



INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR
TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT

Bridges

Weekly Trade News Digest

7 December 2007

Volume 11 Number 42

LEAD STORIES

WTO NEGOTIATORS LOOK TO 2008, THOUGH DOHA
DEAL PROSPECTS REMAIN SLIM 1
UN CLIMATE SUMMIT IN BALI UNDERWAY; SEVERAL
TRADE MINISTERS TO ATTEND 3
DRAFT RULES TEXT WOULD BAN WIDE RANGE OF
FISHERIES SUBSIDIES 5

AG CHAIR PRESENTS NEW PROPOSALS ON
DEVELOPING COUNTRIES' 'SPECIAL PRODUCTS' 7

OTHER STORIES

EU, US CALL FOR ELIMINATING TRADE BARRIERS
TO CLIMATE-FRIENDLY GOODS AND SERVICES 8
LINKS BETWEEN PATENT RULES AND ACCESS TO
GREEN TECHNOLOGY COME UNDER SCRUTINY 10
COUNTRIES STEP UP DEMANDS ON GI EXTENSION,
DISCLOSURE 11

IN BRIEF

FIJI, PAPUA NEW GUINEA BECOME FIRST PACIFIC
COUNTRIES TO SIGN EPA WITH BRUSSELS 12

WTO IN BRIEF

WTO APPELLATE BODY AGREES WITH EU,
REINFORCES RULING AGAINST BRAZIL TYRE
IMPORT BAN 13

EVENTS & RESOURCES

EVENTS 13
RESOURCES 14

LEAD STORIES

WTO NEGOTIATORS LOOK TO 2008, THOUGH DOHA DEAL PROSPECTS REMAIN SLIM

Until recently, trade officials from many governments were warning that the Doha Round trade talks would die or go into indefinite hibernation without a breakthrough agreement on cutting tariffs and subsidies by the end of the year. The troubled WTO negotiations now look set to remain alive, if not quite kicking, into 2008, despite the unusually early start to the US election campaign.

Nevertheless, it remains far from clear whether Members will be able to bridge differences that have divided them for years in order to strike an accord. Even if they succeed, support in Washington for ratifying a multilateral trade deal is uncertain at best.

New draft framework deals from the chairs of the WTO negotiating committees on agriculture and industrial goods trade are expected "somewhere around the end of January," Director-General Pascal Lamy confirmed to ambassadors at an informal meeting of the Trade Negotiations Committee (TNC) on 30 November. These draft negotiating texts, intended to serve as the basis for final-stage negotiations, had initially been expected by early December.

The WTO chief explained that the delay was positive, a result of progress in the agriculture talks. The more issues that Members can agree on now, the fewer will be left up to the chairs' conjecture, or for ministers to decide.

Lamy: conclusion in 2008 possible

A deal on 'modalities' for agriculture and non-agricultural market access (NAMA) would be possible "about a month" after the texts are released, following a "horizontal process" of cross-sectoral tradeoffs possibly involving trade ministers, Lamy said. These formulae and figures for tariff and subsidy cuts would be the "gateway to concluding the round." "If we agree on

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, or by telephone at: (41-22) 917-8498

modalities early next year, I believe we could be able to conclude the round before 2008,” he added.

Lamy cautioned however against focusing on agriculture and NAMA alone, reminding delegations that the ‘single undertaking’ – the notion that nothing is agreed until all issues are – would require them to lay the groundwork for agreement in areas such as services and rules as well.

He said that “setting short-term deadlines would not be helpful” to the current text-based negotiations process, which he said would be driven by “substance.”

Deadlines, though once thought necessary to keep negotiations from drifting, have had an unhappy history in the Doha Round. Since the multilateral trade talks were launched in late 2001 – with a scheduled end-date of 1 January 2005 – far more deadlines have been missed than kept. In fact, every year since 2004 has concluded with Members setting their sights on finishing the round by the end of the following year (see BRIDGES Weekly, 22 December 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-12-22/index.htm>).

At last week’s meeting of the TNC, the body that oversees the Doha Round negotiations, delegations largely agreed that the negotiation process should be driven by substantive progress rather than a specific timeline. For instance, Uganda stressed that realising the developmental aspects of the Doha agenda was important, while “artificial deadlines were not.”

The absence of new deadlines notwithstanding, according to sources the EU delegation said that Members need a breakthrough across the board in February. The delegation stressed that it would not be able to accept potential terms for an agreement on agriculture and industrial goods without knowing the likely outcome in other areas of the talks. The EU was not alone in mentioning other areas of the talks. The US, for example, called for countries to involve senior officials, including capital-based ones, in these other negotiating areas, prompting Jamaica to point out that many in the Africa, Caribbean and Pacific group of countries simply lacked the capacity to do so. India pointed to the importance of services, and to a proposed amendment to WTO intellectual property rules that would require patent applicants to disclose the origin of genetic resources or traditional knowledge used in an invention. These comments appeared to sit uneasily with interventions by Bolivia and Argentina stressing the primacy of agriculture.

Ag progresses, NAMA pace glacial

The agriculture talks have in recent weeks made progress on preventing policies for food aid and export

credits from effectively subsidising the exportation of farm products. Negotiations Chair Ambassador Crawford Falconer (New Zealand) last week turned his attention to more controversial issues, notably the ‘flexibilities’ that developing countries will be allowed to use to shield some products from tariff cuts. For instance, he suggested that developing countries could, for food and livelihood security and rural development reasons, be allowed to designate between 12 and 15 percent of their agricultural tariff lines as ‘special’. Roughly two thirds of these would have to be cut by a certain minimum percentage, say 15 percent, in order to collectively meet an average reduction target, also subject to negotiation. The remaining 3 or 4 percent of products would be eligible for lower reductions; some, none at all.

Falconer announced earlier this week that he would continue consultations with Members until 7 December, and then resume discussions in early January. There are “quite a lot of things we’re moving on,” he told reporters after a meeting at WTO headquarters.

While agriculture negotiators have been able to answer some of the many questions that remained open in the draft agreement text that Falconer circulated to Members in July, the industrial goods talks have made little progress since September.

In part this is because there were many fewer issues left to resolve: the much simpler terms of the NAMA negotiations meant that the draft text Chair Ambassador Don Stephenson (Canada) issued in July more or less revealed how Members stood to be affected. And some, such as Argentina, Brazil, India, China, and South Africa, were not happy with what they saw. They argued that the liberalisation the text would demand of them was disproportionately deeper than the industrial tariff cuts it required of rich countries, and indeed compared to the farm reforms on offer in Falconer’s text.

Lamy acknowledged the demands for ‘balance’ between the agriculture and NAMA negotiations, telling the TNC that “there are also some subjects [in the NAMA talks] where the final decision will depend on the overall package and the balance contained therein.” He said that the text-based process was nonetheless “on the right track.” The structure of the mathematical formulae used to calculate countries’ future tariff levels was now “more or less stable,” even if the numbers to be plugged into these formulae remained undetermined.

Rules leads other issues

The negotiations on WTO rules – primarily on governing fisheries subsidies, the use of anti-dumping

duties, and industrial subsidies – received a boost soon after the TNC meeting on 30 November, when committee Chair Ambassador Guillermo Valles Games (Uruguay) circulated a comprehensive draft text for further talks. The text proposes banning a range of payments that boost fisheries capacity, with various exemptions, especially for poor nations. It also attempts to split the differences between the US and a group of countries that want to see tighter rules placed on the use of anti-dumping duties. Valles Games stressed that the text was nothing more than “the first step in a new phase involving further intensive discussions,” asking Members for their views on whether it contained elements of what might go into an eventual agreement.

As for the services negotiations, Chair Ambassador Fernando de Mateo is consulting with Members on what might go into a possible text whose purpose would be to guide the negotiations. Lamy said that this could potentially “be produced in a first draft form at the same time as revised texts on agriculture and NAMA modalities.”

US political climate raises questions

Even a modalities breakthrough would not necessarily clear the path for a Doha Round agreement. US Ambassador Peter Allgeier told the TNC last week that the immediate priority for WTO Members is to establish modalities on agriculture and NAMA in order to enable them to start scheduling liberalisation commitments. Negotiators expect that this process, which would involve countries haggling over which products to shelter from tariff cuts, would take nine months at the very least.

Furthermore, sealing a Doha Round agreement would require the US presidential administration to secure a ‘trade promotion authority’ mandate allowing it to put trade deals to Congress for a yes-or-no vote without the possibility of amendments. US trading partners want this in order to be sure that lawmakers in Washington will not pick apart already-finalised agreements. The beleaguered George W. Bush administration’s chances of winning TPA from an unfriendly Democratic Congress are slim, though some believe a Doha-specific mandate may be possible if a modalities deal is reached early enough in the year.

The political climate surrounding the WTO negotiations may not become any more friendly even after the elections in November. Hillary Clinton told the Financial Times this week that if elected US president, she would take “a hard look” at the Doha Round before deciding whether to pursue it. “I am concerned by provisions that would prevent countries from enforcing stronger environmental and safety rules under the WTO,” she

said. “I think we have to take a hard look at this [the Doha Round] and do it in the right way.”

The New York senator and frontrunner for the Democratic presidential nomination has called for a “time out” on all trade deals as well as a review of past accords, including the North American Free Trade Agreement that her husband Bill Clinton pushed through as president in 1993. “I want to have a more comprehensive and thoughtful trade policy for the 21st century,” she told the Financial Times. “There is nothing protectionist about this. It is a responsible course. The alternative is simply to pick up where President Bush left off and that is not an option.”

Although leading Republican presidential candidates have not been openly critical of trade agreements, supporters of that party are also growing increasingly sceptical of the value of open trade. According to polling data published in the Wall Street Journal in October, six out of ten Republicans believed that free trade had been bad for the US, and said they would support a Republican candidate who favoured tougher limits on foreign imports.

ICTSD reporting; “Clinton doubts benefits of Doha revival,” FINANCIAL TIMES, 3 December 2007; Republicans Grow Skeptical On Free Trade,” WALL STREET JOURNAL, 4 October 2007.

UN CLIMATE SUMMIT IN BALI UNDERWAY; SEVERAL TRADE MINISTERS TO ATTEND

Government officials from around the world are meeting at a United Nations conference in Bali to develop a blueprint for starting negotiations on a new treaty to protect the global climate from greenhouse gas emissions.

Winning the support of all major players -- particularly the largest emitters of carbon dioxide -- will be crucial to a successful outcome.

For the first time, trade ministers from several countries will attend the summit. They will meet with each other at a separate event hosted by the Indonesian government, with the task of looking creatively at what the trade regime can do to support efforts to mitigate emissions, and to consider the extent to which trade measures could be justified to promote climate change goals.

Bali meeting to agree a roadmap for negotiations

Thousands of policymakers are meeting under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

from 3-14 December. They are not seeking to flesh out a detailed global plan for dealing with climate change, but simply to create a roadmap for how to get to that plan.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the Nobel-prize winning UN scientific body that has detailed how humans affect climate change and the environment, noted in its latest report last month that the "warming of the climate system is unequivocal." The report warns that "concentrations of carbon dioxide, the main greenhouse gas, far exceed the natural range over the last 650,000 years." Under a business as usual scenario, global temperatures are set to rise sharply, hitting the poor and vulnerable disproportionately. This would also threaten the survival of unique ecosystems around the poles and at high altitudes, and increase the intensity and frequency of extreme weather events.

The IPCC report, which synthesises past research and analysis, stresses the need for rapid action: emissions of greenhouse gases would have to peak by 2015 to limit global temperature rises to 2.0 to 2.4 Celsius over pre-industrial times, a strict goal that the EU has adopted in order to avoid "dangerous" climate change.

Also in November, the UN Development Programme (UNDP) warned that "climate change threatens unprecedented human development reversals." The organisation's annual Human Development Report, which focused this year on climate change, detailed the enormous and costly adaptation needs for dealing with rising sea levels, floods, droughts, and storms. "Ultimately, climate change is a threat to humanity as a whole," commented UNDP Administrator Kemal Dervis. "But it is the poor, a constituency with no responsibility for the ecological debt we are running up, who face the immediate and most severe human costs."

The report called for developed countries to cut greenhouse gas emissions to 30 percent below 1990 levels by 2020, with further reductions to at least 80 percent below those levels by 2050. It suggests that developing countries should, by 2050, cut emissions by 20 percent from 1990 levels.

Country positions

Currently, governments have taken different approaches to dealing with climate change. Most have signed on to the Kyoto Protocol, which requires emissions cuts only of industrialised nations, in accordance with the principle of 'common but differentiated responsibilities'. The newly-elected Labour government in Australia this week made ratifying the Kyoto Protocol its first official act, leaving the US as the only industrialised country that has not ratified the treaty.

For a future climate deal to be meaningful, the US will need to be back in the process. Also crucial will be key emerging economies – above all China and India – which are becoming major sources of greenhouse gases, even though their per capita emissions remain a small fraction of those in the industrialised world.

Amidst calls for them to take on at least some form of emissions target, China, India and Brazil have stressed that developed countries must lead the way. "China will play its due role and take its due part in the process of emission reduction, but we will absolutely not take on the commitment of taking on the same responsibilities and making the same commitments as the developed countries," Xie Zhenhua, who will head the Chinese delegation to Bali, told reporters.

The Bali summit is set to launch a climate change adaptation fund to help the poorest countries, which ironically are also the most vulnerable to the effects of climate change, despite having done nothing to create the problem.

Trade ministers to meet

In parallel with the UNFCCC meetings, Indonesia, the host country, has called for a meeting of trade ministers from selected countries to think creatively about how they might help forge an effective climate deal. Although some are reluctant to link the highly complex processes to each other -- especially given the lack of momentum in the ongoing WTO negotiations -- the trade realm does contain some potential carrots and sticks for the climate talks.

Energy efficient goods, renewable energy technologies, biofuels and technologies such as carbon capture and storage need to be available in vastly increased quantities worldwide. The Doha Round negotiations on liberalising trade in environmental goods and services may potentially offer one avenue to encourage the spread of green technology (see related article, this issue).

Meanwhile, some have suggested that relaxing global intellectual property protections might help make climate friendly technologies more affordable in developing countries -- also something that potentially could be discussed within the trade system (see related article, this issue).

As developed countries prepare to implement tough emissions reduction commitments, which will affect domestic energy prices and potentially trade competitiveness, some government leaders, particularly in Europe, have raised the notion of tariff adjustments on imports from countries that do not sign on to climate measures. This would, they claim, both level the playing

field for their goods and encourage countries to join global efforts to mitigate climate change.

US Trade Representative Susan Schwab is going to Bali, as are her counterparts from Argentina, Brazil, China, France, India, South Africa, and the UK. David O'Sullivan, the European Commission's top trade bureaucrat, is also slated to go. Sources say that WTO Director-General Pascal Lamy, too, will attend the discussion.

The IPCC Fourth Assessment Synthesis Report Summary for Policymakers is available at http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4_syr_spm.pdf

The UNDP Human Development Report 2007/2008 is available at <http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2007-2008/>

For more information, please see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 30 November 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/07-11-30/story1.htm>.

ICTSD reporting; "UN Panel Lays Out Risks, Solutions to Warming," REUTERS, 28 November 2007; "Rich Nations Should Do More on Climate Change - China," REUTERS, 28 November 2007; "Climate Change Traps World's Poorest," ENS, 27 November 2007; "Ahead of climate meeting, China says developed world bears emission reduction burden," AP, 29 November 2007.

DRAFT RULES TEXT WOULD BAN WIDE RANGE OF FISHERIES SUBSIDIES

A new potential basis for negotiating future WTO rules on subsidy spending would ban a wide range of government payments to the fisheries sector that conservationists blame for promoting the wide-scale depletion of marine fish stocks.

The chair of the Doha Round negotiations on rules, Ambassador Guillermo Valles Games (Uruguay), circulated a draft consolidated text to Members on 30 November. The draft text was phrased in the form of potential future articles of WTO rules governing issues such as anti-dumping and countervailing measures, in addition to fisheries subsidies.

Until now, negotiators in the struggling multilateral talks had been considering comparable texts outlining potential parameters of an entire agreement only in the areas of agriculture and industrial goods. With revised texts on the latter two now delayed until late January – and with them, the start of final-stage negotiations – Members are trying to make progress on other issues in

the round so they are positioned to reach an agreement in case they prove capable of bridging their differences in the major areas of contention (see BRIDGES Weekly, 21 November 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/07-11-21/story1.htm>).

Members are mandated to “clarify and improve WTO disciplines on fisheries subsidies, taking into account the importance of this sector to developing countries... with a view to enhancing the mutual supportiveness of trade and environment.” The fisheries subsidies talks have been described as offering the greatest potential environmental benefits of any issue in the round.

Valles Games' text would ban several types of fisheries subsidy payments, especially those that boost fishing capacity or create other incentives to fish. In doing so, it attempted to bridge the principal cleavage in the negotiations: between the numerous advocates of a 'top-down' blanket ban on fisheries subsidy payments (with negotiated exceptions), and countries that want a 'bottom-up' ban only on specific kinds of subsidies, most vocally Japan, Taiwan, and Korea.

Subsidies covering the construction, operating and fuel costs of fisheries vessels, for instance, are among those slated to be banned. Other support for the fishing industry -- such as for port infrastructure “exclusively or predominantly for activities related to marine wild capture” fishing, including storage and processing facilities -- is also prohibited in the text. The objective for barring certain subsidies is to curb overfishing, conserve global fisheries resources, and encourage fisheries management, as stated in the draft document.

Some subsidies would be permissible for all countries, provided that they maintain an international-standard fisheries management system. These include payments aimed at boosting fishing vessel safety without increasing fishing capacity, reducing the environmental impact of fishing, or re-training fisheries sector workers into unrelated occupations. Governments would also retain the ability to grant limited fishing access to certain individuals and groups, so long as this does not affect migratory fish stocks or other countries' “identifiable fishing interests.”

Marine conservation group Oceana welcomed the new text. “We are pleased to see that the chair's text on fisheries subsidies contains a strong prohibition on subsidies that increase overcapacity and overfishing,” said Courtney Sakai, campaign director with the organisation. “Furthermore, the text reflects the importance of sustainability and fisheries management criteria for any exceptions to the broad prohibition.”

Valles Games stressed that the draft WTO articles that he had put forward were merely a basis for negotiation.

"I do not request or invite participants to agree to anything in these draft texts at this point," he wrote in the introduction. "These texts are not the end of our negotiating process but only the first step in a new phase involving further intensive discussions within the group." However, he asked countries to consider the proposals "as whole," noting that the time had come "to accommodate others' concerns and interests."

Following the text's release, WTO Director-General Pascal Lamy commented that the drafts were "are ambitious and balanced in all three areas they cover and they will enable negotiators to work in a more intensive manner in the coming weeks."

Developing countries permitted exemptions

Special and differential treatment for developing countries has been yet another contentious issue in the discussions, with negotiators in recent months expressing befuddlement over how the chair would try to address the issue. Critics had argued that substantial flexibilities allowing developing countries to subsidise fisheries would prevent future disciplines from effectively curbing overfishing.

Under the S&DT rules set out in the much-anticipated text, least-developed countries (LDC) would be fully exempt from any disciplines prohibiting subsidies.

Non-LDC developing countries would be allowed to provide otherwise-banned subsidies, including those that boost capacity, to small-scale fisheries in territorial waters characterised by non-mechanised fishing, family- or association-based fishing operations, catches consumed largely by fishing families, and the absence of a "major employer-employee relationship." So long as functional fishery management systems that aim to conserve fish stocks are in place, developing countries would be able to subsidise port infrastructure, and provide income and price supports. These management schemes are supposed to follow practices described in various international agreements, such as UN accords on migratory fish stocks and a Food and Agriculture Organisation code of conduct on responsible fisheries. Construction subsidies would be allowed for harvesting verifiably sustainable levels of fish stocks within countries' exclusive economic zones.

These S&DT disciplines, which stress sustainability and comprehensive management, reflect ideas proposed by Brazil and Argentina in September.

Subsidies for harvesting "unequivocally overfished" stocks would be prohibited for all Members except least-developed countries (LDCs), although the text does not spell out how this evaluation would be made.

Some delegates have called this provision "vague and obscure."

'Access fees' -- the payments that a government offers another coastal nation in exchange for right to fish in that nation's waters -- have been a crucial issue for some developing countries, particularly small and vulnerable coastal states. The African, Caribbean, and Pacific (ACP) states have consistently advocated for access fees to be excluded from the scope of the disciplines, arguing that such payments are critical sources of government revenue.

In response to these concerns, Valles Games' text explicitly states that government-to-government fees are not deemed to be subsidies; they thus remain permissible. However, "subsidies arising from the further transfer" of already-purchased access rights to a third party in the host nation, such as private industry, are normally prohibited -- except when the host is a developing country, and the fishery is within that country's exclusive economic zone and operated in accordance with internationally-recognised best practices for fisheries management. The paper specifies that access rights must only be granted after scientific assessments of fish stocks, and that the access agreements themselves must be made public. As an additional transparency requirement, it calls for countries that purchase access rights to notify their purchase terms to the WTO.

Notably, the text calls on Member states that provide fisheries subsidies of any kind to adopt and implement domestic legislation and enforcement mechanisms for fisheries resource management based on recognised best practices. This includes stock assessments, vessel registries, and the allocation of fisheries rights, to name a few. Subsidies directed towards implementing fisheries management programmes are permitted for all countries.

Negotiations begin

A first discussion of the text is expected to take place from 12-14 December. Valles Games is likely to produce a revised version in a few months.

"Now the real negotiations begin," said Sakai "The question is, will the WTO seize or squander its opportunity to stop global overfishing? Reducing overfishing subsidies now is essential for abundant fisheries in the future."

The text is available online at http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/news07_e/rules_no_v07_e.doc

ICTSD reporting.

AG CHAIR PRESENTS NEW PROPOSALS ON DEVELOPING COUNTRIES' 'SPECIAL PRODUCTS'

The chair of the WTO agriculture negotiations has suggested a new set of potential parameters for the number and treatment of the 'special' farm products that developing countries will be able to slate for shallower tariff cuts based on food security, livelihood security and rural development grounds.

The issue has been controversial in the Doha Round talks, with exporters such as the US and some developing countries opposing demands from the G-33 bloc of developing countries that has championed the notion of special products. The former fear reduced export opportunities; the latter say that protecting small and vulnerable farmers from the potential negative impacts of trade liberalisation is vital for their development objectives.

Negotiators present at invitation-only meetings on 29-30 November told the chair, New Zealand Ambassador Crawford Falconer, that they wanted more time to consult with their capitals before responding to his suggestions.

Falconer was considering allowing developing countries to designate around 12-15 percent of their total agricultural tariff lines as 'special', negotiators said, an increase over the 5 to 8 percent he had suggested earlier in the year.

These special products would be divided into two tiers, to be treated differently, the chair suggested, sources say. The first tier would include between 8 or 10 percent and 12 percent of tariff lines. These would be required to undertake an average cut, perhaps somewhere around 20 percent, with each tariff line cut by a certain minimum percentage, say 15 percent, and by no more than a maximum, perhaps 25 or 30 percent. The exact figures could be negotiated, the chair said.

The second tier would include some 3 or 4 percent of tariff lines, and would be subject to a lesser cut, with some products eligible for no tariff reduction at all. Falconer concluded in November that at least some special products would have to be fully exempt from reduction if Members are to reach an agreement (see BRIDGES Weekly, 7 November 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/07-11-07/story1.htm>). The G-33 had previously called for a tenth of all products to be eligible for exemption.

The chair indicated that the total number of special products would in any case be greater than the number of 'sensitive' products that all countries, developed and

developing, would be allowed to shield from the standard tariff cut in exchange for expanded import quotas.

Members also discussed the possibility of allowing developing countries to transfer part of their sensitive product allotment to special products instead, an idea that the G-33 favoured, trade sources said. Instead of expanded tariff rate quotas, exporters could be provided some other concession, the source said.

Earlier in the meeting, Falconer had reiterated that small vulnerable economies could be allowed to undertake an average 24 percent tariff cut, with no minimum tariff cut for individual lines, along the lines he had suggested in his July draft text.

The chair has been reluctant to set out his ideas in writing, delegates report, preferring instead to discuss them verbally first. Negotiators who attended Falconer's informal 'room E' consultations with 36 representative delegations last week were familiar with the details of the proposals, but reported that they were only mentioned in passing at a 3 December 'transparency meeting' open to the full membership.

Special safeguard mechanism

Delegates also reported that Falconer "threw out some ideas" on the special safeguard mechanism, which developing countries would be able to use to raise tariffs beyond bound ceiling levels to protect farmers from import surges and price depressions. No products would be excluded a priori from the mechanism, the chair said, but the G-33 would have to provide some other concession to exporters. Limiting the number of products on which the safeguard could be invoked would be one such option, he suggested, perhaps to a 'single digit' number.

While the G-33 had previously proposed allowing the imposition of safeguard duties if import volumes exceed a 'threshold' of 105 percent of recent average import volumes, the chair suggested that this figure should be somewhere between 110 and 130 percent instead. Members would be more inclined to accept higher safeguard duties if the threshold for invoking them were higher, he said. He also suggested that Members consider using the average of the three preceding years to define average import levels, as proposed by the G-33.

Still controversial was the issue of whether safeguard duties would be allowed to take total tariff levels above the maximum permitted 'bound' tariffs to which WTO Members have currently committed. Some countries, such as China, are adamant that they should be allowed this flexibility. The Cairns Group of efficient

exporters has argued that this would constitute a 'step backwards'. The issue would probably have to be resolved at a level more senior than that of Geneva-based negotiators, sources suggested.

Looking ahead

The chair has indicated that further room E discussions on special products and the special safeguard mechanism are unlikely for the time being. Instead, he will reflect on what Members have told him, and take it into account either in a 'working document' on specific issues in the negotiations, or in a revised version of his July draft agreement text - now expected around late January 2008. Sensitive products and rules to ensure that 'green box' subsidies have no more than minimal effects on trade and production are among the issues likely to be discussed later this week.

Falconer told Members on 3 December that he would convene ten days of talks starting 3 January, sources said.

ICTSD reporting.

OTHER STORIES

EU, US CALL FOR ELIMINATING TRADE BARRIERS TO CLIMATE-FRIENDLY GOODS AND SERVICES

Just prior to a United Nations climate change conference in Bali, the EU and US last week submitted a joint proposal at the WTO calling for trade liberalisation in climate-friendly goods and services.

The proposal calls for the elimination of trade barriers facing goods and services directly related to mitigating climate change as part of the Doha Round negotiations on environmental goods and services. Trade liberalisation could lower costs, for instance for clean energy technologies, thus promoting increased use around the world.

US Trade Representative Susan Schwab said that "WTO Members have an unprecedented opportunity to address in a concrete and meaningful way the global environmental challenge of climate change."

Initial responses from developing countries were mixed, with suggestions that the EU and the US were invoking climate change technology to dress up their continuing demands for liberalisation in a wide range of other goods and services.

EU-US proposal on 'climate-friendly' goods and services

The EU and US tabled their joint informal proposal at the WTO on 30 November. "Trade liberalisation can and should support the fight against climate change," it said, "notably by contributing to the necessary deployment of climate and energy friendly goods and technologies as well as services, thereby complementing and supporting the objectives of... the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)." Trade ministers from a number of major economies are set to meet during the UNFCCC conference in Bali; the proposal was made as a contribution to their discussions.

The proposal sets out a two-tier approach to environmental goods and services liberalisation. The first tier is for goods and services directly related to climate change mitigation; the second, for a broader list of environmental goods and services.

The first tier would be for goods "directly linked to addressing climate change" as well as "other relevant goods that enjoy consensus on the basis of their clear environmental benefit." These would include some 43 products identified as "climate-friendly" by a recent World Bank report on trade and climate change, covering a wide variety of products such as solar collectors and system controllers, wind-turbine parts and components, stoves, grates and cookers and hydrogen fuel cells. The same report concluded that removing tariffs and non-tariff barriers to key clean energy technologies could boost trade by 7-14 percent annually, and encourage greater investment in cutting-edge technology.

"Building on the analysis by the World Bank," the EU and the US call on Members to "commit to eliminate tariffs on these [climate-friendly] products with the entry into force of the Doha Development Agenda."

The proposal calls on all WTO Members – industrialised, developing, small economies, and least-developed countries – to eliminate such barriers. It says that special and differential treatment for developing countries such as longer phase-in periods could be discussed, but that the "ultimate objective should be a zero tariff world for climate friendly goods in the near future and no later than 2013."

The proposal did not, however, mention several developing country concerns cited in the same World Bank report, ranging from potential damage to domestic industry to the need for technology transfer.

Also in the first tier would be services that "could contribute to [Members'] efforts to address climate

change.” It suggests that Members could further their climate change objectives by removing obstacles to foreign competition in sectors such as “environmental services (e.g. air pollution and climate control services; technical testing and analysis; energy-related services (e.g. engineering and maintenance services to optimise the environmental performance of energy facilities); and services for the design and construction of energy-efficient buildings and facilities.”

The proposal stresses the importance of liberalising environmental goods and services in parallel. Building more energy-efficient buildings would require, for instance, consulting, design and construction services in addition to, say, solar panels for heating.

Second tier: other EGS

Tier two of the liberalisation process envisioned by the EU and the US involves the negotiation of an “Environmental Goods and Services Agreement.” This would involve at least all developed countries and the 30-odd larger developing countries slated to apply the standard tariff reduction formula in the industrial goods talks. Unlike the first tier, least-developed and other particularly disadvantaged countries would be exempt from making commitments.

The wider range of environmental goods slated for liberalisation under this agreement would be based on a consolidated list of 153 products compiled by the ‘friends of environmental goods’, a group of mostly developed countries that has been pushing for Members to agree on a list of products for expedited liberalisation. For these products, the proposal calls on participating countries to “eliminate tariffs and take appropriate actions to identify and address specific non-tariff barriers.” It does not set any specific deadlines.

Services in this second tier could include a broad set of environmental and climate-related services, including environmental, energy, construction, architectural, engineering and integrated engineering services. The proposal’s objective would be for Members participating in the initiative to bind existing levels of market access and national treatment commitments, and undertake new liberalisation to remove market access barriers.

Initial developing country reactions

Developing country reactions to the proposal were mixed, at a 30 November meeting of the Committee on Trade and Environment Special Session.

Egypt, among others, noted the importance of climate change and welcomed the short list of goods in tier one. Developing countries asked for more clarification

regarding the scope of the products and services within tier two.

Many developing countries have consistently expressed concern about using a list of environmental goods slated for expedited liberalisation, noting that many products on the ‘friends of environmental goods and services’ group’s list are primarily of export interest to industrialised countries. The issue of ‘dual use’ – the fact that many goods that Members want included on an environmental goods list also have non-environmental uses – has been another sticking point.

At last week’s meeting, many developing countries voiced concerns, without questioning the relevance of environmental goods and services to mitigating climate change. They questioned how the goods had been selected, and said the dual use problem had not been fully resolved even for the short list of 43 goods in tier one, although they did acknowledge that the list specified the intended end-use for a number of the products. For instance, clutches and universal joints were included as specifically for wind turbines.

Brazil and others pointed out that the submission contained no products of export interest to developing countries, compromising its development dimension. Brazil would, for example, have liked to see the list include biofuels and biofuel manufacturing equipment, of which it is a major producer. The list also lacked a technical assistance and technology transfer dimension, it said.

Some countries criticised the concept of a ‘one-size fits all’ environmental goods and services agreement that would be mandatory for some Members, saying the objective of the proposal appeared to be market opening rather than environmental protection. Brazil suggested that its ‘request-offer’ approach took into account developing country interests more adequately than the common list put forward the EU-US submission (see BRIDGES Weekly, 7 November 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/07-11-07/story3.htm>). Hong Kong reportedly asked why a new agreement was needed, given that countries could make commitments within existing goods and services schedules.

Some developing countries also questioned the US’ intentions behind raising the issue in Bali, suggesting that Washington was ‘forum-shopping’. Sources report the US said it only wanted to bring up the submission during informal discussions at the trade ministers’ meeting there, but had no intention to circulate the actual proposal.

More criticism of the proposal came this week, when Indian Ambassador Ujal Singh Bhatia said that the EU-US proposal was “a disguised effort at getting market

access through other means and does not satisfy the mandate for environment.” Reuters reports that he said that India could agree to liberalise trade in goods such as solar panels and windmills, whose sole use would be to combat climate change, but could not accept the possibility that the list would extend over time to include products like cars and refrigerators.

Roberto Azevedo, a senior Brazilian negotiator, was especially critical of the list’s failure to include biofuels, upon which the US and the EU levy steep duties to protect heavily subsidised domestic producers. “We find the proposal modest, we find it biased, and we find it protectionist,” he said. “Anything that they don’t produce is not on the list.”

ICTSD reporting; “India, Brazil slam new WTO Doha proposals,” REUTERS, 4 December 2007.

LINKS BETWEEN PATENT RULES AND ACCESS TO GREEN TECHNOLOGY COME UNDER SCRUTINY

On the eve of an international conference on climate change in Bali, the European Parliament has called for examining the impact of intellectual property protections on the spread of environmentally sound technologies, suggesting that WTO rules might be impeding their diffusion.

Wider use of energy-saving technology would help curb greenhouse gas emissions. However, the extent to which patent protections play a major role in raising the cost of using such technology remains uncertain.

In a resolution adopted on 29 November, the European Parliament pointed to the “urgent need to develop production, consumption and trade patterns that mitigate climate change and its economic impact.” It said that the Clean Development Mechanism, the Kyoto Protocol’s principal system for technology transfer, “is not yet sufficient to significantly shift investment patterns in those sectors that have the greatest impact on climate change, such as power generation, transport and industrial energy use.”

Given this insufficiency, the parliament urged the European Commission, which negotiates trade agreements on behalf of EU members, to push for removing tariff and non-tariff barriers that “prevent or slow the dissemination of low carbon technologies.” To this end, it also recommended “launching a study on possible amendments to the WTO Agreement on Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights in order to allow for the compulsory licensing of environmentally necessary technologies, within the

framework of clear and stringent rules for the protection of intellectual property.” Compulsory licensing effectively suspends patents on a technology, allowing for the production of generic copies against the payment of a royalty to the patent-holder.

The EU could help promote the development of global-scale ‘climate-friendly’ industries by working to lower barriers to ‘green’ trade through measures such as “removing tariffs on ‘green’ goods at the WTO level” and “reshaping the rules on intellectual property rights,” the parliament noted.

The resolution pointed to the EU’s status as a key player in alternative energy technologies, particularly in the wind and solar sector. “The EU should become a market leader in the worldwide export of environmental goods and services,” it said.

Chinese officials, currently resisting heavy pressure from some industrialised nations to accept binding caps on greenhouse gas emissions, have increasingly been arguing that intellectual property protections are putting energy-saving technologies out of the reach of developing countries. “I think we have to resolve a lot of barriers on the so-called intellectual property rights issues,” Zhou Dadi of China’s Energy Research Institute said last week, reports Reuters. “That means if you really want to help China to speed up the technology transfer process, we have to really think about how to help China cover the high costs. Most of them are not based on material, they’re based on intellectual property rights.” Zhou expressed hope that China would raise the issue in Bali.

However, some studies reveal that the key barriers encountered by developing countries may not be related to intellectual property protection, but to trade barriers and other issues related to market structures.

John Barton, an emeritus professor of law at Stanford University and a leading authority on technology transfer, has demonstrated that there is a difference between the renewable energy sector (solar, photovoltaic, biofuels, and wind) and the pharmaceutical sector, the classic example of how compulsory licences have been used to create dramatically cheaper drugs and expand access to medicine. In the pharmaceutical sector, patents and the associated monopoly rights often have a substantial upward impact on price, as there may be no substitutes for a new medicine, he wrote this month in Bridges Trade BioRes Review. In contrast, in the renewable energy sector, patent protections have long expired on the basic technologies used. Thus, only specific improvements or features tend to be patented. As a result, several competing patented products exist – and the competition usually

brings prices down compared what might be charged under a monopoly.

"Any judgment about the [European] Parliament's proposal about compulsory licensing needs to be made only after we know better whether there is a problem," Barton told Bridges. He succinctly summarised the dilemma of a compulsory licensing policy for green technologies: "the risks of not granting a compulsory license readily enough are that technology will be monopolized and priced too high; the risks of granting such a license too readily are that incentives for private research will be decreased."

Barton said that in the cases he had studied, intellectual property-related obstacles to technology transfer were relatively smaller. In these sectors, intellectual property was generally accessible either through competitively priced products, or through modest royalty fees. However, he said that other sectors, notably the automobile industry, merited further study. He suspected that the real problem in some instances might lie more in the realm of anti-competitive practices than that of intellectual property.

That said, Barton noted that the development and transfer of green technologies transfer "is absolutely crucial to the world's future." He suggested that developed countries could try to promote innovation through means other than patent protection, for instance by committing a portion of technology development funding to the needs of developing countries, and working with developing country firms on such research.

The European Parliament's resolution on trade and climate change is available online at <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?Type=TA&Reference=P6-TA-2007-0576&language=EN>.

ICTSD reporting; "Patenting and access to clean energy technologies in developing countries," BRIDGES TRADE BIORES REVIEW, 3 December 2007; "China says rethink of IPR needed for energy saving," REUTERS, 28 November 2007.

COUNTRIES STEP UP DEMANDS ON GI EXTENSION, DISCLOSURE

Two groups of countries this week proposed text for clauses in a potential Doha Round framework deal that would aim to alter WTO intellectual property rules for patent applicants whose inventions involve biodiversity, and strengthen protections for foods linked to particular places.

Both of the proposals, presented on 3 December during informal consultations with WTO Deputy Director-General Rufus Yerxa, address so-called 'implementation issues' under the WTO Agreement for Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS).

Despite the new proposals, WTO Members remain divided on both issues.

Geographical indication extension

The "friends of geographical indications," a group of countries led by the EU and Switzerland, want the modalities decision to say that "Members agree to the extension" of an extra level of TRIPS protection for geographical indications to all products, not just wines and spirits. These rules (Article 23) currently prevent the use of geographical indications such as Champagne for wines and spirits not from the region in question, even when the real origins of a product are clearly displayed for consumers, for example, through the use of expressions such as "type," "style," or "imitation." With GI extension, it would become forbidden to sell, say, a 'Gruyère-style' cheese.

The EU and Switzerland, along with developing countries such as India, Jamaica, Kenya, Pakistan, Thailand and Turkey, have long pushed for securing this additional protection for products such as Parma ham or Darjeeling tea. The EU and Switzerland have suggested that increased price premiums for GI-protected products could help compensate their farmers for subsidy and tariff cuts resulting from the Doha Round.

Other Members, however, including Australia, Canada, Argentina, the US, and South Africa, question the need for such additional protection, concerned about negative impacts on a range of products. These countries have called for additional technical discussions and consultations before moving forward with negotiations.

Disclosure group reiterates demands

The paragraph of text put forward by the "disclosure group," which counts among its members a large number of developing and least-developed countries, would have "Members agree to the inclusion in the TRIPS Agreement of a mandatory requirement for the disclosure of origin of biological resources and/or associated traditional knowledge in patent applications." Patent applicants would also have to provide proof of prior informed consent and benefit-sharing.

Countries including Brazil, India, China, Peru, Thailand, Uganda, and South Africa have proposed text for a TRIPS amendment, which was signed on to more recently by the African Group and the group of least-developed countries. These countries consider a disclosure requirement necessary to avoid the granting of 'bad' patents that use biological resources or traditional knowledge without proper recognition or recompense. Preventing 'biopiracy' of this sort is important for ensuring a mutually supportive relationship between the TRIPS Agreement and the Convention on Biological Diversity. The CBD, the most important international agreement on biodiversity, recognises the sovereign rights of states over their natural resources, and requires access to genetic resources to occur only on the basis of mutually agreed terms and equitable sharing of benefits.

The EU and Switzerland agree that disclosure is important, but have proposed alternatives that do not go as far as the disclosure group's TRIPS amendment with the threat of patent revocation. Other countries, including Argentina, Costa Rica, Japan, Canada, and Australia, continue to oppose introducing disclosure requirements in the TRIPS Agreement.

Way forward on outstanding implementation issues

The two proposals, intended to be part of a future "horizontal modalities decision" – a broad framework deal on issues including agriculture and industrial goods trade that Members are now hoping to strike in early 2008 – provide for countries to agree in principle to each of the concepts. Negotiations in Special Sessions of the TRIPS Council would flesh out specific details about how GI extension and mandatory disclosure requirements would operate, the texts said.

Part of the problem is differing interpretations among members about the status of 'outstanding implementation issues' like GI extension and disclosure in the Doha round. Paragraph 12 of the Doha Declaration stated that "negotiations on outstanding implementation issues shall be an integral part" of the Doha work programme. Thus, some Members suggest that these issues are already part of the negotiations, while others say that a specific decision by all Members would be necessary for negotiations on them to start.

At the WTO's Hong Kong summit in 2005, ministers asked WTO Director General Pascal Lamy to intensify a consultative process on these outstanding implementation issues and to report to Members for appropriate action. Despite the new proposals, the persistent divide on the two issues means that an acceptable way forward remains unclear.

ICTSD reporting.

IN BRIEF

FIJI, PAPUA NEW GUINEA BECOME FIRST PACIFIC COUNTRIES TO SIGN EPA WITH BRUSSELS

Fiji and Papua New Guinea (PNG) initialed 'interim' goods-only economic partnership agreements (EPA) with the EU on 29 November, the European Commission indicated last week.

Fijian officials said that the accord secures unobstructed access to the EU market, except for rice and sugar, with negotiations on issues such as services, investment and government procurement set to continue next year. It also includes improved rules of origin for fisheries, textiles and agriculture. Fiji and PNG will, over the course of the next 15 years, eliminate tariffs on over 80 percent of imports by value, with some farm, forestry, and industrial products exempt from liberalisation.

Civil society groups in the Pacific region criticised the deal. Many, like the Pacific Network on Globalisation (PANG), feel that Brussels has bullied members of the African, Caribbean, and Pacific (ACP) group of countries into signing deals that would only benefit the EU.

The EU has long warned that without EPAs by the end of the year, exports from the 31 relatively richer members of the ACP group faced being slapped with the same tariffs imposed on all developing countries, potentially putting them in direct competition with nations such as Brazil and India. PNG and Fiji faced the prospect of substantially higher tariffs on their major exports, tuna and sugar respectively, if they did not sign.

The 31 December deadline is the result of a waiver under which WTO Members agreed to let the EU maintain its unilateral preference scheme for ACP states until the end of 2007, even though it violated multilateral trade rules by discriminating among developing countries.

Fiji and PNG join the list of countries which have broken off from one of the six ACP negotiating blocs to sign EPAs (see BRIDGES Weekly, 28 November 2007, <http://www.ictsd.com/weekly/07-11-28/story1.htm>). The Seychelles and Zimbabwe did so on 28 November. Mauritius initialled an interim deal on 4 December, sources say. Côte d'Ivoire appears set to sign this week, the Angola Press reports, which would make it the first West African state to do so.

It seems that the ten remaining Pacific group countries – most of which have negligible trade with the EU -- are opting to take their time considering the ramifications of an EPA. The Solomon Islands is more interested in possible free trade agreements with Australia, New Zealand and other Pacific countries.

Brussels has suggested that countries that do not sign EPAs this week might see their exports face disruption, including tariffs, even for a few weeks in January.

ICTSD reporting; "Fiji/EU sign interim partnership agreement," FIJI VILLAGE, 4 December 2007; "EPA deal in Fiji's interest—Fiji Government," FIJI BROADCASTING CORPORATION LIMITED, 4 December 2007; "Solomons Agree to Negotiate Interim Agreement," SOLOMON TIMES, 30 November 2007; "EU agrees to new trade deals wit PNG, Fiji," NATIONAL, 2 December 2007; "Fiji, PNG sign European Union agreement," FIJI BROADCASTING CORPORATION LIMITED, 26 November 2007.

WTO IN BRIEF

WTO APPELLATE BODY AGREES WITH EU, REINFORCES RULING AGAINST BRAZIL TYRE IMPORT BAN

The WTO's highest court on 3 December confirmed an earlier ruling that Brazil's import ban on used and retreaded tyres violated multilateral trade rules because it was applied in a discriminatory manner.

Notably, the Appellate Body set a substantially higher bar for Brazil to make its import ban WTO-compliant, by reversing some aspects of the original panel's ruling.

In its dispute with the EU, Brazil had argued that retreaded tyres -- used tyres reprocessed for a second and final use -- had a shorter life span than new ones and therefore contributed to a faster accumulation of waste tyres. Growing piles of waste tyres in turn provide fertile breeding grounds for disease-carrying mosquitoes, Brazil said, and their sheer volume exceeds the country's capacity for environmentally responsible disposal.

Brussels had charged that the import limitations were motivated by a desire to protect local tyre makers rather than to pursue genuine public health objectives, pointing in particular to repeated court injunctions that allowed Brazil's retreaded tyre industry to import

millions of otherwise-banned used tyres between 2000 and 2005. It also noted that Brazil had continued to import relatively small numbers of retreaded tyres from its Mercosur partners Argentina, Paraguay, and Uruguay.

The earlier panel had accepted that the import ban could be necessary on health grounds, but said that its application was discriminatory: the Brazilian retreaded tyre sector was benefiting at the expense of its EU counterpart. Furthermore, it noted that the imports of waste tyres under court injunction undermined Brasilia's own rationale for the prohibition (see BRIDGES Weekly, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/07-06-20/story3.htm>).

The Appellate Body agreed that Brazil's import ban could be justified for public health reasons. However, it was stricter in assessing the extent to which the ban was "being applied in a manner that constitutes unjustifiable discrimination." For instance, it deemed the Mercosur exemption to have caused the import ban to be applied "in a manner that constitutes arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination." It also reversed the panel's finding that the Mercosur exemption as well as the injunction-sanctioned imports would only be discriminatory if they resulted in tyre import volumes high enough to threaten the objective of the import ban.

The relatively low bar the initial panel set for Brazil to bring the ban into WTO compliance put Brussels in the unusual position of appealing a ruling that it had nominally won.

Environmental groups such as the Centre for International Law and WWF had welcomed the initial panel ruling, and criticised the EU's appeal (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 7 September 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/07-09-07/story1.htm>).

The Brazilian government has been working to convince the Supreme Court to stop the injunctions.

ICTSD reporting.

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.

Coming up: 6-12 December

9-11 December, Berlin, Germany. FROM RED TAPE REDUCTION TO A BETTER REGULATION STRATEGY?. Organised by the International Regulatory Reform Conference (IRRC) and hosted by the Bertelsmann Foundation, this conference is designed to define a common ground that can make regulatory reform work everyone. IRRC hopes this will contribute to mutual policy-learning and the transfer of knowledge that is necessary for finding more effective and less burdensome ways of regulating modern life. Internet: http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/cps/rde/xchg/bst_engl/hs.xsl/prj_53890_53899.htm

11-12 December, Amsterdam, Netherlands. 17TH OECD GLOBAL FORUM ON PUBLIC DEBT MANAGEMENT. Sponsored by the government of Japan, this forum brings together debt managers from all over the world to discuss viewpoints and experiences relating to public debt management. It is a roundtable meeting where public debt managers from the OECD area discuss in an in-depth fashion practices, experiences, and policies in the field of public debt management and the development of government securities markets with their counterparts from non-OECD countries. Forum meetings also serve as opportunities for follow-up discussions of topics that have been discussed by the OECD Working Party on Debt Management by extending and deepening the earlier or initial policy dialogue. Internet: http://www.oecd.org/document/29/0,3343,en_2649_201185_39485405_1_1_1_1,00.html

WTO Events

An updated list of forthcoming WTO meetings is posted at: 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.

6 December: COUNCIL FOR TRADE IN SERVICES - SPECIAL SESSION

6 December: WORKING PARTY ON THE ACCESSION OF CAPE VERDE

7 December: COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT – SPECIAL SESSION

7 December: WORKING GROUP ON TRADE AND TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY

10, 12 December: TRADE POLICY REVIEW BODY – TURKEY

10-14 December: NEGOTIATING GROUP ON TRADE FACILITATION

Other Upcoming Events

10-11 March, London, United Kingdom. THE NEW POLITICS OF THE GLOBAL ECONOMY: A WORLD WITHOUT RULES? Organised by Chatham House, this conference will discuss the impact of changes in the global economy on investment, trade, and the environmental framework, whether new rules will operate across borders, the global security issues raised by the interdependencies of this new economic order and the business strategies that will succeed in this new environment. Requires advance registration. Internet: <http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/events/conferences/view/-/id/113/>

RESOURCES

COMPLIANCE WITH CLIMATE CHANGE COMMITMENTS: THE G8 RECORD, 1975–2007. By John Kirton and Jenilee Guebert. G8 Research Group, November 2007. The report assesses the compliance of G8 members with their climate change commitments, since the G7/8 started generating them in 1987 through to 2007. G8 compliance earns a respectable B. The report is available at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/compliance-climate.html>.

BORDER TRADE IN THE GMS: GROUND REALITIES AND FUTURE OPTIONS. By the Consumer Unity & Trust Society (Hanoi), 2007. This paper analyses the border trade in the Greater Mekong Sub Region (GMS), and suggests that the cooperation within GMS is quite progressive especially taking into account the low level of economic development of most of the member states. It calls for more intensive studies on the impact of border trade policies and the governance of border trade and border towns as well as existing economic structures so as to ensure overall welfare of local people and growth of local economy. Available online at <http://www.cuts-international.org/HRC/pdf/PB-6-07.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, Fleur Claessens, Jonathan Hepburn, Emily Kloosterman, Maria Julia Oliva, Malena Sell, Mahesh Sugathan, and Caitlin Zaino. Editor: Trineesh Biswas. Director: Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz, rmelendez@ictsd.ch. ICTSD is an independent, not-for-profit organisation based at: 7, ch. de Balexert, 1219 Geneva, Switzerland, tel: (41-22) 917-8492; fax: 917-8093. Excerpts from **BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest**© may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and should be directed to the Editor or the Director.

BRIDGES Weekly Trade News Digest is made possible 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 1563-0