism," YONHAP NEWS, 5 June 2007; "Top U.S. Democrats urge tougher stance toward Colombia," ASSOCIATED PRESS, 8 June 2007; "Statement by AFL-CIO President John Sweeney on Meeting with Colombian President," AFL-CIO PRESS RELEASE, 2 May 2007; "Uribe, Back in Washington, Lobbies for Trade Accord," BLOOMBERG, 7 June 2007; "Business fights for Colombia deal, labor pushes back," THE HILL, 6 June 2007; "Congress weighs future of Andean trade scheme," REUTERS, 30 May 2007; "Clinton Underscores Party's Angst Over Trade," WALL STREET JOURNAL, 11 June 2007; "Ecuador pursues trade-preference extension but faces critics in Congress," THE HILL, 12 June 2007; "Treasury says no new China legislation needed," REUTERS, 11 June 2007; "Bill would allow US currency intervention," FINANCIAL TIMES, 30 May 2007; "Labor movement dusts off agenda as power shifts in Congress," NEW YORK TIMES, 11 November 2006; "Inaction on US fast track dangerous for Doha-Lamy," REUTERS, 12 June 2007; "Uribe to face tough audience in U.S.," LOS ANGELES TIMES, 7 June 2007.

## OTHER STORIES

### TRIPS: MEMBERS STILL DIVIDED ON BIODIVERSITY, GIS, AND ENFORCEMENT

WTO Members continue to broadly disagree on how best to achieve the objectives of biodiversity conservation and intellectual property protection. The issue, along with the enforcement of intellectual property rights (IPRs), featured prominently in discussions during a 5 June meeting of the TRIPS Council.

Separate informal consultations on another contentious intellectual property issue -- the protection of geographical indications (GIs) -- took place the following day.

#### Disclosure Group expands

The misappropriation of genetic resources and traditional knowledge (TK) through patents ("bio-piracy") has been a source of major concern to a large number of Members, particularly several developing countries. For this reason, a group of developing countries (Brazil, China, Colombia, Cuba, India, Pakistan, Peru, Thailand, Tanzania, Ecuador, and South Africa) last summer proposed amending the TRIPS Agreement to require patent applications to include disclosure of the origin of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge as well as evidence of prior informed consent and benefit sharing (IP/C/W/474; see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 16 June 2006, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/06-06-16/story3.htm>). They argue that such requirements are necessary to support patent-related obligations that arise from the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

These countries have since repeated their call for making mandatory disclosure requirements part of WTO rules, calling for text-based negotiations to develop a specific amendment. They have been opposed by Members such as Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, which argue that such negotiations would be premature and that even disclosure requirements might not prevent 'bad patents' from being granted.

Notably, the so-called "Disclosure Group" expanded considerably at the recent meeting, with Venezuela, the members of the African Group and the members of the Group of Least-Developed Countries (LDCs) announcing their support for the proposal.

Apart from that, the discussion followed a familiar pattern. Australia, Canada, and New Zealand said that more facts-based discussions on concrete cases of

misappropriation were necessary. Japan and the US underlined their opposition to any TRIPS amendment on disclosure, saying that there is no contradiction between the WTO agreement and the CBD.

Norway supported the Disclosure Group's call for text-based negotiations, pointing to its own similar proposal for an amendment (IP/W/473). Instead of patent revocation, the Norwegians would sanction patent applicants that fail to meet disclosure requirements outside the patent system. Several countries in the Disclosure Group welcomed the Norwegian approach as a step in the right direction.

Finally, the EU reiterated its call for disclosure requirements to be negotiated outside the WTO, at the World Intellectual Property Organization.

Brazil said that Members' political will to engage in negotiations on disclosure as part of the Doha Round negotiations was growing. According to the Brazilian delegate, technical discussions would be pursued in informal consultations rather than at the meetings of the TRIPS Council.

The new chair of the TRIPS Council, Ambassador Yonov Frederick Agah (Nigeria) will consult with Members on whether to grant the CBD Secretariat observer status at the WTO, after Brazil expressed support for doing so but the US indicated its opposition.

### **Disagreement persists over enforcement**

A number of mainly industrialised nations such as Switzerland, Japan, the EU, and the US, (but also El Salvador) have been seeking to make the enforcement of intellectual property rights a permanent item on the TRIPS Council's agenda, pointing to increasing piracy and counterfeiting around the world. Most major developing countries, such as Argentina, Brazil, China, Cuba, India, and South Africa, oppose a requirement to discuss intellectual property rights at every meeting, arguing that giving the issue such prominence could ultimately impinge upon Members' freedom to determine the appropriate means of IP enforcement. They argue that other fora, such as WIPO and the World Customs Organization, deal adequately with enforcement.

Against this background, Switzerland tabled a submission describing its own enforcement system and border measures (IP/C/W/492). It highlights the importance of cooperation between national agencies, and points to the Swiss patent office's campaigns to promote public awareness that IP piracy and counterfeiting is more than a minor "peccadillo." Several developing countries emphasised that there was

consensus among Members to make enforcement a permanent fixture on the Council's agenda.

### **GIs at a standstill**

Like the TRIPS and biodiversity issues, Members remain deadlocked on whether to extend the higher level of geographical indication (GI) protection currently accorded to wines and spirits to other products (such as 'Parma ham'). Informal consultations on 6 June indicated no changes. Opponents of 'GI extension' such as Argentina, Canada, Chile, and the US have expressed concern about the costs of implementation – their farmers would lose the ability to use at least some names for their products, such as 'gruyère cheese.' The EU and India counter that increased protection would offer developing country producers opportunities to gain price premiums in export markets.

Switzerland and the EU believe that commercial opportunities arising from expanded GI protection could help compensate their agricultural producers for subsidy and tariff cuts under the Doha Round. GI extension is likely to become more prominent as WTO Members, particularly the G-4 of Brazil, the EU, India, and the US, try to reach an accord on farm trade.

ICTSD reporting.

---

### **TRADE FACILITATION TALKS AIM TO MOVE TOWARDS DRAFT AGREEMENT TEXT**

The chair of the WTO talks on trade facilitation (TF) told Members during a 7-8 June meeting that there is no time to waste if they want to be able to start negotiating the text of a future agreement on cutting red tape and other obstacles to the trade and transit of goods by July.

Urgency notwithstanding, delegates say that the discussions on trade facilitation have moved forward more steadily than those in other areas of the troubled Doha Round negotiations. Members continue to discuss each other's proposals while refining their own into the shape of text for potential articles of an eventual accord. Sources say that Chair Ambassador Eduardo Ernesto Sperisen-Yurt (Guatemala) would like Members to arrive at a single draft text for further bargaining in time for the negotiating group's next meeting, scheduled for 16-20 July.

Members are specifically mandated to clarify GATT articles on the freedom of transit for goods from other Member states (Article V), trade-related fees and formalities (Article VIII), and transparency in the



regulation and administration of trade regulations (Article X).

The recent meeting saw an active debate on three new submissions tabled by the US and Turkey. One developing country delegate said the proposals were notable for proposing text-based language.

### **S&DT concerns raised again**

Foremost in the discussions, however, was special and differential treatment (S&DT) for developing countries with regard to the implementation of trade facilitation obligations. The trade facilitation mandate is unique in that developing countries will not be required to implement commitments unless they receive the technical assistance necessary to do so. There have been several proposals for this process, from helping countries identify their trade facilitation needs through to the acquisition of the capacity to implement obligations -- and thus the legal responsibility for doing so.

At the meeting, developing countries once again stressed the centrality of technical assistance to the implementation of trade facilitation obligations. Sources say that Jamaica, speaking on behalf of a 'core group' of developing countries that have jointly proposed a system for implementing aid and trade facilitation commitments, called for balanced contributions from rich and poor countries. It argued that least-developed countries (LDCs) should not be required to implement any obligations. Jamaica also noted that some proposed reforms go beyond the group's mandate. Uganda, speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that development had to be an integral part of the talks.

One delegate told Bridges that the 'core group' would likely table a refined version of their earlier proposal calling for trade facilitation provisions to be divided into mandatory and 'best endeavour', with some mandatory ones kicking in only after the necessary capacity has been certifiably acquired. (see BRIDGES Weekly, 21 March 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/07-03-21/story3.htm>). An LDC delegate said that it was still not clear who would actually assess capacity acquisition. Would countries 'self-assess'? Or would it be done by the WTO Secretariat or the donor country?

The extent to which trade facilitation-related commitments should be binding is becoming a more prominent point of contention. Egypt said that it would be desirable to have some commitments as 'best endeavour', so that countries could implement commitments as appropriate for their developmental context. It added that donor countries' delivery of aid should also be carefully monitored. Developed countries generally stressed the need for

comprehensive binding implementation. Switzerland stressed that it was a basic premise of the negotiations that all Members must implement all obligations. The EU said that 'best-endeavour' provisions usually result in non-implementation, although it signalled openness to an Indian proposal for 'progressive implementation' by developing countries.

The EU also reported on a recent informal retreat it organised in Evian for Members including the US, Japan, Switzerland, the Philippines, Japan, China, Bangladesh, and India to informally discuss S&DT and technical assistance for trade facilitation. It said that though there was general agreement on issues, including the non-applicability of dispute settlement in the absence of adequate capacity, participants disagreed on others, such as the notion of a deadline for developing countries to implement commitments. The EU said it would continue to hold further informal retreats on these issues.

### **Turkey, US proposals on transparency**

Turkey's revised proposal on transparency (Article X, TN/TF/W/132/Rev.1) called for governments to publish trade-related legislation and procedures on a national website, and to establish national 'enquiry points' to deal with questions about trade-related requirements from other countries and traders. It suggested that small and vulnerable economies (SVEs) be allowed to establish regional enquiry points, as they had asked to do.

Some negotiators confessed to doubts about the Turkish proposal's provision for Members to agree on a specific interval to publish new or amended trade-related legislation and procedures on the website prior to their entry into force. A similar empty square-bracket awaited a precise maximum number of days within which national enquiry points would respond to questions. An LDC source expressed a preference for non-specific language such as 'immediately', 'rapidly' or in a 'timely manner', primarily for capacity considerations. The Turkish proposal did, however, make the full implementation of obligations by developing countries and LDCs conditional on their acquisition of capacity through technical assistance. A developing country delegate noted that the stipulation for enquiry points to operate at 'no cost or at a cost commensurate with the cost of the service rendered' could be problematic, since establishing them would involve costs such as employing staff and buying computers and telephones.

The US proposed a draft article that would require Members to maintain a website with all necessary trade-related documents and a full description of customs procedures (TN/TF/W/145). One delegate

suggested to Bridges that this may not necessarily simplify access for small and medium enterprises in developing countries.

### **Call for clarification on 'expedited shipments'**

The US also tabled a new proposal (TN/TF/W/144) outlining accelerated procedures for tracked and controlled expedited shipments. Some Members enquired about how 'expedited shipments' differed from the 'express shipments' the US had referred to in an earlier submission. Switzerland asked for clarity beyond what had been provided on the definition of 'expedited shipments'. Brazil wanted a clarification of product coverage.

Tanzania asked why the submission sought to exempt expedited shipments worth USD 200 or less from customs duties or formal entry documents, pointing out that the amount was significant for LDCs like itself, however trifling it was to the US. The EU noted that accelerated procedures already existed for certain authorised traders, and asked what additional companies were being targeted. The US promised to respond with clarifications.

### **Potential path forward**

One source said that Sperisen-Yurt could proceed on the basis of one of two suggestions for the group's next meeting. The first would be to hold consultations with Members on various trade facilitation related issues. The second would have the sponsors of various proposals iron out differences in discussions with other Members – but not the chair – and then report on the outcomes. Members would decide on which to opt for in the coming days, the source added. Another delegate noted that it would be useful to either process for the WTO Secretariat to categorise the different proposals on the basis of how much – or little – consensus they enjoy.

ICTSD reporting.

---

## **SVEs AND ACP GROUP WEIGH IN ON FISH SUBSIDIES DEBATE**

Different blocs of WTO Members have moved to protect their interests in the Doha Round fisheries subsidies negotiations, circulating separate communications around an early-June deadline for submitting proposals for discussion at a meeting of the Negotiating Group on Rules later this week.

The group of African, Caribbean, and Pacific (ACP) states sought to ensure that access fees - payments in

return for rights to fish in a country's territorial waters - remained shielded from new subsidy disciplines. Such fees make up an important part of government revenue in several ACP countries. Meanwhile, eleven small and vulnerable economies (SVEs) tabled a joint proposal on special and differential treatment for developing countries in a future set of WTO rules on fisheries subsidies.

### **ACP encourages dialogue on access fees**

The ACP proposal, dated 1 June, called for all transactions related to fisheries access fees to be exempt from new disciplines on fisheries subsidies. The issue of access fees has featured prominently in fisheries discussions. While the ACP has made similar demands in statements on access fees, the recent communication aimed to crystallise their view into a formal written document to encourage further dialogue.

Access fees are payments made by distant-water fishing nations (DWFN) in exchange for the right of entry to smaller coastal states' exclusive economic zones. These arrangements are bilateral, contractual agreements, often between developed countries and coastal developing nations that lack the capacity to capitalise on their fisheries resources. For coastal nations, these payments are critical sources of income; they are estimated to constitute more than a quarter of total government revenue of Pacific island countries.

Fisheries access agreements are either government-to-government or government-to-industry. In the latter, the remote governments transfer their access rights to a private fishing fleet, often for less than the full amount of access fees paid to the coastal nation. This is where the current debate lies. While government-to-government fees are generally not considered subsidies and are thus exempt from any new disciplines, there is no consensus on whether government-to-industry fees should be similarly protected.

The US, Brazil, and Argentina all consider government-to-industry payments to be subsidies, based on the discrepancy between the fees paid to the coastal nation and the price paid by the private enterprises for the acquisition of fishing rights. Because this is not a 'fair trade price', in the words of Argentina's proposal, it can thus be considered a subsidy.

In contrast, the ACP proposal argued for all transactions related to access fees paid by DWFNs to be exempt from any new disciplines. They are concerned that a classification of government-to-industry payments as subsidies would lead to decreases in government revenue.

**SVE group calls for S&DT for developing countries**

The 11 SVEs, which included Nicaragua, Barbados, Cuba, Fiji, and the Solomon Islands, urged Members to insert flexibilities, technical assistance, and capacity building in any fisheries subsidies rules. They argued that this would boost opportunities for growth in the fisheries sector in developing countries, as well as safeguard the crucial revenue-generating function that the industry currently fulfils.

In the paper, the SVEs outlined principles to guide the creation of special and differential treatment (S&DT) provisions. They pointed to the sector's socio-economic importance to poorer nations, where it aids employment, livelihood security, income, and nutrition, and said that this could be compromised without carefully crafted disciplines.

The group of SVEs appealed to developed countries to go beyond simply providing developing countries with longer periods for implementing new commitments, and to "instead support the development of the fisheries sector in small, vulnerable economies." Pointing to the Doha and Hong Kong Ministerial Declarations, the group asserted that developed nations had been mandated to provide tangible support to developing countries, SVEs, and LDCs in ways that will directly help increase productivity and trading potential.

The text noted that developing countries have a limited capacity to implement effective management structures and carry out research and analysis. It argued, therefore, that making S&DT conditional on management capacity would penalise them, especially SVEs and least-developed countries. Therefore, any such connections in new fisheries subsidies disciplines should require developed countries and international organisations to provide developing nations with technical and financial assistance to strengthen their capacity to meet such standards.

Another element of future disciplines addressed in the paper is the definition of artisanal and small scale fisheries. The SVEs proposed that both be well defined based on their different economic roles, and recommended that any definitions take into consideration the sectors' economic impact.

The SVEs paid heed to the environmental concerns behind recent proposals from the US and Brazil calling for wide-ranging prohibitions on subsidies in order to halt overfishing. However, they argue that "small, vulnerable economies, LDCs, and some other developing countries have had such a minimum [sic] impact on over fishing and overcapacity that the proposed restrictions on these countries would be unduly punitive."

Delegates are studying both papers, but say that they would prefer to comment only after the next meeting of the rules group, which is scheduled for 14-15 June.

ICTSD reporting.

---

**IN BRIEF**

---

---

**WIPO DEVELOPMENT AGENDA  
COMMITTEE GETS TO GRIPS WITH  
TRICKY ISSUES**

---

A World Intellectual Property Organization committee charged with examining over 100 proposals to entrench development concerns throughout the global body's functions kicked off a week-long meeting on 11 June. The fourth session of the Provisional Committee on Proposals Related to a WIPO Development Agenda (PCDA) has the task of agreeing recommendations that can be forwarded to the WIPO General Assembly in September.

The negotiations spring from demands first made in autumn 2004 by a group of countries dubbed the 'Friends of Development' (see BRIDGES Weekly, 6 October 2004 <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-10-06/story1.htm>).

The February session of the PCDA successfully culled a group of 40 proposals that had been deemed easier to resolve into a subset of 24 recommendations to the September General Assembly. This fourth session will look at the 71 substantively trickier proposals, which have been compiled in 'Annex B' of the document containing all of the submissions. The Annex B proposals have been classified into five thematic clusters: technical assistance; norm setting, flexibilities, public policy and public domain; technology transfer, information technology and access to knowledge; evaluation; and institutional matters including mandate and governance.

PCDA Chair Ambassador Trevor Clarke (Barbados) proceeded by assigning a cluster to each regional group coordinator. They produced draft texts to be taken to intensive small-group consultations to bridge differences on the proposals and arrive at concrete recommendations, which were then to be reported back to plenary. A similar 'green room' approach was credited with facilitating the breakthrough on the earlier set of proposals in February (see BRIDGES Weekly, 28 February 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/07-02->

28/story1.htm). However, midway through the week, discussions had not advanced past the second of the five clusters, with agreement proving difficult.

Pakistani delegate Ali Asad Gillani said that the slower progress was predictable, since the technical assistance and norm-setting issues the first two clusters dealt with were substantively tougher than the rest. Though concerned with the pace of progress, he said that the "flexibility and compromise" shown by developing and developed members alike boded well for the conclusion of the PCDA process.

Prior to this session, the Friends of Development group consolidated the 71 Annex B proposals into 25, distributing them in a 'non-paper' to WIPO members. The Group B of developed countries hosted a preparatory meeting in Singapore last week.

ICTSD reporting.

---

## WTO IN BRIEF

---

---

### CANADA REQUESTS PANEL IN US FARM SUBSIDY DISPUTE

---

Canada on 8 June requested the creation of a WTO dispute panel to examine its claim that the US government has in recent years paid out farm subsidies in excess of its legal spending limits.

Ottawa initiated the case in January, requesting consultations with the US on the issue (see BRIDGES Weekly, 17 January 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/07-01-17/story2.htm>). It now says that the consultations have failed to resolve the disagreement.

At issue are US subsidies to support a range of crops, principally corn, wheat, soybeans, pulses, and sugar. Canada claims that in 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2004, and 2005, Washington provided trade-distorting 'amber box' support to farmers that exceeded its binding WTO limit of USD 19.1 billion annually. Furthermore, it claims that some export credit guarantees provided by the US government have the effect of illegally subsidising the export of products including corn and soybean.

Notably, Ottawa refrained from asking the panel to determine whether billions of dollars in US subsidies to the corn industry had distorted world prices and helped them undercut farmers in Canada – although it reserved the right to do so in the future. In its original

complaint, Canada had claimed that US corn subsidies had caused 'serious prejudice' to the interest of Canadian producers, in violation of the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures.

Canadian officials acknowledge that their case aims to reinforce pressure on Washington to cut trade-distorting farm subsidies, both as part of the Doha Round negotiations and as Congress writes new legislation this year mapping out future agricultural spending. "The drafting of the next farm bill over the coming weeks and months is an opportunity for the US to ensure that its subsidy programmes comply with its WTO obligations," said Canadian Agriculture Minister Chuck Strahl.

US officials expressed disappointment with Canada's decision to pursue a panel. "The United States is in full compliance with our WTO commitments," said Gretchen Hamel, a spokesperson for the US trade representative's office. "Canada's claims are without foundation and, if a panel is established, we will demonstrate this."

Canada's case closely mirrors Brazil's successful WTO suit against US support for cotton growers in 2005.

The US will be able to block Canada's request for a panel once, but WTO rules prevent it from doing so a second time.

ICTSD reporting.

---

### WTO REPORTS SLIGHT INCREASE IN ANTI-DUMPING INVESTIGATIONS

---

The number of anti-dumping investigations initiated by WTO Members increased slightly during the second half of 2006, with China retaining its position as the leading target of new inquiries, according to new data released by the WTO on 11 June.

The anti-dumping probes investigate claims that companies based in the targeted country are selling their goods in foreign markets at prices lower than what they charge at home. A total of 103 investigations were launched in the second half of last year, up from 96 for the same period in 2005.

While the WTO does not forbid such practices, it allows Members to impose anti-dumping measures – which usually take the form of an extra import duty – if they can prove that the product is being 'dumped'. Moreover, the importing nation must prove that the dumping practice is causing 'material injury' to its domestic producers.



China was the subject of 36 investigations between July and December 2006, up from 33 during the same period the year before. Indonesia, the subject of seven, was the second-most targeted country, followed by Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Brazil.

The EU, which launched 17 new investigations, initiated the greatest number of new probes, followed by India, Argentina, Brazil, Malaysia, and China.

Just over a quarter of the new investigations were initiated by developed countries, a slight increase from the second half of 2005.

Products from the chemicals sector were the most frequent target, followed by pulp and paper products and base metals.

Anti-dumping measures have been the subject of controversy in the past, as some countries, led by Brazil, Hong Kong, and Korea, have argued that the policies are used to justify protectionist import duties that inhibit healthy competition (see BRIDGES Weekly, 16 February 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/05-02-16/WTOinbrief.htm>).

ICTSD reporting; "WTO Secretariat reports increase in new anti-dumping investigations, and continued decline in new final anti-dumping measures," WTO PRESS RELEASE, 11 June 2007; "Asia faces most anti-dumping probes: WTO," THE PENINSULA ONLINE, 12 June 2007; "WTO: Anti-dumping investigations rise in final half of 2006," INDUSTRY WEEK, 12 June 2007.

## EVENTS & RESOURCES

### 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).

#### Coming Up: 14-20 June

3-15 June, The Hague, Netherlands. FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO CITES. Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) will consider 40 new proposals for rules changes regarding the protection of specific species. Participants will also discuss enforcement of CITES regulations, the control of illicit trafficking, and the

effects of CITES rules on the rural poor. The meeting's agenda also includes the establishment of a new strategic vision for 2008 to 2013. For more information, email [cites@unep.ch](mailto:cites@unep.ch). internet: <http://www.cites.org/eng/cop/index.shtml>

11-14 June, Riksgården, Sweden: SWEDISH "MIDNIGHT SUN" DIALOGUE ON CLIMATE CHANGE. Swedish Environment Ministers Andreas Carlgren has invited some thirty of his counterparts from elsewhere in the world to an informal ministerial conference in Riksgården. The purpose of the meeting is to engage informally in discussions and dialogue on how a future climate regime should be designed. internet: <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/8757>

11-15 June, Geneva, Switzerland: PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE ON PROPOSALS RELATED TO A WIPO DEVELOPMENT AGENDA, FOURTH SESSION. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) will discuss the Development Agenda, a draft Report of the Fourth Session of the PCDA, and the draft PCDA Report to the General Assembly. internet: [http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting\\_id=11927](http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=11927)

14-15 June, Mexico City, Mexico: GLOBAL AGRI-FOOD FORUM 2007: BIOECONOMY- FAD, MYTH OR REALITY? Speakers at this forum will discuss what bioeconomy means and how it will impact the future of agriculture, the development of biofuels, the factors driving and limiting the bioeconomy, and developing countries and their role in the bioeconomy. This dialogue is organized by the National Agricultural Council. internet: <http://www.cna.org.mx/events.htm>

15 June, London, UK. IMPACT OF EXTRATERRITORIAL REGULATION ON THE CROSS-BORDER FINANCIAL MARKETS. This event will focus on attempts being made on both sides of the Atlantic to resolve the current challenge of regulation. It will examine specific issues such as Sarbanes-Oxley, the impact of the evolving consolidation within the financial markets and the convergence of reporting standards. The conference, hosted by Chatham House, will bring together influential policymakers, business leaders and legal professionals to discuss the approaches being taken by the respective governments and the future outlook for cross-border investment. internet: <http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/index.php?id=5&cid=114>.

19 June, Geneva, Switzerland: BIOFUELS: TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS OF PRESENT AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES. The technologies used to produce first-generation biofuels are well known and quite simple, but the need to increase biofuel



production to meet growing demand, maximize feedstock use, and reduce pressure on land is triggering a shift towards new and more sophisticated technologies. This expert meeting, hosted by the UN Conference on Trade and Development, will discuss the risks and opportunities, especially for developing countries, implicit in this technological revolution and the likely impact of the new technology on trade and development and on the competitiveness of developing countries in the biofuels sector. For further information, please contact [lalen.ileander@unctad.org](mailto:lalen.ileander@unctad.org).

19-20 June, Praia, Cape Verde: REGIONAL DIALOGUE ON TRADE, FISHERIES NEGOTIATIONS UNDER WTO/EPA AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN WEST AFRICA. The objectives of this dialogue are to build awareness on issues arising in the context of WTO/EPA negotiations on fisheries, facilitate

dialogue between national and regional stakeholders, and to formulate recommendations for advancing sustainable development objectives in West African countries during WTO/EPA negotiations. This dialogue is being organized by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), in partnership with Enda Tiers Monde, Cape Verde Ministry of Fishery, the National Institute for the Development of Fisheries, and Cape Verde and Réseau sur les Politiques des Pêches en Afrique de l'Ouest (REPAO). internet: <http://www.ictsd.org/dlogue/index.htm>

### WTO Events

An updated list of forthcoming WTO meetings is posted at: [http://www.wto.org/meets\\_public/meets\\_e.pdf](http://www.wto.org/meets_public/meets_e.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.

19 June: COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT – SECOND SESSION ON AID FOR TRADE

20 June: DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BODY

### Other Upcoming Events

25-26 June, London, UK. CLIMATE CHANGE: POLITICS VERSUS ECONOMICS. Climate change is global, both in cause and consequence, and the response requires international action. Yet environmentalists, scientists, economists, foreign policy

and security experts and investors all speak different languages and have different understandings of how best to tackle the issue. The aim of this conference, hosted by Chatham House, is to bring together well-respected representatives from each of these fields to discuss the connections and to debate whether it is international politics or economics or a mixture of both that will deliver a measurable progress in the global response to climate change. For information on the conference contact [conferences@chathamhouse.org.uk](mailto:conferences@chathamhouse.org.uk).

25-26 June, Macau, China: 8th IEEM INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SEMINAR ON INTERNATIONAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW AND PHARMACEUTICALS. This seminar, hosted by the Institute of European Studies of Macau (IEEM), will feature lectures on the pharmaceutical industry in Asia, antitrust laws, and the effects of medicinal patents on public health in developing countries. For more information contact Beatrice Lam at [beatrice@ieem.org.mo](mailto:beatrice@ieem.org.mo). internet: <http://www.ieem.org.mo/courses/ipl/index.html>.

25-27 June, Stanford, California. INTERNATIONAL ENERGY WORKSHOP (IEW). IEW is a network of global energy experts that meet annually to discuss a wide range of topics, with particular emphasis on global as well as regional energy issues. The annual IEW meetings focus on energy assessments and try to understand the reasons for diverging views of development in the energy sector. For more information contact John Weyant at [weyant@leland.stanford.edu](mailto:weyant@leland.stanford.edu). internet: [http://www.internationalenergyworkshop.org/Workshop\\_2007.html](http://www.internationalenergyworkshop.org/Workshop_2007.html)

6-29 July, Ravello, Italy: 11th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGIES: NEW FRONTIERS AND PRODUCTS - ECONOMICS, POLICIES AND SCIENCE. Topics that will be discussed at this conference include; the impact of agricultural biotechnology on international trade; biofuels; public acceptance; biotechnology and developing countries; and regulation of biotechnology. This conference is being organized by the International Consortium on Agricultural Biotechnology Research (ICABR), Catholic University of Leuven, CEIS- University of Rome "Tor Vergata," Rutgers University, and the Economic Growth Center, Yale University. internet: <http://www.economia.uniroma2.it/conferenze/icabr2007/>

---

## RESOURCES

2007 WORLD ECONOMIC SITUATION AND PROSPECTS (MID-YEAR UPDATE). By the UN

Department of Economic and Social Affairs, June 2007. This mid-year update emphasizes that the world economy is still strongly tied to US fortunes and, for current world economic growth rates to continue, it is crucial to keep the US dollar from falling rapidly while also avoiding a recession. It also highlights the importance of improving the employment effects of positive growth in order to meet the Millennium Development Goals. The update is available at <http://www.un.org/esa/policy/wess/wesp.html>.

**FINANCIAL SERVICES AND TRADE AGREEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: AN OVERVIEW.** By Constantinos Stephanou and Marilynne Pereira Goncalves. World Bank, May 2007. The authors of this working paper review the international framework governing trade in financial services, describe the treatment of financial services in recent trade agreements involving Latin America and Caribbean countries, and analyze the liberalization commitments made in three selected country case studies: Chile, Colombia, and Costa Rica. The authors discuss some of the causes and potential implications of their findings. The paper is available at [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSCContentServer/WDSP/IB/2007/03/27/000016406\\_20070327092005/Rendered/INDEX/wps4181.txt](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSCContentServer/WDSP/IB/2007/03/27/000016406_20070327092005/Rendered/INDEX/wps4181.txt).

**EVALUATING THE TRADE EFFECT OF DEVELOPING REGIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS: A SEMI-PARAMETRIC APPROACH.** By Souleymane Coulibaly. World Bank, May 2007. Many recent papers have pointed to ambiguous trade effects of developing regional trade agreements (RTAs) and have called for a reassessment of their economic merits. The author of this working paper focuses on seven such agreements currently in force in Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, and Latin America estimating their impacts on their members' trade flows. The results of this analysis indicate that, with one exception, these RTAs had a positive impact on their members' intra-trade during the period of study. The paper is available at [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSCContentServer/WDSP/IB/2007/04/23/000016406\\_20070423162325/Rendered/PDF/wps4220.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSCContentServer/WDSP/IB/2007/04/23/000016406_20070423162325/Rendered/PDF/wps4220.pdf).

**PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT THROUGH TRADE.** By the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development and the Global Mechanism, 2007. This paper is the result of research and discussions held during an exploratory dialogue on ways to increase investment in sustainable land management (SLM) through market access and trade. The paper identifies linkages between trade policies and rules, SLM, and livelihoods in arid areas; examines the potential for alternative livelihoods to enhance sustainable use of land and natural resources; and reviews relevant policy instruments, mechanisms and

tools for enhancing SLM through trade. The paper is available at [http://www.global-mechanism.org/dynamic/documents/document\\_file/trade\\_livelihoods\\_and\\_slm\\_paper.pdf](http://www.global-mechanism.org/dynamic/documents/document_file/trade_livelihoods_and_slm_paper.pdf)

**TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER ISSUES IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOODS AND SERVICES.** By Lynn Mytelka. United Nations University-Maastricht Economic and Social Research and Training Centre on Innovation and Technology, 2007. This paper seeks to develop a broad conceptualization of the technology transfer process and open the discussion on the need for a multi-goal approach to Environment Goods and Services (EGS) negotiations in the WTO. It argues that a broader perspective must be adopted, with longer-term goals and processes and a more integrated approach to EGS negotiations with the WTO. The author maintains that such a reframing would reshape North-South negotiations on EGS to include commitments, activities, and partnerships that encourage learning and innovation in the South and address the global importance of sustainable development. The paper is available at [http://www.ictsd.org/pubs/ictsd\\_series/env/2007-04-L.Mytelka.pdf](http://www.ictsd.org/pubs/ictsd_series/env/2007-04-L.Mytelka.pdf).

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

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

Contributors to this issue of *BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest* are Trineesh Biswas, Margaret Chon, Jonathan Hepburn, Paige McClanahan, Mahesh Sugathan, Nico Tyabji, and Caitlin Zaino. Editor: Trineesh Biswas. Assistant Editor: Paige McClanahan. Director: Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz. 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 through the generous support of the Government of the United Kingdom (DFID) and ICTSD's core donors including the Governments of Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden; Christian Aid (UK) and NOVIB (NL). *BRIDGES Weekly* also benefits from support for the BRIDGES series of publications from donors including the Rockefeller Foundation and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. ISSN 1563-003X

