



Bridges Trade BioRes

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

Volume 8 • Number 1, 25 January 2008

Climate & Sustainable Energy

Europe Spells Out Climate Plan, Takes
Global Lead..... 1

Eu Climate Strategy: Border Measures Remain
An Option 3

New Technologies

Us Food And Drug Administration: Clones Are
'Safe' To Eat..... 4

Biotechnology

GM ROUNDUP: DISPUTE UPDATE, NEW
FRENCH BAN, MEXICAN CORN TRIALS.. 7

In Brief

Businesses To Share Environmental Patents..... 8

Japan Not To Hunt Humpback Whales..... 9

Events & Resources

Events..... 9

Resources 10

Climate & Sustainable Energy

EUROPE SPELLS OUT CLIMATE PLAN, TAKES GLOBAL LEAD

The EU is preparing to take the next step in tackling climate change after the European Commission presented a draft legislative package on 23 January.

"Climate change is the great project of our generation," said José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission. "Europe can be the first economy for the low-carbon age," he added, hoping that the EU would lead the way towards a new global bargain on climate change involving all countries, including the US and emerging economic giants China and India.

Environment Commissioner Stavros Dimas praised the package for giving Europe "a head start in the race to create a low-carbon global economy that will unleash a wave of innovations and create new jobs in clean technologies."

Less than a year ago, Europe agreed to make a 20 percent cut in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 as compared to 1990 levels (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 16 March 2007, [http://www.ictsd.org/biores/07-03-](http://www.ictsd.org/biores/07-03-16/inbrief.htm#2)

[16/inbrief.htm#2](http://www.ictsd.org/biores/07-03-16/inbrief.htm#2)) — a percentage it would increase to 30 if other countries followed suit. The current draft spells out the implementation of the strategy, including through burden-sharing among EU members states, the expansion and tightening of the European emissions trading scheme and a mandatory expansion of renewable energy. It includes a controversial target for increasing the use of biofuels to ten percent of transport fuels, coupled with a new set of conditions to ensure their sustainability.

Bridges Trade BioRes© is published by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), an independent, not-for-profit organisation based at International Environment House II, Chemin de Balexert 7, 1219 Geneva, Switzerland, tel: (+41) 22-917-8492; fax: (+41) 22-917-8093.

To subscribe to Bridges Trade BioRes or access back issues, visit <http://ictsd.org/news/biores/>.

Excerpts from Bridges Trade BioRes may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and should be directed to the Editor or the Director.

This edition of Bridges Trade BioRes was edited by Malena Sell, msell@ictsd.ch.

Contributors to this issue were Alicia Handy and Malena Sell.

The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz.

ISSN 1682-0843

Key elements of the climate and energy package

The 20 greenhouse gas percent reduction target agreed last year has now been broken down among EU member states, with some taking on more stringent targets, and those less developed facing less steep targets. The European emissions trading scheme will be a key tool in achieving the goal, and will be expanded to cover additional greenhouse gases beyond carbon dioxide, and additional sectors, such as oil refineries and airlines, chemical and aluminium production. The energy-intensive steel, cement and aluminium industries will likely get their emissions permits for free after 2013, when the new, tighter regime comes into place, in order to allay competitiveness concerns. Power utilities, which are to a great extent shielded from international competition due to their physical proximity to the consumers, will have to pay for all their permits starting in 2013.

EU member states will be obliged to derive 20 percent of their energy from renewable sources. This target has also been divided among individual member states, with some countries set to take on significantly higher proportions of renewables in the energy mix. States will also be able to purchase renewable certificates from other countries.

The package also contains provisions to support carbon capture and storage technologies, and new rules for state aid towards climate projects.

Overall, Commission President Barroso said the climate and energy package would cost each EU citizen EUR3 per week - less than a tenth of what the Stern report predicted adaptation costs to climate change would amount to if countries did not take action (see Bridges Weekly, 1 November 2006, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/06-11-01/inbrief.htm#3>).

Barroso noted that should international negotiations on a global climate agreement not succeed, Europe may take trade measures to safeguard its energy-intensive industry (see related story, this issue).

Checks on biofuel production

The draft directive on renewable energy spells out the requirement for ten percent of transport fuel to be derived from biofuels. This target has proved controversial, as the sustainability of biofuels has been seriously questioned over the last year. Just a week before the release of the draft climate and energy package, 17 non-governmental organisations, including Oxfam and Friends of the Earth, warned the Commission that "large-scale biofuel production can cause negative indirect or knock-on impacts such as increasing food and feed prices and increasing water scarcity, which would lead to negative impacts on the world's poor."

The draft directive places new restrictions on the biofuels target. Biofuels would have to give a real saving in carbon dioxide emissions of 35 percent compared to oil. Feedstock crops cannot be grown on land with high biodiversity values, nor land containing high carbon stocks. In addition, growing biofuels feedstock would have to fulfil best agricultural practices criteria. The restrictions would apply both to home-grown and imported biofuels.

The environmental groups were not swayed by these additions to the draft, however. "Growing crops to fuel our thirsty and inefficient cars will be a disaster for the environment and is a false solution to climate change," said Adrian Bebb, agrofuels campaign coordinator for Friends of the Earth Europe.

A Malaysian commentator from the palm oil industry called the restrictions non-tariff barriers. Biodiesel derived from palm oil has been particularly controversial, as tropical forests have been cleared to make way for palm oil plantations.

Response from the environmental community

The civil society response to the draft climate and energy package was less than enthusiastic. "Overall, it is a very small effort to cope with a threat that might lead to Arctic melting and displacement of millions of people in developing countries because of increased floods," said Stephan Singer, head of the climate and energy unit at the WWF global conservation group.

Many groups felt the 20 percent target for greenhouse gas reduction lacked ambitious. At the UN conference on climate change in Bali, Indonesia in December 2007, the EU had called for a cut in emissions of 25 to 40 percent under 1990 levels (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 18 December 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/07-12-18/story1.htm>).

Friends of the Earth Europe lamented the fact that the package did not give much emphasis to an energy efficiency target that the EU had agreed to last year. An editorial in the Financial Times also noted the lack of focus on energy efficiency, which it said was "by far the lowest-cost means of reducing emissions. There is a target for efficiency [within the new EU climate and energy package] — a 20 per cent improvement by 2020 — but it lacks the same legal force as the target for renewables."

The package will still go through a lengthy process before entering into force. The European Parliament and member states will have to approve it, and may amend it before doing to.

ICTSD reporting; "EU Executive Adopts Blueprint for Climate Fight," REUTERS, 24 January 2008; "EU Countries Get Renewable-Energy Targets," WALL STREET JOURNAL, 24 January 2008; "EU sets emissions targets to fight climate change," AFP, 23 January 2008; "EU threatens trade partners over global warming," AFP, 23 January 2008; "Green barricade: Trade faces a new test as carbon taxes go global," FT, 23 January 2008.

EU CLIMATE STRATEGY: BORDER MEASURES REMAIN AN OPTION

A new European climate strategy launched by the Commission leaves the door open to the use of controversial border measures to safeguard the competitiveness of energy-intensive industries.

The drafting of the new European climate and energy package (see related story, this issue of the BioRes) was followed closely by both industry and green lobbyists.

Representatives of heavy industry, including sectors such as steel, cement, chemicals and paper,

voiced major concern over potential competitiveness losses with regard to emerging giants like China and India, where industry faces less stringent climate requirements. Philippe Varin, president of the European Confederation of Iron and Steel Industries, used the so call 'leakage' argument, warning that "if we were to relocate our industries outside Europe [because of steel production becoming unviable due to climate costs] we would then have to transport steel to Europe, adding emissions."

France has led a European call for a climate levy on imports that have been produced without regard to climate concerns.

José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission, agreed when he introduced the new climate and energy package to the European Parliament that "There is no point in Europe being tough if it just means production shifting to countries allowing a free-for-all on emissions". Therefore, he said that "if our expectations about an international agreement are not met, we will look at other options such as requiring importers to obtain allowances alongside European competitors, as long as such a system is compatible with WTO requirements."

Europe to wait and see

The draft European climate and energy package does not now include provisions requiring polluting exporters to buy EU emissions permits. However, it does leave the door open for a decision on the issue at a later stage. Under the European Emissions Trading Scheme, a large portion of emissions allowances will be auctioned out, with a smaller portion handed out for free. However, all allowances to energy-intensive industry may be given free of charge in order to address competitiveness concerns. A decision will be taken in 2010, when there is more clarity regarding the global climate change regime.

"An international agreement is our absolute priority," stressed Barroso. "But let me be clear, if we do not make progress we will protect European companies." He said that the EU "was not seeking to introduce protectionist measures," but rather asking its trade partners to join Europe in its efforts to combat climate change.

Concern over green protectionism

Other players cautioned against a system setting up carbon barriers. US Trade Representative Susan Schwab and European Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson brought up the issue during a meeting in Washington on 21 January. Following the meeting, Mandelson said "I don't believe that trade restrictions are the way forward for combating climate change." A Chinese trade official voiced a common developing country concern when commenting that "I doubt whether the measures taken in the name of the environment will always be applied to protect the environment and not to protect domestic industries."

Current draft climate change bills under consideration in the US Senate also include provisions that would require trade partners that do not undertake strict climate change policies to buy 'emissions offset' at the US border. US climate legislation is still at an early stage of the legislative process and years will likely pass until new climate change laws come into force.

Whether or not border taxes would be WTO-compliant remains the subject of debate.

ICTSD reporting; "EU Executive Adopts Blueprint for Climate Fight," REUTERS, 24 January 2008; "EU Countries Get Renewable-Energy Targets," WALL STREET JOURNAL, 24 January 2008; "EU sets emissions targets to fight climate change," AFP, 23 January 2008; "EU threatens trade partners over global warming," AFP, 23 January 2008; "Green barricade: Trade faces a new test as carbon taxes go global," FT, 23 January 2008.

New Technologies

US FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION: CLONES ARE 'SAFE' TO EAT

After six years of research, the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) announced on 15 January that food products from cloned pigs, cows, goats and their offspring are as safe as food produced from traditionally-bred animals. Due to inadequate

data, a decision on food products from other animals was not yet made.

As WTO Members around the world begin to assess and implement strategies regarding food products based on clones, they may be going down different paths — meaning trade in cloned products could become a complicated and contentious issue in the future.

FDA ushers in cloned meat and dairy

Dr. Stephen Sundlof, the FDA food safety chief said, "We found nothing in the food that could potentially be hazardous" and that "it is beyond our imagination to even find a theory that would cause the food to be unsafe." The US National Academy of Sciences came to the same conclusion.

The FDA conclusion is not unchallenged, however. The US Congress recently passed legislation requesting that the FDA further study the safety of food products from cloned animals. A large number of consumer and animal rights groups are opposed to cloning, and even producers have acknowledged concerns over the marketability of cloned food products in export markets.

Clones are very expensive to produce, ranging from US\$10,000 to US\$20,000 per cloned cow, compared to just US\$1,000 for an ordinary cow.

Bruce Knight, the USDA undersecretary for marketing and regulatory programs, emphasised that because there were so few cloned animals, it was "unlikely many consumers will encounter products made from clones." Agricultural companies would more likely use the clones for breeding purposes, only introducing their offspring into the food chain. The USDA has requested that companies voluntarily keep milk and food products from cloned animals from distribution, especially to give time to government officials to disseminate their findings to foreign trade partners and food companies. This voluntary moratorium is not applicable to the cloned animals' offspring.

The FDA is not planning to require the meat or milk products from cloned animals or their

offspring to be labelled, as they say there is no material difference between them and food produced by conventional methods.

Consumer and animal rights groups react

Consumer groups claim that the data used by the FDA does not sufficiently establish that foods from cloned animals and their offspring are safe for consumption. Andrew Kimbrell of the Center for Food Safety said the decision was based on an "incomplete and flawed review that relies on studies supplied by the cloning companies that want to force cloning technology on American consumers." Tom Buis, President of the National Farmers Union added that "there is no data to suggest any consumer demand for such products."

Animal rights groups strongly opposed cloning, arguing that the process itself is "stressful to the animals involved." Wayne Pacelle from the Humane Society of the US did not think that the FDA gave sufficient consideration to the welfare of the animals or of their surrogates. Animal protection groups also called for a discussion on the ethical implications of cloning animals.

Biotechnology industry supports cloning

Support for the FDA announcement came primarily from the biotechnology industry. Mark Walton, President of ViaGen, a genetic biotechnology company, announced that "ViaGen applauds the release of the [FDA's] rigorous scientific analysis of the safety of food from cloned animals and their offspring." David Faber, President of Trans Ova, another genetics company specialising in reproductive technologies, stated that their "farmer and rancher clients are pleased [with the decision] because it provide[s] them with another reproductive tool." Faber also "pledged" that Trans Ova would be a "good steward of the technology." The company, in conjunction with ViaGen, announced that they would track the food products through a Supply Chain Management Program to aid "food processors wishing to identify food products from [cloned] animals."

The Biotechnology Industry Organisation supported the fact that the FDA would not require cloned food products to be labelled,

arguing that "cloning is simply a way to make offspring." Because other forms of "animal procreation" do not have labelling requirements, cloning should not either.

The European Food Safety Authority seeks comments on clones

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) published a draft scientific report on 11 January, reaching a conclusion similar to that of the FDA: food products from cloned cows and pigs are the same as those from traditionally bred cows and pigs. However, the EFSA cautioned that there was 'only limited data available' and has opened the draft scientific opinion to public comment until 25 February this year.

The European Commission's Group on Ethics for science and new technologies (EGE) opposed cloning animals, finding no argument to justify cloning animals for food. The group stated that "considering the current level of suffering and health problems of surrogates and animal clones, the EGE has doubts as to whether cloning animals for food supply is ethically justified" and that more research was needed on their offspring. The EGE also recommended that more studies be conducted on the long-term health impacts of cloned animals and their offspring and called for public debate on "the impact of...cloning on agriculture and the environment, on the society impact of increasing meat consumption...[and] the fair distribution of food resources."

The EFSA plans on issuing its final report in May. If the EFSA authorises the sale of food products from cloned animals, "the EU has indicated [they would have to be labelled]." It remains unclear to what extent food products from offspring would be labelled.

Like in the US, the announcement was met with great resistance by various groups. According to a survey conducted by the International Food Information Council, less than half of all consumers were likely to buy food products made from cloned animals.

Australia, New Zealand, Japan and Canada are also evaluating the safety, health and

environmental issues associated with animal cloning.

What are the trade implications?

Although the EU EFSA has tentatively reached the same conclusion as the US FDA, they may take different final decisions, complicating trade in meat and dairy between the two trade blocs. Potential differences with regard to labelling requirements could also complicate trade. The EU has previously rejected hormone-treated beef imports from the US, and takes a much stricter approach to genetically-modified foods than the US. These differences between the trade partners have already led to two major dispute cases at the WTO.

Taking into account public sentiment and the EGE's position, the EU may decide not approve the to approve importation of cloned food products and their offspring. This could potentially lead to another trade dispute between the US and EU. This scenario is tempered, however, by the similar uneasiness of American consumers toward food products produced from cloned animals. It could also be tempered by the voluntary withholding of food products from cloned animals and their offspring by US producers, at least in the short to medium term. The International Dairy Foods Association (IDFA) has stated that "it would be prudent to wait until all major foreign trading partners have reviewed and approved the same cloning technology."

Background

Cloning is the process by which biological material is duplicated. Reproductive cloning is the cloning process associated with animal cloning, which gained widespread attention after the successful cloning of Dolly the sheep in 1997. It is the process by which scientists "transfer genetic material from the nucleus of a donor adult cell to an egg whose nucleus, and thus its genetic material, has been removed." Scientists then stimulate cell division and transfer the resulting embryo into the uterus of a surrogate until birth.

Although reproductive cloning is viewed by some as a way to provide a steady food supply,

according to the US Department of Energy's Human Genome Project, there are risks associated with animal cloning. First, cloning is expensive and inefficient, with "more than 90 percent of cloning attempts [failing] to produce viable offspring." Second, cloned animals "tend to have more compromised immune function and higher rates of infection, tumour growth, and other disorders." Lastly, "defects in the genetic imprint of DNA...may lead to [development] abnormalities [in] cloned embryos."

"FDA Issues Documents on the Safety of Food from Animal Clones," FDA Press Release, 15 January 2008; "FDA to Back Food From Cloned Animals: Move Would Defy Congress's Wish for Delay," Washington Post, 5 January 2008; "FDA OKs Meat from Most Cloned Animals," CNN.com, 15 January 2008; "EFSA Launches its Draft Opinion on Animal Cloning for Public Consultation," EFSA Press Room, 11 January 2008; "Will You Eat Meat from Cloned Animals?" Reuters, 17 January 2008; "Foes Decry Clone Ruling," USA Today, 16 January 2008; "US Approves Animal Clones as Food," BBC News, 15 January 2008; "FDA Says Cloned Animals Safe for Food," Associated Press, 15 January 2008; "Industry Responds to FDA Cloning Decision," Dairy Herd, 16 January 2008; "USDA Recommends that Food from Clones Stay Off the Market," Washington post, 16 January 2008; "Fierce Responses to FDA Cloning Safety Report," Truth about Trade and Technology News Clippings, 21 January 2008; "Cloned Meat and Dairy Products Step Closer to EU Supermarkets," Reuters, 11 January 2008; "EU Report Says Cloned Food Probably Safe," Associated Press, 12 January 2008; "EU Ethics Group Advises Against Cloning Animals for Food," EurActiv.com, 18 January 2008; "Cloning Fact Sheet," US Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Biological and Environmental Research, Human Genome Project; "International Markets: Europe" and "Statistics," US Meat Export Federation; "Dairy and Products Annual: 2007," USDA Foreign Agricultural Service, 19 October 2007; "Biotech Food Tears Rifts in Europe," NY Times, 6 June 2006.

Biotechnology

GM ROUNDUP: DISPUTE UPDATE, NEW FRENCH BAN, MEXICAN CORN TRIALS

EU misses compliance deadline

The EU missed an 11 January deadline to comply with a WTO ruling against its practices for the approval and marketing of biotech products. The initial deadline had already expired in late 2007.

The US, Canada and Argentina, the victors in the case, have temporarily suspended their right to impose retaliatory trade sanctions against EU exports in an effort to give the EU more time to demonstrate "meaningful progress on the approval of biotech products." For the EU, however, compliance will remain a challenge due to the national policies of some of its member states, which have specific restrictions in place on genetically modified (GM) plants.

The US was not alone in criticising EU member states' moves to restrict the importation of genetically modified food products. EU Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson argued that the EU should approve GM imports and be a leader in the development of a "global system of clear rules that allow exporters and importers to trade GM crops and feed." Mandelson also argued that "it [would be] an economic risk for Europe to fall behind the global economy in approving safe biotechnology."

The case dates back to 2003, when the US, Canada and Argentina initiated WTO dispute proceedings with the EU in regard to its policies on genetically modified food imports, claiming the EU had in place a de facto moratorium on the approval of GM products. In 2006, the panel ruled in favour of the complainants. In November 2006, the EU was given twelve months to comply with the report (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 6 July 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/07-07-06/story1.htm>). This deadline was later modified and extended to 11 January 2008.

France announces GM ban

On 11 January — the day that the EU missed its compliance deadline with the WTO biotech case — France announced that it would ban the growing of MON810 nationally. This strain of maize has been developed by Monsanto and is the only GM crop grown in France. The announcement drew criticisms not only from the US and the biotechnology industry, but also from some in France's parliament and certain farmers. French president Sarkozy had called last year for a temporary ban of biotech products, allowing for further scrutiny of their safety by a special panel.

Bernard Accoyer, President of the French Assembly criticised the decision against MON810 by the special panel. He said the reviewing panel's opinion was controversial and the panel itself marred by internal divisions. Accoyer added that GM foods could yield "potential public health benefits" and that the parliament should oversee the authorisation of GM foods.

Jacques Beauville, a farmer, expressed concern over whether France would be able to grow enough corn when banning the GM variety. He said that if crop yields decreased during the next year, GM maize imports from Argentina would increase have to increase. The European Commission will review the French panel's decision. If it does not consider the evidence provided by the panel to be valid, it will ask France to lift the ban.

Mexico opens borders to US corn

Mexico will begin growing GM maize as part of a series of experimental trials. This comes at the end of a 15-year gradual phase out of import barriers protecting on certain crops, including corn, as part of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). This 15 year time frame was put in place to allow Mexican farmers to prepare for increased competition by modernising farming techniques and diversifying crops. However, many Mexican farmers are not ready for increased trade with the US. According to some estimates, as many as two million farm jobs have been lost since NAFTA was signed.

The new GM corn trials have the support of many government officials. Catalino Flores, a geneticist working with the Agriculture Minister stated, "we don't want to be behind. We have to start testing now...If you don't plant something like that when everyone else is, you'll be down the drain." Rural organisations of northern Mexico, which represents the wealthiest farmers, have also welcomed the trials.

However, there is strong opposition to the introduction of GM maize, particularly in light of the important cultural and economic significance of maize in Mexico. Maize was first domesticated in Mexico 9,000 years ago and is the staple food for most of the country's 109 million people. Opponents of GM maize argued that the impact of the crop on Mexico's environment, particularly its biodiversity, had not been studied enough. Farmers groups also voiced concerns over how they would fare when competing with potential US exports of white corn, "Mexico's principal crop," absent some barriers.

"French Government Move to Ban Monsanto GMO Draws Fire," Reuters, 13 January 2008; "French Farmers Criticize Ban on Monsanto's Corn Seed," Bloomberg, 12 January 2008; "Mexico's Protection for Farm Goods Runs Out, Leaving Farmers Feeling Rootless," Associated Press, 29 December 2007; "Mexico: Transgenic Maize Knocking at the Door," Upside Down World, 28 December 2007; "Duty-Free US Corn Imports Force Mexico GMO Debate," Reuters, 21 December 2007.

In Brief

BUSINESSES TO SHARE ENVIRONMENTAL PATENTS

Several corporations have partnered with the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) to provide access to environmentally beneficial patents by creating an "Eco-Patent Commons." The Eco-Patent Commons are a mechanism by which businesses pool and provide free access to environmentally beneficial patented processes, such as those that reduce waste, conserve energy or water, or increase recycling.

IBM, Nokia, Sony and Pitney Bowles are the first four businesses to participate in the Eco-Patent Commons and have collectively donated thirty-one patents. For example, IBM donated the patent for a new packaging technique that uses corrugated cardboard instead of styrofoam products to protect electronic components during shipping, and Nokia donated a patent for converting disposed mobile phone components into new electronic equipment.

A driver behind the initiative was to reduce barriers created by intellectual property rights in the transfer of technologies between companies and countries, and to ease access in particular for developing countries. The Eco-Commons participants hope that, "[researchers and industry will be encouraged] to create, use and develop processes in an environmentally responsible way," similar to the functioning of the open source software community.

However, Graham Dutfield, professor of International Governance at the University of Leeds, expressed some concern. "One wonders if the patents [they are] supposedly giving up are the ones that are for genuine inventions," he mused. Nevertheless, Dutfield remained optimistic. "If IBM and the other companies involved are really serious about this then it can be a really good thing," he said.

Additional information

To access the Eco-Patent Commons website, see <http://www.wbcd.org/templates/TemplateWBCSD5/layout.asp?type=p&MenuId=MTQ3NQ&dOpen=1&ClickMenu=LeftMenu>

"Scheme to 'share environmentally-friendly patents'," SCIDEV.NET, 17 January 2008; "Eco-patent Commons' Hopes to Improve Environmental Innovation," SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE, 14 January 2008; "IBM Joins Sony, Nokia in Sharing Ecological Patents," BLOOMBERG, 14 January 2008.

JAPAN NOT TO HUNT HUMPBACK WHALES

Following intense international pressure, Japan decided in late 2007 to abandon its plan to hunt endangered humpback whales.

A Japanese whaling fleet is, however, currently hunting over 1000 whales of other species in Antarctic waters. Japan hunts whales as part of a scientific research programme that has been approved by the International Whaling Commission (IWC), and opposes a global moratorium on whaling. The longstanding, contentious issue will again be discussed at an intersessional meeting on the future of the IWC in March in London.

Many anti-whaling countries welcomed Japan's plan to abandon any hunt of the endangered humpback whale, although they called for a total withdrawal of hunting activities.

Commenting on the political climate in Japan, Greenpeace Executive Director Gerd Leipold, speaking at the annual World Economic Forum meeting, said "I think we're quite pleased with what is happening, an opening up in the Japanese media, which is beginning to ask the question, why so much of taxpayers' money is being spent on something that is not essential for our economy and that damages our reputation." Leipold added that "Young people in Japan don't eat whale meat any more."

"Greenpeace Hopeful of Stopping Japan Whaling," REUTERS, 24 January 2008; "Japan Removes Humpback Whales from Antarctic Hunt," REUTERS, 24 December 2008; "Japan Suspends Humpback Whale Hunt," ENS, 21 December 2007.

Events & Resources

EVENTS

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

ICTSD event

29 January, Geneva, Switzerland: TECHNICAL AND INFORMAL WORKSHOP ON WTO DISCIPLINES ON FISHERIES SUBSIDIES: ELEMENTS OF THE CHAIR'S DRAFT TEXT. This meeting is organised by UNEP, WWF, Oceana and ICTSD from 9h00-17h30 at the International Environment House II. The chair of the WTO Negotiating Group on Rules recently circulated a draft text, which includes potential disciplines on fisheries subsidies. As part of the effort to facilitate discussion on the merits and implications of the Chair's draft text, this workshop aims to provide an opportunity for informal technical discussion and to allow for elaboration and exploration of issues in a non-negotiating context. The discussion will be conducted according to the "Chatham House Rule"-i.e. the outcomes from the meeting will not include the identity or affiliation of the speakers. To participate, please register with Cecile de Gardelle at cdeg...@ictsd.ch or by calling +41-22-917 8755. Further information is available online at <http://www.ictsd.org/dlogue/2008-01-29/2008-01-29-desc.htm>

Coming up in the next two weeks

23-27 January, Davos, Switzerland: WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM ANNUAL MEETING 2008. The World Economic Forum will highlight 'The Power of Collaborative Innovation' as the principal theme for the Annual Meeting 2008 in Davos. Internet: <http://www.weforum.org/en/events/AnnualMeeting2008/index.htm>

30-31 January, Tokyo, Japan: A CHANGE IN CLIMATE FOR WHALES: IS THERE A COMMON WAY FORWARD? - SECOND PEW-SPONSORED WHALE SYMPOSIUM. This meeting follows the first Pew Whale Symposium held in New York in April 2007 and will precede a special meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) on the future of the whale conservation regime at the end of February, as decided at the last annual meeting of the IWC. Internet: <http://www.pewwhales.org/tokyosymposium/>

30-31 January, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA: MAJOR ECONOMIES MEETING ON ENERGY SECURITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE. This meeting is organised by the US Government and follows the first such meeting, which convened in September 2007 in Washington, DC. Internet: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/environment/>

5 February, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO GENERAL COUNCIL. For further information, contact the WTO Information and Media Relations Division, Geneva; tel: +41 22 739 5007; fax: +41 22 739-5458; email: enquiries@wto.org.

Other upcoming meetings

7-9 February, New Delhi, India: DELHI SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT SUMMIT (DSDS) 2008: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE. The DSDS will offer a platform for leading figures from North and South to address the vital issues of climate change and sustainable development, and to set the stage for an intensified search for global solutions during the year. Internet: <http://www.teriin.org/dsds/2008>

20-22 February, Monaco: TENTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UNEP GOVERNING COUNCIL AND GLOBAL MINISTERIAL ENVIRONMENT FORUM (GCSS-10/GMEF). The Governing Council constitutes the annual ministerial-level global environmental forum in which participants gather to review important and emerging policy issues in the field of the environment. The ministerial consultations during the tenth special session of the Council/Forum will focus on the emerging policy issues of "Globalization and the environment - mobilizing finance to meet the climate challenge"; as well as "International environmental governance and the United Nations reform." Internet: <http://www.unep.org/gc/gcss-x/>

RESOURCES

If you have a relevant resource (books, papers, bulletins, etc.) you would like to see announced in this section, please forward a copy for review by the Bridges staff to Malena Sell at msell@ictsd.ch.

TRADE AND CLIMATE CHANGE LINKAGES. By Aaron Cosbey, International Institute for Sustainable Development (December 2007). This paper was written as the first of a pair of background papers to the 'Trade Ministers' Dialogue on Climate Change Issues, held in conjunction with the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Bali, Indonesia, December 8-9, 2007 (UNFCCC COP 13, Kyoto Protocol MOP 3). It lays out the full range of linkages by which trade and climate change are interlinked, including legal linkages, physical impacts of climate change on trade and investment flows, impacts of trade and investment policy changes on climate change, and competitiveness issues. The paper is available at http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2007/trade_climate_linkages.pdf

TRADE POLICY TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS FOR ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. By Aaron Cosbey, International Institute for Sustainable Development (December 2007). This paper was written as the second of a pair of background papers to the 'Trade Ministers' Dialogue on Climate Change Issues, held in conjunction with the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Bali, Indonesia, December 8-9, 2007 (UNFCCC COP 13, Kyoto Protocol MOP 3). It examines in some depth the ways in which trade and investment policy might be employed to further climate change objectives. The discussion covers: liberalizing trade in low emission goods, allowing subsidies for greenhouse gas reductions, addressing domestic barriers to clean energy investment, amending intellectual property rights and lowering fossil fuel subsidies. The paper is available at http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2007/trade_tools_climate_sd.pdf

THE FUTURE CONTROL OF FOOD: A GUIDE TO INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS AND RULES ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, BIODIVERSITY AND FOOD SECURITY. Edited by Geoff Tansey and Tasmin Rajotte (Earthscan, 2008). This practical book is the first wide-ranging guide to the key issues of intellectual property and ownership, genetics, biodiversity and

food security. Proceeding from an introduction and overview of the issues, comprehensive chapters cover negotiations and instruments in the World Trade Organization, Convention on Biological Diversity, UN Food and Agriculture Organization, World Intellectual Property Organization, the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants and various other international bodies. This guide is an essential tool for everyone involved in shaping the future of food including negotiators, activists, environmentalists, food and intellectual property researchers, companies, farmer groups and all others affected by global negotiations. For more information, please see <http://shop.earthscan.co.uk/ProductDetails/mcs/productID/776/>

BOOM OR BUST: HOW COMMODITY PRICE VOLATILITY IMPEDES POVERTY REDUCTION, AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT. By Oli Brown, Jason Gibson and Alec Crawford, International Institute for Sustainable Development (2008). Commodity price volatility is a serious issue, but not a hopeless one. The basic economic tools necessary to help commodity producers get more predictable incomes are well-known and better understood than ever before. This publication synthesizes a sizeable body of work to investigate the experience, problems and promise of five different types of economic tools: supply management, national revenue management, market-based price risk management, compensatory finance and alternative trade initiatives. This document (soon available in French and Spanish) can be downloaded at <http://www.iisd.org/publications/pub.aspx?pno=930>

GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE: THE CASE OF INDIA, BANGLADESH, INDONESIA, AND THE PHILIPPINES. IFPRI, December 2007. Genetically modified (GM) food crops have the potential to raise agricultural productivity in Asian countries, but they also pose risks for market access losses in sensitive importing countries. This new paper from the International Food Policy Research Institute examines the potential economic effects of trade-related regulations on the adoption of new GM food crops resistant to

biotic or abiotic stress (such as drought resistant rice) in Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, and the Philippines. The simulations results show that the gains associated with GM food crops largely exceed potential trade losses these countries may incur. Segregation of non-GM food for exports can help reduce potential commercial risk for countries willing to adopt GM crops. Adopting GM crops also allows net importing countries to greatly reduce their imports. The full Discussion Paper is available online at <http://www.ifpri.org/pubs/dp/ifpridp00740.asp>

THE WORLD FOOD SITUATION: NEW DRIVING FORCES AND REQUIRED ACTIONS. International Food Policy Research Institute (December 2007). This report, comprising the IFPRI's biannual overview of the world food situation presented to the CGIAR Annual General Meeting, says that income growth, climate change, high energy prices, globalization, and urbanization are all converging to transform food production, markets, and consumption. As a result, global food demand and prices are likely to rise, threatening the livelihoods and nutrition of poor people in developing countries. The report says policymakers must take explicit measures to mitigate the negative effects on poor households. Recommended measures include that developed countries should facilitate flexible responses to drastic changes in food prices by eliminating trade barriers and programs that set aside agriculture resources. According to the report, a world facing increased food scarcity needs to trade more, not less. Developing countries should increase investment in rural infrastructure and market institutions to improve access to critical agricultural inputs, including fertilizers, seeds, and credit, which are key to enhancing productivity. To access the report visit <http://www.ifpri.org/media/20071204agm.asp>