



Bridges Trade BioRes

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

Volume 8 • Number 11, 12 June 2008

Sustainable Agriculture

Biofuels in the Spotlight at Global Food Summit 1

Climate Change & Sustainable Energy

US Senate Rejects Climate Bill; Topic Still Very Much Alive 3

High Cost of Cargo Shipping Could “Reverse Globalisation,” Report Says 4

In Brief

Climate Negotiations Underway in Bonn 6

TRIPS: Members Differ on Whether to Include Biodiversity in Horizontal Negotiations 7

Europe Remains Divided on GM Safety 8

China’s Growing Ecological Footprint Linked to Exports 8

Events & Resources

Events 9

Resources 11

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 Ammad Bahalim, Fleur Claussens, Samantha Fang, Malena Sell and Jonars Spielberg.

The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz.

ISSN 1682-0843

Sustainable Agriculture

BIOFUELS IN THE SPOTLIGHT AT GLOBAL FOOD SUMMIT

A major international conference recently concluded with a call to address the complex issues underlying the current food crisis. Among the issues addressed — and left unresolved — was the contribution of biofuels production to the problem.

Heads of state, ministers and other high-level officials from 181 countries attended a summit on climate change, energy and food in Rome on 3-5 June. The UN Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) ‘High-Level Conference on World Food Security: the Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy’ was a culmination of months of expert-level meetings that assessed the complex causes and effects of the recent rise in food prices. A Declaration on World Food Security was issued at the conclusion of the meeting, committing the attendees to “eliminating hunger and securing food for all.” It included provisions on short and long-term measures to address the causes and effects of the recent spike in food prices.

Industry interests represented in Rome

Key biofuels stakeholders started preparing the ground for a battle on the topic in advance of the Food Summit. A number of developed countries, including the US, Canada and several European countries — also top donors to the FAO and World Food Programme — have committed themselves to the use of biofuels, and have active stakeholders within their farming communities and biofuel industries.

Preparing for the summit, industry representatives in the US, Canada and Europe sent a letter to the attendees, downplaying the negative impact of biofuels on food prices. According to the letter, “It would be highly precipitous...for the United

Nations or other international bodies to single out biofuels as the major cause for escalating food prices and take actions that might lead to even higher food prices.”

A number of studies have provided a range of estimates of the actual impact of biofuels policies on food prices, with the FAO and the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) attributing between 20-60 percent of the rise in food prices to biofuels. The Washington-based International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) provided an estimate of 30 percent.

The FAO/OECD report further suggested that leaders rethink biofuel policy, called the economic, environmental and energy benefits of current generation biofuels “at best modest and sometimes even negative.”

Diouf questions use of biofuels

Early on at the summit, FAO Director-General Jacques Diouf honed in on biofuels subsidies, saying that “Nobody understands [why] \$11-12bn of subsidies in 2006 and protective tariff policies [should be used to] divert 100m tonnes of cereals from human consumption, mostly to satisfy a thirst for fuel for vehicles.”

During the three-day meeting, biofuels continued to be one of the most contentious issues.

US Agriculture Secretary Ed Schafer played an active role as a proponent of biofuels, defending the US corn-based ethanol industry. “It’s not a question of choosing between food and fuel. The world has no shortage of agricultural land to produce either, but it has been short of agricultural investment for a long time,” he said. In contrast to estimates provided by FAO, the OECD and IFPRI, Schafer stated that the biofuels boom has only had an impact amounting to 2-3 percent of the increase in food prices.

The summit also saw squabbling between different biofuels producers. Brazilian President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva took aim at the US, saying that the country’s subsidies and tariff barriers are designed to keep out Brazilian sugarcane ethanol. He dismissed charges that biofuel

production was responsible for the current food crisis and supported sustainable biofuel production, noting the many benefits of cane-based ethanol. Brazilian ethanol does not depend on subsidies in order to be viable, something most developed-country biofuels do.

However, a number of developing countries, Venezuela and Egypt among them, proposed strong language for the final declaration, opposing the diversion of food crops for the production of biofuels.

Indian Agriculture Minister Sharad Pawar said “if we decided to convert all of the world’s grain into motor fuel we will still need to use lots of oil and we would not be having anything to eat.” He added that “conversions of food grain and oil seeds for producing bio-fuel, prima facie, appears to be fraught with food security concerns as is evident already.”

Development groups such as Oxfam and ActionAid also spoke out against biofuels. Rob Bailey, a biofuels expert at Oxfam, stressed the necessity of focusing on biofuels policy and subsidies as an area of intervention in the food crises. “We can’t control the weather, we can’t control the growth of demand in China, we can’t control the oil price but we can control biofuels policy, because it’s politically created in the first place,” he said. He noted that cane-based ethanol posed less of a threat as compared to corn-based biofuels.

Participants decide to study biofuel impacts

In the end, the summit agreed on a watered-down declaration on biofuels, recognising both “challenges and opportunities posed by biofuels, in view of the world’s food security, energy and sustainable development needs.” In the declaration, the conference called for in-depth study “to ensure that production and use of biofuels is sustainable.” The attendees also said they would “foster a coherent, effective and results-oriented international dialogue on biofuels in the context of food security and sustainable development needs.”

The renewable fuels associations of the US, Canada, with the European Bioethanol Fuel

Association welcomed the “thoughtful approach” the declaration took. “We welcome today’s UN FAO proposal to undertake further study of biofuels in agriculture. We are confident it will underscore the valuable contribution biofuels can make to ease the energy and agriculture challenges confronting all nations,” they said in their statement.

Other developments: short and long-term action

In addition to the biofuel debate, the Food Summit addressed a number of crucial issues, including the immediate need for funding to alleviate the food crises. Diouf appealed to the international community to commit “US\$30 billion a year to enable 862 million hungry people to enjoy the most fundamental of human rights: the right to food and thus the right to life.” At the summit, participants pledged US\$6.8 billion towards a fund to address hunger and poverty.

The declaration of the summit also called for increased resources for UN agencies, cooperation between international and national food security actors, and food assistance that is cognisant of a “continuum from urgent to longer term assistance.”

After addressing the urgent need for relief, the declaration emphasised the need for an appropriate set of policies that support agricultural trade and production. Global market integration, reduced barriers to trade and capacity building through improved agricultural inputs were particular areas of emphasis.

The Doha round of trade negotiations was explicitly mentioned. WTO Members reiterated “their willingness to reach comprehensive and ambitious results conducive to improving food security in developing countries.”

The summit declaration also set out a series of longer-term measures and objectives to reduce hunger, decrease the vulnerability to shocks of the food system, and address the challenges of climate change.

Additional resources

For a full report on the Summit, see Bridges Weekly at <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/08-06-11/story2.htm>.

World Declaration on Food Security is available at http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/food_climate/HLCdocs/declaration-E.pdf.

For daily reports and a summary of the World Food Summit by IISD’s Earth Negotiations Bulletin, visit <http://www.iisd.ca/ymb/wfs/>.

ICTSD reporting; “Food-summit draft rejects biofuels control,” GLOBE AND MAIL, 5 June 2008; “World’s farmers by-passed at UN food crisis summit: IFAP,” AFP, 9 June 2008; “Africa: Food Summit Calls for More Investment in Agriculture,” GHANAIAN CHRONICLE, 10 June 2008; “Biofuel industries pleased by U.N. summit resolution,” REUTERS, 5 June 2008; “Rome food summit calls for in-depth study on bio-fuels,” PRESS TRUST INDIA, 6 June 2008.

Climate Change & Sustainable Energy

US SENATE REJECTS CLIMATE BILL; TOPIC STILL VERY MUCH ALIVE

As anticipated, the Lieberman-Warner climate bill, widely lauded as the most aggressive and comprehensive climate bill introduced in the US, did not gather enough support in a 6 June vote in the Senate to pass to the next stage of consideration.

The four days of deliberation on the bill were characterised more by partisan bickering than real debate. On Wednesday, 4 June, Republicans forced clerks to read the entire bill, which took over ten hours, due to a dispute over judicial nominees.

Opponents, such as Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY), said that the economic burden that the bill would impose — including job losses, tax hikes estimated at US\$6 trillion, and mounting electricity, gas and diesel prices — was simply too high, especially in an economy already

under the weather. An editorial in the Washington Post called the bill “the most extensive government reorganisation of the American economy since the 1930s”, in reference to Roosevelt’s New Deal.

“As I suspected, reality hit the US Senate when the economic facts of this bill were exposed,” Senator James Inhofe (R-OK), a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, said. “When faced with the inconvenient truth of the bill’s impact on skyrocketing gas prices, very few Senators were willing to even debate this bill.”

Despite such wrangling and opposition, proponents of climate change legislation remain optimistic for the future of climate change legislation.

“This is moving in the direction that history needs it to move,” Senator Joe Lieberman (I-CT), co-sponsor of the bill along with Senator John Warner (R-VA), said.

Environmentalists are looking beyond the Bush administration — which threatened to veto the bill should it pass in the Congress — towards 2009, when a new administration will occupy the White House.

“This week’s debate was just the first round in a three-round fight,” said the Environmental Defense Fund, National Wildlife Federation and Natural Resources Defense Council in a joint statement. “The Senate debate has elevated the importance of this issue for the election and the next round will be in November. The final round will be next year, when we will have the support and momentum we need to pass legislation that will more effectively build a clean energy economy and prevent the worst consequences of global warming.”

While the bill fell short of the 60 votes required, 48-36, it did gain majority support within the Senate. Six senators - including presumptive presidential candidates Senator Barack Obama (D-IL) and Senator John McCain (R-AZ) - were unable to attend the meeting, but dispatched letters saying that they would have voted in favour of the bill had they been there, bringing its supporters to a total of 54.

Since either candidate would support a similar bill, work on a “road map” for the next president may begin as early as next week, according to Senator Barbara Boxer (D-CA).

“We will have a Senate next year that I believe will be much more hospitable to this bill and they’ll like this bill,” Boxer said. “And we will have a president, either one, who will be hospitable to this subject and we believe will send down a bill to us and work with us.”

The 491-page bill proposed establishing an economy-wide cap-and-trade scheme for greenhouse gas emissions and would have cut total US emissions to 66 percent of 2005 levels by 2050. If passed, the bill would have capped greenhouse gas emissions from 87 percent of pollution sources, including power plants and oil refineries. The bill contained controversial provisions on border measures to protect energy-intensive US industries against foreign competition. The legislation targeted emerging economies, such as China or India, in case these did not take ‘comparable measures’ to tackle climate change, requiring them to purchase ‘carbon offsets’ at the border.

As new climate legislation emerges in the US, the trade measures are likely to remain a part of it.

To read the bill in its entirety, see <http://lieberman.senate.gov/documents/lwcsa.pdf>.

“U.S. Senate abandons global warming bill,” ENS, 6 June 2008; “US carbon-capping climate bill dies in Senate,” PLANET ARK, 9 June 2008; “US climate bill dies; hope for 2009,” REUTERS, 6 June 2008; “Climate reality bites,” WALL STREET JOURNAL, 27 May 2008; “Climate Security Act dies, failing to muster enough votes to move forward,” GRIST, 6 June 2008; “Taking a dive: Why greens are glad the climate bill tanked,” NEW REPUBLIC, 10 June 2008.

HIGH COST OF CARGO SHIPPING COULD “REVERSE GLOBALISATION,” REPORT SAYS

Rising international shipping costs driven by high oil prices could effectively wipe out decades’

worth of trade liberalisation, according to new research from CIBC World Markets.

By making it substantially more expensive to ship cargo over long distances, higher freight costs are likely to change global trade and production patterns, said the Canadian investment bank. They may also make it easier for domestic manufacturers to withstand competition from lower-wage countries. For instance, US steelmakers have already become competitive against Chinese imports for the first time in more than a decade.

“In a world of triple-digit oil prices, soaring transport costs, not tariff barriers, pose the greatest challenge to trade,” argue the study’s authors, Jeff Rubin and Benjamin Tal.

They reckon that in 2000, when oil cost US\$20 per barrel, transport costs were equivalent to a 3-percent tariff rate in the US. At US\$100 per barrel, a threshold crossed at the beginning of this year, “transport costs outweigh the impact of tariffs for all of America’s trading partners.” Current transport costs (with oil above US\$130 per barrel) are equivalent to an average tariff rate of over 9 percent. If oil prices hit US\$150 per barrel, say Rubin and Tal, the ‘tariff-equivalent’ rate in the US would be 11 percent - comparable to import duties in the 1970s. At US\$200 a barrel - a rate which some analysts think likely over the next few years - “we are back at ‘tariff’ rates not seen since prior to the Kennedy Round GATT negotiations of the mid-1960s.”

“Globalisation is reversible,” they posit. “While trade liberalisation and technology may have flattened the world, rising transport prices will once again make it rounder.”

Massive reductions in cargo transportation time and costs have played a major role in enabling the expansion of global trade. A particularly dramatic drop came with the advent of container shipping in 1956, as Nayan Chanda wrote in ‘Bound Together’, his recent account of the history of globalisation. The first rapidly loadable container ship cut port times and charges dramatically, slashing the cost of freight by more than 97 percent. With subsequent improvements, transport-related cost savings between 1950 and

1998 have been estimated to be equivalent to cutting average US manufacturing duties from 32 percent to 9 percent.

However, as Rubin and Tal point out, the fact that container ships spend so little time in ports means that changing fuel costs factor more heavily into shipping rates. It also increases the significance of ship speed. Faster speed invariably needs more energy; they figure that rising ship speed over the past 15 years has doubled fuel consumption per unit of freight.

“At today’s oil prices,” they write, “every 10 percent increase in trip distance translated into a 4.5 percent increase in transport costs.” While shipping a standard 40-foot container from Shanghai to the east coast of the US cost US\$3,000 when oil was at US\$20 per barrel, it now costs US\$8,000. If oil goes up to US\$200, the cost would rise to US\$15,000.

In terms of shifts in trade and production patterns, products for which freight costs make up only a small proportion of final sale prices stand to be less affected if shipping becomes more expensive - additional freight charges would be dwarfed by everything else. However, where freight-to-value ratios are high, transportation expenses can be very significant.

A “surprisingly high percentage” of Chinese exports to the US fall into the latter category, according to the report. These include furniture, footwear, metal manufacturing, and industrial machinery. And while export growth to the US has in general slowed, the slowdown has been most pronounced for goods that carry relatively high freight costs, it says.

The study’s authors suggest that manufacturers’ worldwide search for low wage expenses “will increasingly take place within the constraints imposed by soaring transport costs. Instead of finding cheap labour halfway around the world, the key will be to find the cheapest labour force within reasonable shipping distance to your market.”

Some low-cost manufacturing to supply the North American market is likely to move from China to Mexico, they forecast. Current oil prices mean that

extra shipping costs from East Asia are equivalent to a 9-percent tariff in the US; this margin would rise to 15 percent if the cost of oil per barrel rose to US\$200. These differences could potentially more than offset any cost advantages enjoyed by East Asia-based industries.

Precedent suggests that high oil prices could divert trade based on geographical proximity, says the report. From the first OPEC oil shock in 1973 through the early 1980s, when trans-oceanic freight costs were high, the share of products from Europe and Asia in the US' non-petroleum imports fell by 6 percent, while those from Latin America and the Caribbean rose by a similar margin.

Meanwhile, from 1974 to 1986, world exports' share in global GDP stagnated, despite fairly robust recoveries from two economic recessions. Indeed, although worldwide GDP growth over that period was comparable to that from 1987 to 2002, the latter interval saw exports' share in global GDP expand by 60 percent, supported by tariff cuts and far lower energy prices.

Global trade still growing faster than GDP

WTO economists estimate that growth in global merchandise trade is slowing, as "sharp economic deceleration in key developed countries is only partly offset by continuing strong growth in emerging economies." The growth in world trade in goods dropped from 8.5 percent in 2006 to 5.5 percent in 2007; a 4.5 percent expansion is predicted for this year. However, this growth remains ahead of global GDP expansion, which is forecast to be 2.6 percent in 2008. Over the past ten years, growth in world merchandise trade fell behind output growth only once, in 2001.

A crucial part of economic globalisation, cargo shipping is also a major source of greenhouse gas emissions. The International Maritime Organisation (IMO) recently demonstrated that shipping produces more carbon dioxide than previously thought. Intertanko, the global association of independent tanker owners, puts the annual emissions from the world's merchant fleet at nearly 4.5 percent of the global total. Shipping emissions are projected to rise by a further 30 percent by 2020, although it is not clear

how these estimates will be affected by energy prices.

Dudley Curtis, a spokesperson for Transport and Environment, a Brussels-based campaign group, said that there was very little international regulation of maritime pollution, whether in terms of carbon dioxide emissions and fuel efficiency, or fuel quality.

While it is natural for oil prices to have some impact on demand, and thus on shipping-related pollution, "we don't think that an oil price spike is a substitute for regulation," he said.

The CIBC World Markets analysis is available at http://research.cibcwm.com/economic_public/download/feature1.pdf.

The WTO trade statistics for 2008 are available at http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/pres08_e/pr520_e.htm.

ICTSD reporting.

In Brief

CLIMATE NEGOTIATIONS UNDERWAY IN BONN

Climate change negotiations are underway in Bonn, Germany, with participants taking small steps forward towards a comprehensive global agreement set to take effects in 2012.

During the negotiations from 4-13 June, over 2000 participants are convening in multiple groups, both formal and informal, focusing on the technical and political issues that have to be resolved with regard to mitigation and adaptation, targets and timetables, technology transfer and financing.

One of the topics participants have sparred over is bunker fuels, with disagreements emerging on how the issue should be treated.

The rapid rise in fuel costs is having a tangible impact on international trade, affecting trade in products for which freight makes up a substantial part of the final price (see related story, this issue

of the BioRes). Yet, this is an area that remains largely unregulated, meaning that carbon costs are by no means incorporated into the prices.

After being reintroduced onto the agenda within the UNFCCC context in March this year (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 4 April 2008, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/08-04-04/story1.htm>), bunker fuels remain controversial in Bonn. Overall, countries differ on whether bunker fuels should be addressed under the UNFCCC, or rather tackled by the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) and International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO). A number of developing countries, such as India, expressed concerns that scoping work by the IMO and ICAO has not sufficiently recognised the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, which is well established within the UNFCCC process.

Several side events organised in Bonn also touched on the bunker fuels issue, with ideas such as using a trading scheme or an international levy on bunker fuels, with part of the proceeds going to fund adaptation. Small and remote countries highlighted their vulnerability with regard to rising bunker fuels costs.

An update on the conclusions of these discussions, as well as other negotiating tracks, will be included in the next issue of the BioRes.

For daily updates and a summary of the climate change negotiations in Bonn, see IISD's Earth Negotiations Bulletin at <http://www.iisd.ca/climate/sb28/>

ICTSD reporting.

TRIPS: MEMBERS DIFFER ON WHETHER TO INCLUDE BIODIVERSITY IN HORIZONTAL NEGOTIATIONS

As negotiations in key areas of the Doha Round, such as agriculture and industrial goods, have moved into a stage where countries are looking at the overall compromises needed to clinch a deal, Members are struggling to decide how to move issues related to the Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement

forward. Among the contentious issues is a long-standing debate on whether the TRIPS agreement should be amended to bring it into line with the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in terms of disclosure requirements. The other outstanding issues relate to the creation of a register for geographical indications (GIs), and GI extension.

Chair of the TRIPS special sessions, Ambassador Manzoor Ahmad (Pakistan), authored a document (TN/IP/18, available at <http://docsonline.wto.org>) on negotiations regarding the creation of a multilateral system for registering GIs - product names associated with places and characteristics - for wines and spirits. Ahmad's report declined to discuss the TRIPS biodiversity amendment or GI extension issues, calling them "beyond the mandate" of the special session he chairs, which is limited only to issues regarding the GI registry for wines and spirits. A second report (WT/GC/W/591 - TN/C/W/50), issued by Director-General Pascal Lamy, covered the two other issues.

Included in Lamy's paper was reference to an official submission (WT/GC/W/590 - TN/C/W/49) by India last week to the highest-level negotiating body, the Trade Negotiations Committee that operates under the WTO General Council. India submitted the document, which argues in favour of the TRIPS biodiversity amendment, on behalf of a large group of developing countries, including the least developed country group and the Africa Caribbean and Pacific group. The amendment in question concerns the introduction of a mandatory requirement for the disclosure of origin of biological resources and associated traditional knowledge in patent applications.

Meanwhile, two recent 'non-papers' reflect the division in negotiations, reasoning either for or against the inclusion of these three IP issues in the agenda of the forthcoming TRIPS Council meeting, scheduled to take place as part of the horizontal negotiations in the overall Doha round.

On the one hand, some WTO Members believe that these issues should be part of the horizontal process in order to have modality texts that reflect ministerial agreement on the key parameters for

negotiating a final draft legal text as part of the single undertaking. Yet other Members maintain that no further guidance is necessary since the existing mandate is sufficiently clear and technical work can and should be pursued on this basis.

The TRIPS Council will take place from 17-18 June.

ICTSD reporting; "Reports on WTO IP Negotiations released," INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY WATCH.

EUROPE REMAINS DIVIDED ON GM SAFETY

EU environment ministers and the European Commission recently unanimously accepted a French proposal to re-evaluate the approval process for genetically modified (GM) products.

In their 5 June meeting in Luxembourg, ministers recognised the need to improve the GM evaluation and authorisation system, with emphasis placed on longer-term discussion on health and environment impacts.

The proposal stems from growing criticism of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), the EU's scientific risk assessment body that authorises products for the European market. Member states claim that the understaffed agency relies too much on information provided by the industry and therefore improperly approves GM products with insufficient research. EFSA is responding by creating a database of external scientific experts to help the agency with its work and to increase transparency in the process.

"It is now clear that the authorisation process must be halted until risk assessment procedures are truly independent and compliant with EU legal requirements," said Marco Contiero of the Greenpeace Genetic Engineering European Unit to the EUObserver.

The EU is, however, under pressure from its trading partners to ensure that GM approvals are speeded up, following a dispute settlement case at the WTO (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 22 February 2008, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/08-02-22/story2.htm>).

Meanwhile, on 10 June EU Health Commissioner Androulla Vassiliou proposed raising the tolerance threshold for unauthorised GM material in imports, negating the EU's "zero tolerance" policy. This move, which was strongly opposed by environmental groups, could open the door for more imports from trading partners that have embraced GM. Much European feed is imported, and the feed industry had called for an easing of imports to deal with shortages and rising prices.

On a related note, Switzerland voted on 29 May to extend its moratorium on GM cultivation to 2010. According to the Swiss Federal Council, Swiss farmers have been able to sell their products at a premium on the international market, as they are guaranteed to be non-GM and free of GM contamination.

ICTSD reporting; "EU food safety agency aims for more transparency," EURACTIV, 9 June 2008; "EU to propose more flexible GMO food imports," REUTERS, 10 June 2008; "Environment ministers agree GMO approval overhaul," EUOBSERVER, 6 June 2008; "GM crops banned in Switzerland until 2010," AGRA EUROPE, 29 May 2008; "EU official takes Nebraska agricultural tour," WORLD HERALD BUREAU, 16 May 2008.

CHINA'S GROWING ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT LINKED TO EXPORTS

According to a new study, China consumes more than twice the natural resources its ecosystems can sustainably supply, having doubled its needs since the 1960s. China remains a net exporter of natural resources, with increased demand partly fuelled by exported output.

The 10 June report, jointly commissioned by environment group WWF and the China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development (CCICED), argues for increased conservation and innovative solutions for sustainable development. It is the first comprehensive report on China's footprint.

China's footprint in 2003 of 1.6 hectares per person, ranked 69th in the world, is less than the world average ecological footprint of 2.2 hectares per person. China uses 15 percent of the world's

total biological capacity, and presents a large challenge because of its population size and robust economic growth. The report states that were China to have the same ecological footprint per capita as the US, it would demand the available capacity of the entire planet.

The report finds that China's increased ecological footprint is due partly to trade. While China imports raw material to make up its ecological deficit, it also exports biocapacity embodied in manufactured products to developed countries. A recent review of China's economy conducted at the WTO called for concerted action to preserve the environment, while recognising that China already is taking steps to reduce energy-intensive exports through export taxes and other trade measures (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 30 May 2008, <http://www.ictsd.com/biores/08-05-30/inbrief.htm#3>).

According to the new study on China's ecological footprint, the country should implement a dual strategy to reduce its ecological footprint. On the one hand, China should undertake cheap and easy short-term changes such as the use of energy-intensive light bulbs, while simultaneously focusing on longer-term efforts through investment in resource-efficient infrastructure and compact urban development.

"If China can model a new development path that achieves environmental quality, social harmony, and human well-being, it will lead the way for the world as a whole," the report argues.

ICTSD reporting; "China is urged to conserve resources," WSJ, 11 June 2008; "New report shows China's ecological footprint doubled," WWF, 10 June 2008; "China not solely responsible for its ecological footprint, says WWF," CHINA DEVELOPMENT BRIEF, 10 June 2008; "Ecological resources use below average," CHINA DAILY, 11 June 2008.

Events & Resources

EVENTS

For a more comprehensive list of events in trade and sustainable development, please refer to

ICTSD's web calendar, <http://www.trade-environment.org/page/calendar.htm>.

Coming up in the next two weeks

13-14 June, Osaka, Japan. G8 FINANCE MINISTERS MEETING. The Summit has been held annually since 1975 as a meeting for heads of state regarding economic issues among the leading developed nations. The finance minister and foreign minister of each country, as well as the head of state, have participated from the outset. The finance ministers meeting is an important preliminary to the summit proper. Subjects discussed at this meeting on previous occasions have spanned a wide range of areas, including not only international financial issues such as hedge funds, but also issues having a large impact on the global economy, such as energy, climate change and other global environmental issues, and the development of and elimination of poverty in Africa. For further information, please refer to <http://www.g8finance.mof.go.jp/index.html>.

16-17 June, London, UK: A NEW GLOBAL CLIMATE DEAL? ACHIEVING REAL COLLABORATION FOR A LOW CARBON FUTURE. This will be the 11th Chatham House conference on climate change. Topics will include how to balance economic growth with the need for emissions reductions in developing countries, developing low carbon technologies, carbon markets and equity, and climate strategies that can be agreed to in Copenhagen 2009. Internet: <https://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/events/conferences/view/-/id/118/>.

17 June, Washington DC, US. CLIMATE CHANGE AND TRADE. Global climate change has become a "hot" issue for policy makers inside and outside the beltway. Over the past several years, a number of proposals have been floated to reduce greenhouse gases, promote sustainable manufacturing, and encourage the development of environment friendly technologies. Many of these proposals will directly or indirectly affect international trade policies of the US and foreign governments. What are the trade implications of the global climate change debate? Which proposals create potential conflicts with international trade rules, and what is being done to resolve those conflicts? How do US proposals

compare with those coming from our trading partners? How will this issue fare in the upcoming elections? To answer these and other questions, please join the Washington International Trade Association (WITA) as we hear from a distinguished panel of experts on the trade implications of the global climate change debate.

17 June, London, UK. FOOD PRICES: WHERE NEXT? The presentation, hosted by Chatham House, will be made by Alexander Evans, non-resident Fellow, Center on International Cooperation, New York University, and author of the Chatham House Briefing Paper 'Rising Food Prices: Drivers and Implications for Development'. Recent months have seen rapidly mounting concern over global food prices, which have risen 83 per cent over the last three years. This discussion will focus on the outlook over the medium to longer term, examine whether recent price increases are likely to be sustained, and explore what policy actions are under consideration in agriculture, trade and on the demand side. For further information, please refer to

<http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/events/view/-/id/856/>.

17 June, Geneva, Switzerland. HIGH LEVEL NORTH-SOUTH DIALOGUE ON FOOD AND ENERGY SECURITY. The purpose of the event is to assess the underlying causes and policy dilemmas related to energy security, food security and livelihood security and multilateral responses required to correct the systemic issues. The dialogue is organised by the South Centre and co-sponsored with the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Indonesia to the United Nations. For further information, please refer to http://www.southcentre.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=630&Itemid=119.

17 June, worldwide. WORLD DAY TO COMBAT DESERTIFICATION. The theme for 2008 World Day to Combat Desertification, 'Combating Land Degradation for Sustainable Agriculture', corresponds with the thematic agenda items to be discussed during the sixteenth and seventeenth sessions of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development: agriculture, rural development, land, drought, desertification and Africa. For more information contact: tel: +49-

228-815-2800 ; fax: +49-228-815-2898; e-mail: secretariat@unccd.int; internet: <http://www.unccd.int>.

17-18 June, Seoul, Korea. CHANGING LANDSCAPES: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY IN ASIA - DIALOGUE ON SUSTAINABLE FINANCE, RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT AND CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP. This meeting is jointly hosted by Principles for Responsible Investment, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Finance Initiative and UN Global Compact. It will offer a platform for dialogue among financiers, investors and businesses on the latest issues in the field of sustainable finance, responsible investment and corporate citizenship. In addition, special joint breakout sessions will examine in greater detail environmental, social and governance factors across the business activities of financial institutions, institutional investors and corporations. For further information, please refer to <http://www.changinglandscapes.org/>.

23-24 June, Jaipur, India: NATIONAL WORKSHOP ON ECOLABELLING. The workshop seeks to engage relevant stakeholders by introducing the "Enabling developing countries to seize eco-label opportunities" project and discussing the procedure, criteria and related market opportunities of the European Union's ecolabel. Organised by Consumer Unity and Trust Society (CUTS) and the Confederation of Indian Textiles Industries (CITI), in collaboration with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Internet: <http://www.cuts-citee.org/events.htm#event0>

23-27 June, Bali, Indonesia. NINTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE BASEL CONVENTION. The ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention (COP-9) on the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Waste will convene in Bali, Indonesia. COP-9 will address, inter alia, the implementation of the Strategic Plan; Basel Convention Regional and Coordinating Centres; synergies and cooperation with other chemicals conventions; e-waste and end-of-life equipment; and ship dismantling. For more information contact Secretariat of the Basel Convention; tel: +41 22-917-8218 ; fax: +41-22-797-3454; e-mail:

sbc@unep.ch; internet:
http://www.basel.int/meetings/meetings.html

24-26 June, Cochin, India: INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON CLEANER PRODUCTION & ENERGY CONSERVATION FOR SUSTAINABILITY. The workshop aims to bring together different stakeholders in developing countries, working in the fields of Energy Efficiency, Renewable Energy, Industrial Productivity and Waste Minimization along with experts from the National Cleaner Production Centers (NCPC, established by UNIDO) to deliberate on various aspects of Cleaner Production. Case studies are presented to help understand the concept of cleaner production as a growing worldwide movement. Hosted by the Centre for Science and Technology of the Non-Aligned and Other Developing Countries (NAM S&T Centre). Contact: Arun P. Kulshreshtha; tel.: +91-11-24645134 ; e-mail: apknam@gmail.com; Internet: <http://www.energyprofessional.in/articlepages.php?id=135&pg=&Month=&Year=&Category=3>

24-28 June, Geneva, Switzerland: TWELFTH EADI GENERAL CONFERENCE: GLOBAL GOVERNANCE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: THE NEED FOR POLICY COHERENCE AND NEW PARTNERSHIPS. Individuals and organisations are cordially invited to submit a paper for the 12th General Conference of the European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI). The conference deals with the overarching theme: "Global Governance for Sustainable Development" and will be hosted by the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies (IHEID) in Geneva. The deadline for abstract submission is 28 November 2007. We kindly ask you to use the online submission tool for submitting your abstract. Internet: <http://www.eadi.org/gc2008>

29 June-4 July, Kushiro, Japan. WORKSHOP ON BIODIVERSITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE. Co-organized by the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and the Kushiro International Wetland Centre, in partnership with Japan-UNDP Partnership Fund and the Secretariats of the Ramsar Convention and the Convention on Biological Diversity, this

workshop aims to support the sharing of scientific facts and policies on biodiversity, wetlands and climate change, provide analytical knowledge to understand and practically use the scientific data and documentation, facilitate exchange of ideas and strengthen the Kushiro/UNITAR network of experts in wetlands, biodiversity and climate change. For more information contact: e-mail: hiroko.nakayama@unitar.org; Internet: <http://www.unitar.org/hiroshima/programmes/kushiro08/>

30 June-July 2, Paris, France: ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL ENERGY WORKSHOP. The International Energy Workshop (IEW) is a network of global energy experts who meet annually to discuss a wide range of topics, with particular emphasis on global as well as regional issues. The annual IEW meetings focus on energy assessment and try to understand the reasons for diverging views of development in the energy sector. Internet: http://www.internationalenergyworkshop.org/Pre_announcement_2008.html

30 June-4 July, Geneva, Switzerland: 31ST SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION. Internet: <http://www.codexalimentarius.net/web/current.jsp?lang=en>

Other Upcoming Meetings

24-25 July, New Delhi, India: TOWARDS A COHERENT TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY OF INDIA. This National Conference to be held at the India Habitat Centre, New Delhi on 24-25 July 2008 aims to provide a forum for discussion on the dynamic relationship between international trade and poverty reduction, at the national as well as international levels. It will address the need for mainstreaming India's national development strategy to make use of the beneficial role that international trade can play in enhancing development and reducing poverty. <http://www.cutscitee.org/events.htm#event01>

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.

AFRICA: ATLAS OF OUR CHANGING ENVIRONMENT. By UNEP, 2008. Increasing concern as to how human activities impact Africa's environment has led to documentation and quantification of the changes taking place. Through a combination of ground photographs, current and historical satellite images, and narrative based on extensive scientific evidence, this publication illustrates how humans have altered their surroundings and continue to make observable and measurable changes to Africa and its environment. A 350 page, large-format, hard cover atlas of environmental change in each of Africa's 53 countries, with reports on their progress toward the United Nation's Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 7: Ensure environmental sustainability. Available in English or French. Purchase at <http://www.earthprint.com/product/d51f6ab5-fed1-45e4-ae83-f400def37e38.aspx>.

WEBSITE: NONTARGET EFFECTS OF GENETIC MANIPULATION. The Nature Institute has unveiled a new website designed to set the public debate about genetic engineering upon a more accessible scientific foundation. Distilling a voluminous technical literature, the website gathers together — often in the researchers' own words — information about both the intended and unintended consequences of transgenic experiments. The emerging picture tells a dramatic story — one that has scarcely begun to inform the public conversation to date. The website is part of The Nature Institute's ongoing project on "The Nontarget Effects of Genetic Manipulation." See the website at available at <http://nontarget.org>.

THE RIGHT TO FOOD AND THE IMPACT OF LIQUID BIOFUELS (AGROFUELS). By Asbjørn Eide, 2008. This study examines the impact of biofuel production on the enjoyment of the human right to adequate food and the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger. It follows from internationally recognised human rights that States have a core obligation to ensure freedom from hunger for all, and that any decisions which may negatively affect the enjoyment of the right to food should be

reviewed. This has also been reiterated by the UN Human Rights Council in its resolution adopted on 22 May 2008 as the result of its special session on the food crisis from a human rights perspective. This paper therefore explores whether and to what extent biofuel production has undermined or is likely in the future to undermine or weaken the access to food for vulnerable people, and whether there are any overriding ethical concerns that can justify biofuel production even if it harms access to necessary and sufficient food to avoid hunger. Download at http://www.fao.org/righttofood/publi08/Right_to_Food_and_Biofuels.pdf.

"Traditional knowledge and intellectual property rights: A note on issues, some solutions and some suggestions." By Krishna Ravi Srinivas. *ASIAN JOURNAL OF WTO AND INTERNATIONAL HEALTH LAW AND POLICY*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 81-120, March 2008. This article discusses the issues in intellectual property protection for traditional knowledge. After discussing the definitional issues in traditional knowledge, it examines the current global debates on this issue. It identifies some solutions and provides an analysis of the solutions. It then highlights the North-South divide in this issue and the predicament of the south in finding an acceptable solution. It ends with some suggestions for arriving at a solution and argues that there is a need to go beyond intellectual property rights to resolve this issue. This paper is available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1140623.

TRENDS IN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT 2008-2009, 2008. By DESA, April 2008. The report finds that efforts to reduce poverty and improve food security in developing countries are hampered by declining support for strong agricultural growth, long considered a hallmark of successful poverty reduction strategies. Strong agricultural growth is four times more effective than growth in other sectors in benefiting the poorest half of the population. Download at <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/publications/trends2008/>.