



INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR
TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT

Bridges

Weekly Trade News Digest

23 January 2008

Volume 12 Number 2

LEAD STORIES

- NAMA IMPASSE PERSISTS, AS WTO MEMBERS
AWAIT NEW DRAFT TEXTS 1
- AS ANTIGUA CONSIDERS CROSS-RETALIATION
AGAINST US, WIPO OFFICIAL CREATES STIR 3

OTHER STORIES

- WTO BIOTECH RULING: EU MISSES COMPLIANCE
DEADLINE 4
- PAKISTAN'S TPR LAUDS OPENNESS BUT
HIGHLIGHTS CHALLENGES AHEAD 5

WTO IN BRIEF

- UPCOMING PANEL HEARINGS IN EU-US ZEROING
DISPUTE TO BE OPEN TO PUBLIC 7

EVENTS & RESOURCES

- EVENTS 7
- RESOURCES 8

LEAD STORIES

NAMA IMPASSE PERSISTS, AS WTO MEMBERS AWAIT NEW DRAFT TEXTS

WTO Members insist that they have not given up on concluding the Doha Round of global trade talks in 2008. Director-General Pascal Lamy, too, sounds optimistic. "It's an Olympic year for China and maybe an Olympic year for Doha too," he told a Chinese newspaper last week.

In theory, finishing up the Doha Round this year would look something like this: the chairs of the WTO negotiating committees on agriculture and industrial goods trade would issue updated draft deals to Members in early February. These texts would serve as the basis for a 'horizontal' negotiating process involving tradeoffs across the two sectors, which would culminate in an agreement – say by April or so – on formulae and figures for tariff and subsidy cuts, possibly linked to some promises on services trade. The US presidential administration would use this 'modalities' deal to win negotiating authority from a Congress that would be reluctant to torpedo a multilateral trade pact.

Meanwhile, WTO Members would turn their attention to wrapping up talks on services, fisheries subsidies, trade facilitation, anti-dumping, special and differential treatment for poor countries, and other issues. They would then proceed to scheduling product- and sector-specific liberalisation commitments, a process likely to take months and entail more than a little last-minute haggling. Following legal verification of each others' future obligations, WTO Member governments would adopt the Doha Round agreements with much fanfare, before the year is out.

However, Members failed to achieve very similar goals over the past two years, even when the beleaguered Bush administration would not have needed to secure a new trade promotion authority mandate from a hostile Congress. Indeed, the Doha talks, launched over six years ago, were originally supposed to finish by the end of 2004.

Nevertheless, recent months have been marked by intensive negotiations and modest signs of progress. In

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

an interview published in the 22 January edition of China Daily, Lamy said that this year, an accord was “doable as we now have both political and technical conditions to make it possible.”

Following a meeting in Brussels earlier this week, EU Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson and US Trade Representative Susan Schwab also spoke of wrapping up the talks in 2008. Mandelson said that a modalities deal would be necessary by the “very early spring” for this to happen.

NAMA divide largely unchanged

Major obstacles will need to be overcome even for Members to reach the crucial modalities deal on agriculture and industrial goods trade.

Not least among the stumbling blocks is the wide gap between Members’ positions in the negotiations on non-agricultural market access (NAMA). “Nothing happened” to narrow these differences during last week’s talks on the figures that will determine Members’ future tariff levels, negotiating committee Chair Ambassador Don Stephenson (Canada) told delegates on 21 January. This was also true for the parameters for the controversial ‘flexibilities’ that will guide the extent to which developing countries will be able to shield some products from tariff reduction.

In fact, little has changed since July 2007, when Stephenson issued a draft agreement text setting out terms for where he guessed an agreement might lie, in light of Members’ notable failure to converge on their own. That text provided for a formula and associated numerical ‘coefficients’ that would cap developed country tariffs at 8-9 percent and those of developing countries between 19-23 percent, with duties reduced correspondingly across the board.

The NAMA-11 group of developing countries, which includes South Africa, Argentina, Brazil, and India, has criticised the July 2007 text for being too demanding of poor nations, too easy on industrialised nations, and out of all proportion to the farm subsidy reform provided for in a linked draft deal from the agriculture committee chair (see BRIDGES Weekly, 1 August 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/07-08-01/story2.htm>). On the other hand, the US and the EU have said that the text’s tariff cuts for developing countries are barely sufficient. Both sides repeated these views during talks last week, the NAMA-11 saying that the proposed cuts would mean “massive consolidation of tariffs for developing countries.”

The two camps have also clashed over the coverage of ‘flexibilities’ for developing countries. Stephenson’s July 2007 text would allow the 30-odd developing countries

required to apply the standard reduction formula to subject 10 percent of tariff lines to reductions half as steep as those ordinarily required (so long as this does not cover more than a tenth of manufacturing import value). Alternately, they would be allowed to exclude 5 percent of tariff lines from reduction altogether (albeit limited to only 5 percent of total import value). The NAMA-11 has sought to expand the reach of these flexibilities, while the EU and the US have proposed constraining them further.

A ‘middle ground’ group of developing countries including Chile, Colombia, Peru, Singapore, and Thailand have called for accepting the parameters in the July text, both for the formula and the flexibilities. However, many of these countries already have low overall tariff levels or see a significant share of imports enter their markets duty-free due to bilateral agreements, and would thus be left relatively less affected by the Doha Round.

Stephenson: much left to ‘horizontal process’

Incremental progress on the far more numerous issues in the farm trade talks has enabled agriculture committee Chair Ambassador Crawford Falconer (New Zealand) to tell negotiators that he will be able to significantly update the draft text that he presented to them last July. Sources now expect this text soon after the General Council meeting scheduled for 5-6 February.

In the industrial goods talks, however, the deadlock has hampered Stephenson’s ability to revise the figures in his own text. He finally said this week that the key issues in the NAMA talks – especially the formula and the flexibilities – would only be resolvable in conjunction with the agriculture negotiations. He was referring to the so-called ‘horizontal’ process during which senior officials (and ultimately ministers) are expected to negotiate cross-sector tradeoffs based on the revised agriculture and NAMA texts.

Some countries may be willing to soften their positions on NAMA if they receive concessions that they want on agriculture, or vice versa.

Stephenson indicated that he would look at the new agriculture text and consider any adjustments before releasing his own draft deal, sources said. He said that he would issue his text either alongside the agriculture one, or shortly thereafter. Delegates said that they were not sure specifically how the new text would differ from the old, although the chair had promised some changes.

Trade ministers from several influential WTO Member countries are set to meet this week in Davos, on the

sidelines of the World Economic Forum summit there. Both Lamy and Mandelson are looking to the upcoming talks to produce clearer signs on how the WTO negotiations might move forward.

Indian Commerce Minister Kamal Nath also expressed hope that the Davos gathering would “create a greater momentum towards the conclusion” of the Doha Round, reports Reuters. However, he said that he was “realistic” that the US elections and “a new phase of protectionism” in the EU could pose problems.

ICTSD reporting; “India hopes for progress on WTO trade deal this week,” REUTERS, 22 January 2008; “Lamy eyes success in trade talks,” CHINA DAILY, 22 January 2008 ; “EU, US still hoping for 2008 Doha deal,” REUTERS, 21 January 2008.

AS ANTIGUA CONSIDERS CROSS-RETALIATION AGAINST US, WIPO OFFICIAL CREATES STIR

In a rare move, the WTO last month awarded Antigua and Barbuda the right to place sanctions on US patents, copyrights, and other intellectual property, as compensation for being unduly shut out of the US' online gambling market.

However, little precedent exists for precisely how the tiny Caribbean island nation might go about suspending standard WTO protections for US intellectual property, even though it has been authorised to levy annual penalties worth \$21 million on both IP and services companies (see BRIDGES Weekly, 16 January 2008, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/08-01-16/story2.htm>). No government has ever actually suspended intellectual property rights as a result of a WTO dispute. Ecuador, the only other country to receive permission to do so, never went through with suspending EU patents and copyrights.

Lawyers have pointed to some potential complications with implementing retaliatory sanctions against intellectual property. Quantifying damages, for instance, could prove difficult if the US and Antigua disagree on the financial value of an overridden patent or denied trademark.

A senior official of the World Intellectual Property Organization last week created a stir by suggesting that suspending certain intellectual property protections could leave the Antiguan government in breach of international treaty obligations other than the WTO.

In an interview with the Antigua Sun, Jorgen Blomqvist, the director of WIPO's copyright law division, pointed

specifically to the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, an international copyright agreement ratified by both the US and Antigua. The Berne Convention is one of several intellectual property treaties administered by WIPO, which is based in Geneva.

“The [WTO] TRIPS Agreement says that contracting parties shall comply with the Berne Convention, with one exception, but the bulk of the economic protection under the Berne Convention is referred to in the TRIPS Agreement,” Blomqvist said, reports the Antigua Sun.

“Since both parties are parties to the Berne Convention, if they, under some other convention, start to not grant protections to each other, then they will infringe the Berne Convention,” Blomqvist added. “The fact that under one treaty you can make such sanctions does not relieve a country from responsibilities under other treaties.”

Frederick Abbott, a professor of international law at Florida State University, argued that “there is reason to doubt the validity of Mr. Blomqvist's opinion” on the relationship between WTO rules and the Berne convention.

Participants in WTO disputes “often have supplementary treaty obligations that overlap with WTO commitments, and the theory that a Member is legally precluded from exercising rights under the Dispute Settlement Understanding because of those supplementary overlapping treaties would undermine the effective operation of WTO dispute settlement,” Abbott said.

Both Abbott and Sisule Musungu, an intellectual property expert affiliated with development think tank IQsensato and Yale Law School, suggested that Blomqvist's interpretations of the Berne Convention were of questionable legal merit, and worse, risked being construed as an official view from the WIPO secretariat.

WIPO distances itself from remarks

When contacted, a WIPO spokesperson told Bridges that Blomqvist's comments were personal views. As a matter of policy, she said, WIPO does not comment on rulings or decisions made by other organisations. She added that the Antigua Sun report mischaracterised Blomqvist's remarks insofar as they were general in nature and did not pertain to any specific conflicts at the WTO or elsewhere.

Regardless, Abbott emphasised that Antigua would not be failing to fulfill its obligations under the Berne Convention for sanctions imposed under the WTO

ruling. "Antigua and the United States are each party to the WTO Agreement and the Berne Convention," he said. Both have agreed to abide by WTO dispute settlement decisions.

"The WTO Dispute Settlement Body in this proceeding has authorised Antigua to withdraw concessions under the TRIPS Agreement, including corresponding obligations under the Berne Convention, and the United States is legally bound to accept that authorization," he added.

The obligation to accept the WTO decision means that "the rights of the United States under the Berne Convention are not being infringed because the United States has legally accepted the withdrawal of Berne concessions (or obligations) by Antigua," the law professor said. It also left Washington "legally estopped [i.e., prevented] from asserting a breach of the Berne Convention by Antigua."

"Mr. Blomqvist's assertion of a hypothetical violation of the terms of the Berne Convention is the assertion of a legally inconsequential abstraction because there is no party whose rights would be infringed," Abbott concluded.

Errol Cort, Antigua's minister of finance and the economy, this week said that he would have "a big difficulty" accepting Blomqvist's suggestion that the Caribbean island nation would remain fully bound by the strictures of the Berne Convention. "If that is so," he told the Antigua Sun, "it puts a nonsense to the whole World Trade Organization and the rulings and sanctions. It just brings the whole thing into disrepute. So I don't accept that."

Antigua was authorized to 'cross-retaliate' against intellectual property after successfully arguing that confining sanctions to US services companies, or additional duties on US goods – the most common form of WTO retaliation – would hurt its own tiny economy and have virtually no effect on the US.

Some legal scholars argue that such cross-retaliation may be one avenue for economies too small to threaten their trading partners with retaliatory tariffs to benefit from WTO dispute settlement.

ICTSD reporting; "Cort dismisses concerns of property rights proponents," ANTIGUA SUN, 22 January 2008; "Antigua may violate int'l treaty: Expert," ANTIGUA SUN, 16 January 2008; "In Trade Ruling, Antigua Wins a Right to Piracy," NEW YORK TIMES, 22 December 2007.

OTHER STORIES

WTO BIOTECH RULING: EU MISSES COMPLIANCE DEADLINE

The EU has missed a 11 January deadline to comply with a WTO ruling against its practices for the approval and marketing of biotech products.

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 EU countries more time to demonstrate "meaningful progress on the approval of biotech products" in order to "normalize trade" in such commodities.

For the EU, however, achieving compliance will remain a challenge due to national policies in different member states. Austria, for example, has a ban on genetically modified food products. And France on 11 January further aroused the US' ire by banning imports of genetically modified maize – a genetically modified food product grown in France. Washington expressed particular disappointment with France's announcement because the crop has long been produced in both the US and the EU.

The US was not alone in criticising EU member states' moves to restrict the importation of genetically modified agricultural and food products. EU Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson has argued that EU member states should approve genetically imports when "science is on their side," arguing that with the EU's rigorous biotech approval system already in place, health and safety priorities can be maintained. He also argued that because genetically modified foods will continue to play an important role in agricultural productivity, "it [would be] an economic risk for Europe to fall behind the global economy in approving safe biotechnology."

Piet Bukman, chair of the International Food and Agricultural Trade Policy Council (IPC) and former Dutch minister of agriculture, trade and development stated, "Europe really needs to consider the broader implications of its position," suggesting that member states ignoring the EU-wide biotech approval regime may cause the regime to lose its credibility, and complicate effective EU decision-making on the issue. Bukman also argued that slower authorisations for biotech food and animal feed products will lead to increased prices for EU member states.

Background

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 agricultural and food imports. They alleged that the EU applied a moratorium on the approval of biotech products, which restricted agricultural imports. It was also alleged that member states imposed bans on the marketing and imports of biotech products already approved at the EU level (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 6 October 2006, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/06-10-06/story1.htm>). The US, Canada and Argentina claimed that these measures were inconsistent with provisions of the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Measures, GATT 1994, the Agreement on Agriculture, and the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT).

A dispute panel was convened after initial consultations failed to resolve the dispute. In 2006, the panel ruled in favour of the complainants, finding individual EU member state bans on the "marketing and import of EU-approved biotech products" to be inconsistent with Annex C and Article 8 of the SPS Agreement also because of "undue delays in the completion of the approval procedures" and with Articles 5.1 and 2.2 of the SPS Agreement because the "measures were not based on risk assessments satisfying the definition of the SPS Agreement." It found that the EU's policy amounted to an undue "de facto moratorium on approvals of biotech products."

The European Commission decided not to appeal this ruling. Some have speculated that the Commission did not want to expose itself to a less favorable ruling on appeal, or that the ruling "would be helpful in its efforts to persuade some of the EU member states to lift their GM bans." This decision drew criticism from various groups concerned with the implications of the ruling for future environmental disputes, stressing the WTO panel's non-use of the UN's Biosafety Protocol, an agreement that allows nations to use the precautionary approach to ban GM products. The EU is a signatory to that treaty, but none of the complainants were. Groups such as Greenpeace said that the ruling highlighted the need for a different forum to deal with environmental trade disputes.

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.

ICTSD reporting; "US holds fire on sanctions against EU in biotech food dispute," AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 15 January 2008; "IPC urges Europe to look

at broader implications of biotech stance," IPC News Release, 14 January 2008; "US Holds Fire on EU GM Ban," BBC NEWS, 14 January 2008; "World Trade Panel Sides with Biotech Food Producing Countries," ENVIRONMENT NEWS SERVICE, 9 February 2006; "U.S. to Evaluate EU Progress on Biotech Approvals, Temporarily Suspends WTO Sanctions Process," US MISSION TO THE EUROPEAN UNION, 14 January 2008; "Biotechnology and the EU," SPEECH BY PETER MANDELSON, AT THE EUROPEAN BIOTECHNOLOGY INFO DAY, 14 June 2007; "EU Accepts Trade Ruling on GMOs," EURACTIV.COM, 22 November 2006; "WTO Dispute," GENEWATCHUK.COM.

PAKISTAN'S TPR LAUDS OPENNESS BUT HIGHLIGHTS CHALLENGES AHEAD

Pakistan has enjoyed an impressive economic performance since 2002 but faces challenges due to persistent structural weaknesses, low tax collection, current account deficits, insufficient export diversification, and political uncertainty, according to a new report issued by the WTO Secretariat last week.

Praise for Pakistan's generally liberal foreign direct investment regime and increased FDI inflows was tempered by concern over persisting impediments including complex investment procedures.

WTO Members met on 16 and 18 January to discuss Pakistan's Trade Policy Review (TPR). Both delegates and the report lauded Pakistan's active role in the multilateral trading system and the Doha Round negotiations.

Human development up, but problems persist

The review (WT/TPR/S/193) noted that Pakistan rated amongst the fastest growing Asian economies, with real GDP growth touching 9 percent in 2004-05 before slipping to 7 percent in 2006-07. The country had risen modestly on the UN Human Development Index, to 134th out of 177 in 2004, with corresponding decreases in unemployment (from 8.3 percent in 2001-02 to 6.2 percent in 2006) and absolute poverty (to one-fourth living under less than one dollar a day, compared to one-third during 2001-02). However, poverty remains widespread, and income inequality has widened slightly.

Pakistan's economic fundamentals could be regarded as 'reasonably sound' despite inflationary pressures, suggested the review. However, structural weaknesses such as political and security uncertainties, infrastructural bottlenecks, excessive regulation, labour market rigidities and governance problems continued to

raise the costs of doing business. Corruption remained a problem with the country among the world's twenty worst offenders according to Transparency International.

Some trade reforms, but competitiveness declining

The review commended Pakistan's trade reforms to shorten customs clearing times, reduce overall tariff protection from 20.4 percent in 2001/02 to 14.5 percent in 2007/08, increase tariff bindings as well as strengthen intellectual property protection. However, it also pointed to backsliding, for example in terms of increased subsidies provided to exporters.

The country's overall international competitiveness appeared to be declining, particularly in crucial sectors such as textiles and clothing, with little diversification away from low value-added products or progress in terms of market diversification. The US and the EU remained Pakistan's main markets. Moreover, Pakistani textiles only received moderately preferential access to the EU market through the GSP (Generalised System of Preferences), and no preferential entry in US and Japanese markets.

Tariffs rising source of revenue

Pakistan extended MFN treatment to all WTO Members except India, from where many imports were prohibited, and Israel, with which trade was banned.

The review noted that tariffs – despite liberalisation -- had become an increasing source of tax revenue, due mainly to import growth. 97.2 percent of Pakistan's tariffs were fully bound and 0.8 percent were partially bound.

Although almost all rates were 'ad valorem' – expressed as a percentage of value – thereby significantly increasing transparency, the review noted that average bound levels are more than four times the average applied rate, thus reducing predictability, especially in agriculture where gaps are wider.

The review said that domestic taxes (sales and income taxes and excise duties) appeared to discriminate against imports, and were administratively complex and therefore not transparent, and distorting.

During the meeting, many Members urged Pakistan to simplify and reduce its tariffs. Some expressed concern over the impact of export taxes and multiple tax and non-tax incentives, with the latter possibly favouring local content. Others asked Pakistan to notify its export and agriculture assistance schemes.

Several Members reportedly commended Pakistan's efforts to strengthen intellectual property rights protection, while expressing concern over deficiencies in certain areas (e.g., trademarks, patent protection, and book piracy).

Agriculture still major employer

Agriculture remained a mainstay of the Pakistan economy, accounting for 43.4 percent of employment even though its share of GDP had declined to 20.9 percent in 2006/07. Food security based on self-sufficiency, a major government priority, was deemed costly by the review. In the same period, manufacturing contributed 19.1 percent to GDP, and services 57.4 percent (with the latter accounting for 42.6 percent of employment).

The aim of industrial manufacturing policy is to contribute 30 percent of GDP by 2030. Government intervention in manufacturing remains directed at protecting infant and pioneer industries, using tariffs, tax concessions, and subsidies. According to the review, liberalising trade, including imports from India, could raise industrial efficiency and thus competitiveness.

The report highlighted the fact that the state was still significantly involved in commercial activity in all sectors, despite divestment in areas such as steel, engineering and services.

Regional trade expanding

While Pakistan has participated actively in the Doha Round, the review noted that its trade policy has recently also turned to regional integration, by deepening and expanding existing plurilateral commitments such as with the South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA), the Organisation of the Islamic Conference (OIC), and other alliances across Asia.

ICTSD reporting; "Openness to trade and investment has supported growth", WTO PRESS RELEASE, 16 and 18 January 2008.

WTO IN BRIEF

**UPCOMING PANEL HEARINGS IN EU-US
ZEROING DISPUTE TO BE OPEN TO
PUBLIC**

The upcoming hearings of a WTO dispute panel examining an EU complaint about the US' controversial anti-dumping duty calculation practices will be opened to the public, following a request made by both parties. The next hearings will take place from 29-30 January at WTO headquarters in Geneva. The subsequent set is scheduled for 8-9 April. The panel's work is set to be completed by September.

When calculating the extent to which imports are being 'dumped' - that is, exported at artificially low prices - US trade authorities ignore ('zero out') instances where goods command higher prices in the US than at home. They only take into account cases where prices in the US are lower. Critics say that this inflates 'dumping margins', allowing injured US companies to secure inappropriately high levels of anti-dumping duties on competing imports.

Past WTO dispute panels as well as the Appellate Body have repeatedly ruled against the practice, leading the EU to state this time that it had "no doubt that the United States [would] be found in breach of its WTO obligations," and it "[hoped] that the United States [would] accept the inevitable and respond positively to the request for consultations, making further actions unnecessary."

The panel in the current case was convened in July 2007, after the two sides failed to resolve their differences in consultations dating back to autumn 2006.

Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Norway, Taiwan, and Thailand joined the dispute as third-parties. Many of them have previously launched disputes against the US' anti-dumping practices.

Public dispute hearings are a relatively recent phenomenon in the WTO, and remain rare. The first panel proceedings to be opened to the public were in 2005, in a dispute over beef hormones that pitted the US and Canada against the EU. At the time, legal experts said that such exercises in transparency would enhance the WTO's legitimacy (see BRIDGES Weekly, 7 September 2005, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/05-09-07/story1.htm>).

ICTSD reporting; "WTO Hearings on Zeroing Dispute Opened to the Public," WTO NEWS, 8 January 2008;

"EU Requests Consultations Over U.S. Anti-Dumping Fees," INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 22 September 2006; "WTO to Investigate U.S. Fees on European Imports," USA TODAY, 4 June 2007; "Zeroing In: Antidumping's Flawed Methodology under Fire," FREE TRADE BULLETIN, 27 April 2004; "Europe and US in New Trade Row," BBC NEWS, 13 June 2003.

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: 24-30 January

23-27 January, Davos, Switzerland: WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM ANNUAL MEETING. The theme of this year's summit is "The Power of Collaborative Innovation." Leadership vacuums are beginning to emerge on a wide range of critical issues in the international environment. The absence of a common vision and agenda ensures that the status quo will be maintained with respect to major global challenges – ironic given the ubiquity of knowledge and rapidity of change in our networked world. The forum will attempt to catalyse the creation of platforms for like-minded communities to initiate necessary changes together. Internet: <http://www.weforum.org/en/events/AnnualMeeting2008/index.htm>.

24 January, Geneva, Switzerland: TRADE, THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER. This conference concludes a 14-month research program the relationship between Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and the WTO agreements, with a particular emphasis on technology transfer and the Doha Round negotiations, conducted by the University of Geneva's Law Faculty and the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies with cooperation from the United Nations Environment Programme (Economics and Trade Branch), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and the International Network on Environmental Compliance and Enforcement. Funding has been provided by the Geneva International Academic Network (RUIG/GIAN). Contact Urs Thomas, e-mail: urs.thomas@droit.unige.ch, tel: +41 22 379 8491, +41 22 329 6730.

24-25 January, Bangkok, Thailand: AID FOR TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT: GLOBAL AND REGIONAL PERSPECTIVES: UNCTAD XII PRE-EVENT. Organised under the auspices of the Working Group on Trade of the United Nations Executive Committee on Economic and Social Affairs. At the pre-event, the major United Nations agencies active in development cooperation and long-standing providers of trade-related technical assistance and capacity-building will discuss ways to sustain the momentum of moves to implement the Aid for Trade initiative and the supportive role to be played by the United Nations system in promoting development and helping to bring about a reduction in poverty, to which Member States committed themselves in the Millennium Declaration and the outcome of the 2005 World Summit. The event should be of particular interest to government officials and representatives of the private sector dealing with trade agreements and negotiations. Internet: <http://www.unctad.org/Templates/meeting.asp?intlItemID=1942&lang=1&m=14941&info=not>.

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 the UN Environment Programme, WWF, Oceana and the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development 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 under "Chatham House Rules," i.e., statements will be reported but not attributed to speakers. To participate, please register with Cecile de Gardelle at cdegardelle@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>.

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.

25 January: WORKING PARTY ON THE ACCESSION OF UKRAINE

28 January: TRADE POLICY REVIEW BODY – GHANA

29-30 January: ZEROING (DS350) PANEL PUBLIC VIEWING

30 January: WORKING PARTY ON THE ACCESSION OF BHUTAN

Other Upcoming Events

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/>

RESOURCES

THE FUTURE CONTROL OF FOOD: A GUIDE TO INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS AND RULES ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, BIODIVERSITY AND FOOD SECURITY. By Geoff Tansey and Tasmin Rajotte. 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/>.

TRADE AND CLIMATE CHANGE LINKAGES. By Aaron Cosbey. International Institute for Sustainable Development, 2008. 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, 2008. 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

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, Alicia Handy, and Mahesh Sugathan. 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

