



Bridges Trade BioRes

Biweekly news, events and resources at the intersection of trade and environment

Volume 9 • Number 21, 27 November 2009

Climate Change

Copenhagen Expectations Buoyed Somewhat
by Political Presence..... 1

Sustainable Agriculture

World Food Summit
Falls Short of Expectations..... 4

Special Section: Copenhagen Countdown

Climate Change Financing..... 5
Technology and Finance 7

In Brief

Environmentalists Say ICCAT Cuts
are Insufficient..... 10
New Study Claims Sulphur Emissions Cuts
Could Accelerate Global Warming..... 10
GM Crops Cause Dramatic Increase
in US Pesticide Use: Report..... 11
Lobby Group Opposes Proposed
Changes to Green Technology Patents 12
Chile to Restrict Salmon Roe Imports..... 13

Events and Resources

Events..... 14
Resources 16

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 www.ictsd.net/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 Andrew Aziz, aaziz@ictsd.ch.

Contributors to this issue were Michelle Athanas, Andrew Aziz, Ammad Bahalim, Ana Maria Kleymeyer, and Thais Macedo.

The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz.

ISSN 1682-0843

CLIMATE CHANGE

Copenhagen Expectations Buoyed Somewhat by Political Presence

With a little more than a week left before the 15th UN Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP), few observers are willing to commit to predictions on the outcome.

Those hopeful that Copenhagen would be a watershed moment for climate change got a dose of reality following the recent Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit when 21 heads of state sunk earlier hopes of a binding treaty in favor of a substantially watered down 'political agreement'.

The APEC meeting – which took place from 8 to 15 November in Singapore – has been pegged as a moment of recalibration as far as expectations for Copenhagen are concerned. With Copenhagen fast approaching, APEC leaders instead opted to back a political deal proposed by Danish Prime Minister Lars Rasmussen, who flew to Singapore to discuss the status of climate change talks with the group.

But room for optimism has appeared in recent days as global emissions heavyweights – including US President Barack Obama, Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao, and Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper – announced that they will be making an appearance at the COP, thus indicating their readiness to jump in the water with the rest of the world and signaling they may actually have something substantial to declare.

All eyes on US commitments

On the heels of the APEC meeting, and perhaps to assure concerned observers that the global process was not on the brink of failure, US

President Barack Obama, gave his most significant pledge to continue working towards a comprehensive legal agreement on climate change.

He proposed a new pact that would require rigid targets on mid-term emissions from developed countries, “pledges” from emerging economies to curb their emissions growth, finance to support mitigation in developing countries broadly, and a set of institutions to ensure that such promises are kept.

“Our aim...is not a partial accord or a political declaration but rather an accord that covers all of the issues in the negotiations and one that has immediate operational effect,” he said. The operational language is particularly resonant for developing countries who have long claimed that developed countries have not delivered on their global promises captured in the UN Convention.

Obama has been reluctant to speak forcefully on climate change commitments, largely due to the fact that the US Senate has yet to pass climate legislation and is not expected to debate its current draft bill before the spring of next year. Obama had earlier suggested he might appear at the Copenhagen conference if a deal was imminent and his presence would help push it to a conclusion. The downgrading of a legal outcome to a political agreement put both his participation and the possibility of a robust global agreement in doubt.

But in a surprise announcement, the US released its climate targets on 25 November. “In the context of an overall deal in Copenhagen that includes robust mitigation contributions from China and the other emerging economies, the President is prepared to put on the table a US emissions reduction target in the range of 17 percent below 2005 levels in 2020 and ultimately in line with final U.S. energy and climate legislation,” read a statement from the White House.

While the release of the US targets is noteworthy, critics have pointed out that the targets outlined in the statement reflect the lower end of the national draft legislation currently under consideration by the US Congress and that comments referring to “China and other emerging economies” may

suggest that the US is stepping away from their commitment to help finance adaptation in the developing world.

The statement also confirmed that Obama would make a one day appearance in the first week of the COP en route to Oslo to accept the Nobel Peace Prize, which has buoyed hopes of many for a positive outcome from the COP.

“I am pleased the American president will visit Copenhagen,” said Danish Prime Minister Lars Lokke Rasmussen, whose country is hosting the conference. “The strong commitment of the American president to the climate change issue is very valuable.”

But Rasmussen and others close to the negotiations have expressed disappointment with the timing and duration of Obama’s visit, as the final decision is expected to take place closer to the end of the conference.

Two step approach moving forward

The current approach to Copenhagen agreed to by APEC leaders – and later backed by the European Union – encompasses a two-step approach that includes both a strong, action-based political agreement and the promise of a comprehensive pact in the near future.

“Even if we may not hammer out the last dots of a legally binding instrument, I do believe a political binding agreement with specific commitment to mitigation and finance provides a strong basis for immediate action in the years to come,” Rasmussen said following the APEC meeting.

Rasmussen proposed the new game plan to reach a binding agreement on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, which would include a 5-8 page document with “precise language of a comprehensive political agreement,” followed by continued negotiations to be concluded preferably before the next Conference of the Parties set for December 2010 in Mexico City.

Many developing countries and climate advocates argue that the shift in goals is an attempt to save face in light of the improbability of a robust

agreement to address climate change in Copenhagen, as was initially intended.

European officials said they were not surprised with the announcement, but pushed for governments to make concrete progress at the summit, and not to treat it simply as a delay.

“We shouldn’t set the bar too low,” said Christoph Steegmans, German deputy government spokesman. “Copenhagen must become an important milestone on the way to a decisive accord next year. Nobody can shirk their responsibility.”

China announces cuts in “carbon intensity”

Political goodwill in the form of Obama’s visit to Copenhagen was followed shortly thereafter by an announcement that Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao would also make the trip to Copenhagen. As the world’s largest polluter China holds a central position in climate negotiations. Many developed countries – particularly the US – are concerned that countries like China and India will not be subjected to binding commitments, which will water down the effectiveness of any global agreement. The US and China have been undergoing bilateral talks on the issue for the past year or so and it was considered top of the agenda in President Obama’s recent visit to Beijing.

For their part, these emerging economies are looking for substantial financial incentives from the developed world to support their transitions to a ‘low carbon’ reality. The current figure often floated by China and other developing countries for financing emissions reductions is 1 percent of developed countries’ yearly gross domestic product (GDP) – a number regularly dismissed as too high by developed countries. Other experts, such as the renowned climate economist, Nicholas Stern, promote a higher 2 percent level of support, arguing that it is worth the certainty of achieving climate goals, economically feasible, and cost effective in the long run.

One day following the release of the US targets, China announced that it would cut its “carbon intensity” -- the amount of greenhouse gas it emits per unit of gross domestic product -- by 40-45 percent below 2005 levels by 2020. Unlike

standard emissions reduction targets, which aim to reduce overall emissions, the Chinese plan aims to slow the rate at which emissions grow.

It is not yet clear when the Chinese Premier will make his appearance in Copenhagen.

A meeting of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) taking place from 27-29 November in Trinidad will also attempt to produce a strong statement on climate change ahead of Copenhagen. The meeting is unusual due to the presence of other world leaders – including UN chief Ban Ki-moon, French President Nicolas Sarkozy and Danish Prime Minister Lars Rasmussen – who are meant to help move the climate change agenda forward.

“It could be a springboard for a successful Copenhagen,” said British Prime Minister Gordon Brown. “It will prove the worth of the Commonwealth, that we can bring together countries to work together for a common solution.”

ICTSD Reporting; “APEC Concedes Copenhagen Climate Treaty Out of Reach,” BLOOMBERG, 16 November 2009; “Obama damps hopes for final treaty on climate change at Copenhagen,” FINANCIAL TIMES, 16 November 2009; “Obama renews climate pledge,” FINANCIAL TIMES, 17 November 2009; “Denmark seeks specific pledges at climate talks,” AP, 17 November 2009; “China, U.S. Square Off on Climate Proposals,” THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, 27 November 2009, “Obama Will Go to Copenhagen,” THE NEW YORK TIMES, 25 November 2009.

SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE

World Food Summit Falls Short of Expectations

The World Summit on Food Security in Rome brought together 60 heads of state and scores of representatives from intergovernmental organisations to address the needs of the nearly 1 billion people around the world who suffer from undernourishment. The summit aimed to revitalise the United Nations Committee on Food Security and confront the global challenges of feeding the world's hungry, but the official declaration that emerged from the meeting was widely criticised as unsubstantial.

The meeting, which lasted from 16 to 18 November, was hosted by the UN Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), which is based in Rome.

At the close of the three-day summit, FAO Director-General Jacques Diouf, who had kicked off the summit with a fast to demonstrate solidarity with the hungry, voiced regret that the officials had failed to agree to "targets or deadlines that would permit better monitoring and implementation."

Early drafts of the summit declaration aimed to eliminate hunger completely by 2025, an acknowledgement of the challenges facing Millennium Development Goal (MDG) to halve hunger by 2015. But the final summit declaration, issued shortly after the meeting began on Monday, simply reinforced commitments to the MDG on food security.

The question of how to revitalise the UN Committee on Food Security (CFS) took centre stage. The summit declaration made the CFS a 'central component' of a 'Global Partnership for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition' to coordinate international governance on food security. However, questions about funding, monitoring and implementation remain unresolved.

Olivier De Schutter the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, noted that past approaches solve hunger had failed due to the "absence of accountability and follow-up on commitments made summit after summit."

Representatives of NGOs present in Rome for the meeting voiced disappointment, pointing out that rich country heads of state had not attended the summit, and that the outcome had left many questions hanging.

"The summit didn't give the CFS money, made no commitments, or ability to monitor," Matt Grainger of the NGO Oxfam told the BioRes. "The summit sanctioned the CFS to address global governance on hunger but didn't give it any of the tools."

Food and climate change

Addressing the summit, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon cautioned participants that "food security and climate change are deeply interconnected" and that there could be "no food security without climate security."

The theme, woven through his speech, called attention to the upcoming climate change conference in Copenhagen and the need to work with intergovernmental organisations, the private sector, and civil society to help realise the right to food.

Moon's words were also echoed in the WSFS declaration, as well as in a declaration that emerged from a civil society summit that was held in parallel to the FAO-sponsored gathering. The NGOs called for an "ecological model of food provision," while the FAO summit participants agreed that "climate change poses additional severe risks to food security and the agriculture sector."

Agricultural trade

Trade was low on the agenda at the summit and only featured as a component of one of the round table discussions. The summit declaration addressed the issue in two paragraphs and called for a 'timely, ambitious, comprehensive and balanced conclusion' to the WTO's Doha Round

of trade talks. The declaration also commits signatories to refrain from taking measures that have “adverse impacts on global, regional and national food security” and that are “inconsistent with WTO rules.”

But Oxfam’s Grainger challenged the principle of that clause, noting that even if a trade measure is WTO-consistent, it could still pose a threat another country’s food security.

Other NGOs pointed out that the summit statement fails to address the role that developed country subsidies and market access barriers play in shaping global agricultural production and trade. Alexandra Spieldoch of the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy noted that the “WTO seemed very secondary” at the Summit and that the officials had shown a “misunderstanding the current failure of the food system.”

“This is a moment to rethink the model” of agricultural production, Spieldoch said, adding that three years’ worth of calls for urgent action have not yet yielded sufficient results.

More information

The FAO summit declaration is available here http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/wsfs/Summit/Docs/Final_Declaration/WSFS09_Declaration.pdf

The NGO summit declaration is available here http://peoplesforum2009.foodsovereignty.org/final_declarations

ICTSD reporting.

SPECIAL SECTION: COPENHAGEN COUNTDOWN

In the lead-up to the UNFCCC’s 15th Conference of the Parties, each issue of Bridges Trade BioRes will feature background and analysis on key issues facing negotiators as they prepare for December’s meeting in Copenhagen. The following two articles focus on the ongoing debate over how to finance countries’ efforts to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to a changing climate and discussions on climate technologies and financing, respectively.

Climate Change Financing

Meeting the challenges that climate change poses to both developed and developing countries will require enormous and costly structural changes. Securing new and effective financing for climate change adaptation and mitigation is critical to any global agreement reached in Copenhagen, and in most countries, meeting the costs and absorbing external financing will require major fiscal reordering. These changes, which would be difficult and costly for any country to undertake, pose particular challenges to developing countries.

Precisely because climate change is caused by emissions from a broad spectrum of economic activities, efforts to address it will impact the way goods and services are produced and traded around the globe. Furthermore, the inevitable impacts of a changing climate imply vast social and ecological implications, especially in the most vulnerable areas of the world like the least developed countries (LDCs) and the small islands developing states (SIDS). For these countries, effective and predictable sources of funding are fundamental to helping their economies such as to mitigate climate change while adapting to impacts or, in the worst of cases, responding to disasters.

Estimates of the total global costs of mitigating greenhouse gas emissions and adapting to the changing climate vary widely from source to source, yet all of the figures are head-spinning. According to the 2009 World Development Report published this month, between US\$ 140 billion and US\$175 billion will be needed annually to help developing countries implement the mitigation measures that would be needed to

prevent the world from warming more than 2°C. Notably, up-front investments will need to be even greater, as the economic savings associated with energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources only appear over time. McKinsey & Company, the global consulting firm, estimates that an extra US\$ 563 billion above and beyond business-as-usual investments will be needed to jump-start the process (McKinsey 2009).

Current financing for both mitigation and adaptation falls far short of such estimates, amounting to less than 5 percent of the projected requirements. But political promises from developed countries in recent weeks indicate that the tide may be shifting. Aside from individual country statements, the G8 and the G20 have stressed that financing for climate change is a top priority.

Financing top of the agenda for the Copenhagen outcome

This past week, heads of state and government at the APEC Summit backed the Danish Prime Minister, Lars Løkke Rasmussen, in signalling that Copenhagen will produce a 'political agreement' in lieu of the legally binding treaty that was originally expected, with a possible treaty emerging after continued negotiations (see related story, this issue). With the two largest emitters and a solid regional block leaning in this direction, any major variation of this scenario is highly unlikely. However, US President Barack Obama was quick to clarify this week that the Copenhagen meeting should result in an "accord that covers all of the issues in the negotiations and one that has immediate operational effect." The question remains: what will Copenhagen produce, and how far can the outcome go to set the objectives of the forthcoming treaty?

Two issues have emerged as top priorities in the talks: financing and mitigation. The two topics are deeply linked. Stronger mitigation will both avert climate impacts and reduce the costs of adaptation, but, at the same time, greater mitigation measures will require greater funding. Mitigating emissions is particularly complicated for countries that are concurrently struggling with basic development needs such as access to water,

health care, education, and civil strife. The same goes for adaptation costs in such countries.

Sourcing financial support

Identifying sources of financing has been one focus of the climate negotiations. Countries recognise that developed countries will need to provide new and additional financial resources, but they continue to disagree over how such sources can be made reliable and sufficient. Many developing countries assert that financing for climate change - and especially for adaptation - should come primarily from the public sector. But most rich countries counter that public monies should only be used to leverage the much greater levels of financing that are available in the private sector.

Officials also continue to debate whether climate financing should be bundled into overseas development assistance (ODA) or kept strictly separate. Proponents of the former stress the efficiency of using existing institutions and the apparent overlap of objectives and activities. Opponents assert that the intermingling of ODA and climate funds will result in less per-country financing for each objective, that current institutions already struggle to deliver finance effectively, and that ODA decision-making is an inherently unbalanced process.

According to the OECD, the total volume of private investment flows that aim to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions is between six and ten times larger than the amount of public money devoted to the same cause. Further exploration of how to catalyse foreign direct investment (FDI) to help finance the climate fight is critical. According to the OECD, FDI to developing countries amounted to US\$ 259 billion between 2003 and 2005. However, 54 percent of those funds were directed to activities that are not relevant for climate change mitigation. Likewise, less than a quarter of bilateral overseas development assistance commitments between 2003 and 2007 were directed to mitigation-relevant activities in developing countries.

In addition to the broad discussion on where the funding will come from, the climate financing negotiations are also considering proposals on a

variety of issues, including a possible uniform global levy on CO₂ emissions (LDCs would be exempted); levies on international aviation and maritime transport, except for journeys from or to LDCs; how to use the proceeds generated by the Clean Development Mechanism and emissions trading; and possible external debt swap/relief for sustainable development in developing countries. These proposals are under discussion and will require substantial time for refinement and agreement.

Maximising opportunities for resilience

Another potential source of funding - and one that has not received much attention in the global climate talks - is the WTO's Aid for Trade initiative. Aid for Trade is a development assistance approach that has emerged from the WTO's Doha Round of trade negotiations. The initiative is intended to help developing countries take advantage of trade opportunities while strengthening their ability to fight for their interests in trade negotiations. It includes measures such as trade negotiation capacity building, infrastructure and marketing development, and ultimately is intended to help build economic resilience, particularly in LDCs and small and vulnerable economies. Notably, these countries, along with Small Island Developing States, are at the greatest risk for climate change impacts and require the greatest and swiftest adaptation support.

Because Aid for Trade and climate change financing address many of the same objectives, the two instruments could be conceived and implemented in a coherent and supportive manner. Specifically, climate change adaptation objectives could be targeted in two major Aid for Trade sub-categories: economic infrastructure and building productive capacity. Within economic infrastructure, adaptation projects could play a major role in transport and storage, as well as in energy supply and generation. Within building productive capacity, the agriculture and fisheries industries represent key sectors that are relevant from the perspective of economic resilience and climate change.

In this sense, officials could bolster climate financing by streamlining it with 'Aid for Trade'

activities that are ongoing in many developing countries.

Governing finance

Another key issue in the current discussions is how financing will be governed. Among other questions, officials are debating the institutional structures for delivery and the question of direct access for recipient countries. The negotiations have already narrowed options significantly, but differences remain over many of the details of what a financial architecture for climate change should look like. One key discussion relates to the monitoring of funds, referred to as "monitoring, reporting, and verifying" or MRV. The question cuts both ways, as some parties wish to create a system that increases certainty about the delivery of adequate funds from developed countries, while others wish to ensure that whoever uses those funds will be held accountable.

Key issues and concerns for SIDS, LDCs, and Small and Vulnerable Economies

Constructing and strengthening institutional capacities in LDCs will also be fundamental to addressing pressing climate challenges. LDCs like Malawi and Tanzania are currently struggling to fill critical posts and create effective financial mechanisms to support their climate efforts. Moreover, National Adaptation Plans of Action (NAPAs) and their implications in both countries are not well understood at the regional and local levels, and the two countries' national budgets seem to neglect to provide any funds for climate change.

ICTSD reporting.

Technology and Finance

Governments around the world will need to access and implement a host of new technologies to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the changing climate. But whether countries, especially poor countries, will be able to harness those technologies largely hinges on whether climate negotiators will be able to

establish mechanisms to make those products readily available - and useable.

The development and transfer of clean-energy technologies, with the support of adequate financing, has the potential to multiply countries' emissions reductions. Such technologies have the added benefit of fuelling economic and social development by increasing investment flows and enhancing countries' capacity to develop and use technologies. As many rich-country politicians have stressed, massive investments in new climate tech can create new jobs in 'green' manufacturing and services.

If developing countries can gain access to both climate technologies and climate financing, they will be better equipped to both address climate change and promote sustainable development at home. Indeed, the potential synergies between technology and financing have been front and centre in the negotiations of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Although a legally binding deal is no longer expected to emerge from next month's meeting in Copenhagen, technology and financing will no doubt be major elements of the political agreement that is likely to emerge from the conference. Details will be further elaborated in future negotiations towards a legal treaty, when the time comes.

Technology - making it happen

Developing countries' access to and 'uptake' of mitigation and adaptation technologies will require a broad array of support systems. In particular, regulatory and financial policy tools are important first steps to ensuring that technologies and financing are delivered effectively and equitably. In the context of the UNFCCC negotiations, countries have called specifically for the establishment of funds, mechanisms, and plans that 'enhance enabling environments' for climate technologies, including technology-specific policies and measures that generate adaptation or mitigation benefits.

Recent studies show that regulations and fiscal incentives can play an important role in creating markets for renewable energy and may in fact be more important than tariffs in affecting trade

flows for a number of renewable energy goods. Thus, any tariff reductions on 'environmental goods' - like solar energy collectors and hydrogen fuel cells - will need to be supplemented by regulatory and fiscal policies that can help build markets for those products.

The role of international assistance in creating such an 'enabling environment' is particularly significant for developing countries, which may not yet have the resources or institutional capacity to do so on their own. Such assistance could come in the form of soft loans or financial incentives, including for research and development, which could help leverage private capital flows. (See section on financing below.)

In addition to finance and technology through the market-based mechanisms, parties have also put forward proposals that would aim to directly spur technology transfer and development. Some of these proposals - especially those on environmentally sustainable technologies (ESTs) - are strikingly similar to requests that have been made in the ongoing WTO negotiations on environmental goods and services (EGS).

One specific proposal in the climate talks, for example, would provide financial support through the UNFCCC to help developing countries build new EST manufacturing facilities fitted out with low-GHG emission technologies. Another relates to the creation of a 'technology mechanism' to accelerate the development, adoption and transfer of environmentally sound technologies. Both of these proposals directly echo demands that a number of developing countries have made in the EGS negotiations at the WTO. In those talks, poorer countries have stressed that they will need help building their supply-side capacities for EGS, and that the transfer of technology must be one of the outcomes of the EGS negotiations.

Speaking informally, some delegates have pointed out that technology transfer and diffusion can only be meaningfully operationalised outside the WTO. At least as far as climate change is concerned, the UNFCCC certainly appears to be the forum where discussions have been most advanced. Meanwhile, WTO members are still haggling over how to give shape to a deal on technology transfer. Broader discussions on the

issue have been going on within a Working Group on Technology Transfer, but critics say that the group has failed to deliver meaningful results.

Another trade issue — the development and application of international standards and testing procedures — has also arisen in the climate discussions, with notable links to WTO rules. Draft UNFCCC negotiating text includes proposals for countries to “...participate, to the extent possible, in international programmes that support the development and use of common performance standards, testing, verification and certification programmes.” Such standards and testing procedures are particularly important with regard to trade in energy-efficient products. Standards that do not conform to the procedures set out in the WTO’s Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) could be considered illegal non-tariff barriers. The language in the UNFCCC text has echoes of Article 2.4 in the TBT Agreement, which calls on members to base their national standards on international ones, with some limited exceptions.

Financing is key

Financing will play a critical role in helping developing countries make use of any new technologies they might gain through a global climate deal. Proposals in the UNFCCC negotiations address this question by, for example, suggesting that the UNFCCC provide financial support to cover technology-related incremental costs borne by developing countries, including research and development and patent-related costs.

Another particularly constructive proposal in the draft text on financing would establish a global fund to support a global ‘feed-in tariff’ programme. Financing for feed-in tariffs in developing countries would more readily incentivise utilities and consumers to switch to renewable energy sources. Many countries and regions have already carried out national- or state-level versions of such a programme. Recent research by Jha (2009) indicates that feed-in tariffs are particularly important in the creation of a market for renewable energy.

The Kyoto Protocol’s Clean Development Mechanism provides a telling example that can offer lessons for future offset and technology transfer initiatives. The CDM is a flexibility mechanism that allows developed countries to offset their Kyoto-based emissions commitments by purchasing carbon credits from developing countries. These credits are created from new carbon reduction projects that typically involve the purchase and introduction of new technologies for the sector in question.

During recent climate negotiations, Argentina pointed out that its most significant barrier to developing CDM projects has been a lack of access to up-front investment finance. Private sector investment specialists point out that investment naturally flows to the projects with the largest mitigation potential; this is the ultimate objective of the offset mechanism, they say. However, as the CDM is the UNFCCC’s only source of finance and technology, and as offset mechanisms will certainly play a significant role in a future regime, it is critical that a wide range of countries be able to make use of the mechanism.

To address such concerns, some parties have suggested engaging the business and financial sectors by providing national-level incentives to mobilise private capital. Such incentives could come in the form of concessional loans, risk guarantees, tax exemptions or subsidies for the owners of patented environmental technologies who willingly make their products available to developing countries. Notably, this recommendation has echoes of Article 66.2 of the WTO’s Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property, which states that rich country members “shall provide” incentives for domestic businesses to “promote and encourage” technology transfer to least developed countries. Critics note that Article 66.2 has yet to be meaningfully operationalised. It is possible, however, that the gravity of the climate crisis could act as a catalyst for the effective implementation of both the WTO and UNFCCC commitments.

ICTSD reporting.

IN BRIEF

**Environmentalists Say ICCAT Cuts
are Insufficient**

The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) – the organisation in charge of regulating the bluefin tuna industry – adopted new measures aimed at stabilising Atlantic bluefin tuna stocks at their annual meeting in Recife, Brazil. But despite the new efforts, environmental groups say ICCAT's efforts are still not enough to save the species.

Earlier this year, Monaco made a proposal to list bluefin tuna under Appendix I in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 5 October 2009, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/biores/56863/>). The proposal, currently backed by the US, would effectively place a ban on all international commercial trade of the species. Environmental groups also supported this initiative, claiming that the ICCAT has failed in the past to protect bluefin tuna stocks (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 16 October 2009, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/biores/57013/>).

ICCAT scientists announced at the meeting that if catches were to fall below 15,000 tonnes a year, this would provide a 60 percent probability that the bluefin tuna stock would recover by 2023. With this in mind, Japan – the world's largest importer of the giant tuna – and major fishing nations in the EU opposing greater quota cuts, ICCAT reduced the total allowable catch from 22,000 tonnes in 2009 to 13,500 tonnes for 2010. This measure was accompanied by a decrease in the fishing season by one month for purse seiners and improved mechanisms for the evaluation of Parties' control efforts.

Joe Borg, European Fisheries Commissioner, supported the group's decision, "admittedly, ICCAT had a very tough task this year, but it has risen to the challenge."

But environmental groups have challenged these provisions, pointing to a study presented during

the ICCAT meeting showing that even a stringently enforced 8,000 tonne quota would only have a 50 percent possibility of stock recovery by 2023. "It is a decrease and that's nice, but it's not going to recover the species," noted Susan Lieberman, director of international policy for Pew Environment Group.

"This reduction of allowable catch is not based on any particular scientific advice to recover the stock with high probability – it is just an arbitrary political measure," said Sergi Tudela, Head of Fisheries at WWF Mediterranean. "Now more than ever WWF sees a global trade ban as the only hope for Atlantic bluefin."

CITES will consider Monaco's proposal to list bluefin tuna as an endangered species at the organisations next Conference of the Parties, which will take place in March 2010 in Doha, Qatar.

ICTSD Reporting; "Tuna's Death Spiral," THE NEW YORK TIMES, 21 November 2009; "Fishing Body Agrees To Cut In Atlantic Tuna Quota," REUTERS, 18 November 2009; "Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Quota Cut, Conservationists Urge Trade Ban," ENVIRONMENT NEWS SERVICE, 17 November 2009; "Atlantic bluefin trade ban now vital as tuna commission fails to take action again," WWF, 15 November 2009.

**New Study Claims Sulphur
Emissions Cuts Could Accelerate
Global Warming**

Sulphur dioxide emissions from bunker fuels used in ships have helped to decelerated the rate of climate change, a new study suggests. However, the authors caution that due to its harmful effects of sulphur on human health, the use sulphur in shipping emissions to promote 'climate cooling' is not be advisable.

Jan Fuglestad, of the Center for International Climate and Environmental Research Oslo (CICERO), said that "so far shipping has caused a cooling effect that has slowed down global warming."

Releasing sulphur dioxide into the atmosphere allows for the creation of clouds by supplying tiny seeds around which water droplets form. Sunlight then bounces off of the white tops of these clouds, resulting in a cooling effect.

Some scientists have proposed releasing sulphur in the upper atmosphere in order to shelter the Earth from sunlight and slow global warming. This has been one of many suggestions for deliberate 'geoengineering' to adjust the climate system. Nevertheless, scientists have warned against such methods, calling attention to the health risks to humans involved in sulphur pollution.

According to a previous study, in 2001 toxic sulphur dioxide produced by burning bunker fuel, used in aviation and shipping, accounted for the deaths of roughly 60,000 people around the world. The study linked the pollutant to cancer and heart and lung disease and said that a cut in sulphur emissions would have a positive effect on human health.

Other scientists have argued that decreasing sulphur pollution from ships would result in a 'double warming' effect: less pollution allows more sunlight to reach the planet's surface resulting in a rise in carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions. Since shipping comprises approximately 3.3 percent of global (CO₂) emissions already, the UN Climate Panel says an increase in this pollutant would trigger more floods, rising sea levels, heat waves, droughts, and disease.

Fuglestad's study conversely argues that it would take some 70 years for the shipping industry to evolve into a net contributor to global warming if sulphur dioxide emissions were immediately reduced by 90 percent, with all other fuel-related emissions remaining at 2000 levels.

The International Maritime Organisation (IMO) is seeking a reduction in the sulphur content of bunker fuel to a maximum of 3.5 percent by 2012, followed by a further decrease to 0.5 percent by 2020. Participants in the UN climate summit in Copenhagen in December will also deliberate over new measures to penalise CO₂ emissions in both the international aviation and shipping industries.

ICTSD Reporting; "Curbs To Ship Pollution Would Stoke Global Warming, Study Says," REUTERS, 23 November 2009.

GM Crops Cause Dramatic Increase in US Pesticide Use: Report

The growing popularity of genetically modified (GM) corn, soybeans, and cotton has triggered an increase in pesticide use, a dramatic emergence of herbicide-resistant weeds, and a rise in the amount of chemical residues found in food, according to a new report published on Tuesday by US-based groups the Organic Center, the Union for Concerned Scientists, and the Center for Food Safety.

The report found that there was an additional use of 174 million kg (383 million lbs) of herbicide between 1996 – when the first biotech crops were released – and 2008. The rate of increase has spiked in recent years, shifting from a drop of 1 to 2 percent in the first four years of biotech crop use, to a 20 percent increase in 2007, and a 27 percent rise in 2008, the report said.

The groups pointed out that the use of insecticide has actually dropped by 64 million pounds since 1996, due to the introduction of GM corn and cotton, yet over the same period pesticide use has jumped by 318 million pounds. The group classifies herbicides, insecticides, and fungicides as types of pesticides.

This rise in herbicide use was caused by the introduction of crops that have been engineered to tolerate higher levels of weed killer, the study authors say. The most popular of these crops are the 'Roundup Ready' seeds produced by GM seed producer Monsanto. The seeds are known for their resistance to 'Roundup' brand herbicide.

"Herbicide resistance crops are incredibly popular with farmers. They help them manage their weed problems in ways traditional crops don't," said Mike Wach, managing director of science and regulatory affairs at the Biotechnology Industry Organization, of which Monsanto is a member.

The biggest impact of a rise in herbicides is the epidemic of herbicide-resistant weeds, which can damage crops and farming equipment, the report concludes. The authors explain that to get rid of these weeds, farmers must either spray more herbicide at an increasing rate or manually weed them out, the former being by far the most common method of elimination. In US cotton fields, some herbicide-resistant weed infestations have been so drastic that farmers have been forced to abandon cropland or hoe the weeds by hand.

“With glyphosate-resistant weeds now infesting millions of acres, farmers face rising costs coupled with sometimes major yield losses, and the environmental impact of weed management systems will surely rise,” said Charles Benbrook, chief scientist of The Organic Center.

The groups also criticised the high prices of GM seeds. The report found that GM corn would be almost three times more expensive than conventional seeds by 2010, and that newer, more enhanced biotech soybeans will cost 42 percent more than the original biotech soybeans. Biotech industries claim the higher prices are justified by the fact that the seeds bring farmers numerous side benefits.

The report predicts that GM corn, soybean, and cotton planted over the next five to 10 years will, “pose unique resistance management, crop health, food safety, and environmental risks. [Herbicide-tolerant] crops will continue to drive herbicide use up sharply, and those increases in the years ahead will continue to dwarf the reductions in insecticide use on [GM] crop acres.”

“This may be profitable for the biotech/pesticide companies, but it's bad news for farmers, human health and the environment,” said Bill Freese, science policy analyst for the Center for Food Safety.

Additional information

The study can be found here:
<http://tinyurl.com/y8hz457>

ICTSD Reporting; “Biotech crops cause big jump in pesticide use: report,” REUTERS, 17

November 2009; “GM crops causing a rise in pesticide use in US,” ECOLOGIST, 17 November 2009.

Lobby Group Opposes Proposed Changes to Green Technology Patents

As the UN climate change conference in Copenhagen draws nearer, developing countries are pushing for measures on flexibilities and exceptions in intellectual property rights to ensure greater access to green technology. But a new industry-sponsored study suggests that such a move would be detrimental to the European green job market.

Countries such as China and India argue that, because of their history, developed countries should bear the burden of climate change adaptation. In addition to providing financing for adapting industry to a new green reality, new green technologies should be subject to an expanded use of existing flexibilities in the implementation of intellectual property rights including resorting to ‘compulsory licensing’, they say. Under compulsory licensing, a government can authorize the use of patented technology by third parties without the consent of right holder but with appropriate compensation,.

Such a licensing system has been used in the health area where, for example, a particular life saving drugs is prohibitively expensive.

But critics of the current proposal say that applying the same concept to climate change technology could jeopardise millions of jobs in the developed world that focus on research and production of green technology.

"Our study clearly indicates that involuntary measures, such as compulsory licensing and other anti-IP efforts, will hinder the EU's ability to reinvigorate its economy, create jobs, and lead the world in green technologies," said Michael Taylor of the Coalition for Innovation, Employment, and Development (CIED) – a Geneva-based industry coalition.

The CIED paper asserts that a strong intellectual property (IP) system will support the development of green technologies and the creation of over 2 million jobs in the EU over the next 20 years. The report strongly urges a position of solely financial assistance for developing countries with regard to climate change technology transfer.

Taylor said that the business community is in need of a predictable intellectual property environment in order to plan research and development investments, he said. Giving technologies to developing countries must not be an option, he added.

A similar position exists across the Atlantic, where the US Chamber of Commerce is reported to be ramping up its efforts to ensure that climate change negotiations don't undermine IPRs in relation to environmentally sound technologies (ESTs). The lobby group says it is concerned that UN climate change negotiations will erode the position of corporations holding patents on existing and future technologies.

For their part, developing countries argue that the scale and urgency of the climate change challenges requires exceptional measures to speed up technology diffusion to combat climate change, including through ensuring that the intellectual property system is made supportive of such efforts, including by the use of exceptions and flexibilities.

Climate change issues will be discussed at length at the 12th EU-China Summit, which will take place on 30 November in Nanjing, China. The UNFCCC's 15th Conference of the Parties gets underway on 7 December in Copenhagen, Denmark.

More information

The CIED report can be accessed here: <http://tinyurl.com/yfpxe23>.

ICTSD Reporting; "China, India push for 'patent free' green tech," EURACTIVE, 23 November 2009.

Chile to Restrict Salmon Roe Imports

The Chilean National Fisheries Service says it will present a letter to the WTO next month which will outline the country's plans to restrict imports of salmon roe from countries with pancreas disease, a fatal viral disease in salmon that can threaten salmon roe supplies.

Currently, only 20 percent of salmon roe used in Chile's local industry is imported – mostly from Denmark, Scotland, Canada, and Norway. However, after Norway had uncovered outbreaks of the disease in over 100 municipalities in 2008, the Chilean government decided to set in place precautionary measures that would halt the entry of salmon roe within its borders. Chile says it will soon release a report that denies the presence of pancreas disease in the country. For now, it is also overseeing salmon farming centres and ports.

Chile's salmon industry has struggled against outbreaks of infectious salmon anaemia (ISA) virus since 2007 and, as such, is anxious to keep other diseases out of the country.

"The sector is very weak in sanitary and financial terms, were a new disease to appear, it could be the end of the Chilean salmon farming industry," reports the national Chilean newspaper, *La Tercera*.

Felix Inostroza, director of Chile's National Fisheries Service, said that the department's study will allow the country to block imports of salmon roe. But the country must first notify the WTO of its plans to comply with trade rules and avoid accusations of applying para-tariff measures on salmon exporting countries.

While the Chilean government is working on limiting imports from nations with the illness, Inostroza also said that "it is necessary to negotiate, for perhaps there are countries with [pancreas disease] that have disease-free areas."

ICTSD Reporting; "Salmon roe import restriction adopted," FIS SWITZERLAND, 23 November 2009.

EVENTS AND RESOURCES

Events

For a more comprehensive list of events for the trade and environment community visit the BioRes online calendar, <http://ictsd.net/news/biores/events/>.

Coming up in the next two weeks (27 November – 11 December)

30 November-2 December, Geneva, Switzerland. SEVENTH WTO MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE. Under the general theme, “The WTO, the Multilateral Trading System and the Current Global Economic Environment,” this session will be a regular gathering of the Ministers to engage in a broader evaluation of the functioning of the multilateral trading system and the future of the Doha Round. Organisers say the conference is not intended to be a negotiating session. The meetings will take place during a fixed three-day period with an emphasis on transparency and open discussion rather than on small group processes and informal negotiating structures. For more information, visit: http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min09_e/min09_e.htm

30 November - 2 December, Geneva, Switzerland. GENEVA TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT SYMPOSIUM. ICTSD is organising the Geneva Trade and Development Symposium (GTDS), to take place over 3 days in parallel to the Seventh Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organisation. The three broad topics for the GTDS will respond to the three principal types of challenges currently facing the multilateral trading system: institutional challenges, perspectives on the Doha Round, and new issues and challenges such as climate change. The symposium will be held at the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) and will be open to all who wish to participate (however, registration is required). For more information, please see <http://www.ictsdSYMPOSIUM.org/>.

30 November-2 December, Jakarta, Indonesia. THIRD BUSINESS AND THE 2010 BIODIVERSITY CHALLENGE

CONFERENCE. This conference, held in conjunction with the UNEP Business and Industry Global Dialogue, aims to strengthen business participation in CBD processes. The overall objective of this event is to effectively engage the private sector in addressing biodiversity by stressing the link between biodiversity and core business and by highlighting best case practices, including life cycle approaches and incentive mechanisms. Ways to scale-up business engagement on biodiversity issues and develop recommendations on collaborative actions that can be undertaken will also be explored. An additional goal is to identify opportunities for key partnerships or international initiatives between the business community and biodiversity organisations that would further support mainstreaming. For more information, contact the organisers: tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; email: secretariat@cbd.int; internet: <http://www.cbd.int/business3/>

2-4 December, Munich, Germany. EUROPEAN GEOTHERMAL ENERGY COUNCIL. In partnership with the European Geothermal Energy Council (EGEC), this conference will discuss the use of geothermal power from established countries - such as Italy and Iceland - to emerging markets - including Turkey, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic and Greece. With speakers from across Europe, this international conference will bring together project developers, investors, legislators, utilities, service companies and advisors to discuss the legislative and financial hurdles preventing quicker uptake of geothermal power across the continent. For more information, contact the organisers: email: laura.brownie@greenpowerconferences.com; internet: <http://www2.greenpowerconferences.co.uk/>

7-9 December, Istanbul, Turkey. WIND POWER TURKEY: DRIVING WIND POWER DEVELOPMENT FORWARD IN TURKEY AND SOUTHEAST EUROPE. This event will examine the current and future wind power markets in Turkey and the Southeast Europe (SEE) region, with an in-depth analysis and country case studies. The event will discuss recent technological advances in wind power development, how the latest government

incentives, subsidies and tax credits are attracting investment, policy frameworks in Turkey and SEE, and the challenges of transmission and land use. For more information, contact Nick Chantrell: tel: +44-(0)203-355-4203; email: nick.chantrell@greenpowerconferences.com; internet: <http://www2.greenpowerconferences.co.uk/v8-12/Prospectus/Index.php?sEventCode=WE0911TR>

7-18 December, Copenhagen, Denmark. UNFCCC COP 15 AND KYOTO PROTOCOL COP/MOP 5. These meetings, the fifteenth Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC and fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, are expected to finalise an agreement on a framework for combating climate change post-2012 (when the Kyoto Protocol's first commitment period ends). For more information, contact the UNFCCC Secretariat: tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: secretariat@unfccc.int; internet: <http://unfccc.int/>

7-18 December, Copenhagen, Denmark: ICTSD at UNFCCC COP 15. ICTSD is organising several events in parallel to the official negotiations at the climate change conference in Copenhagen, to take place over 2 weeks. ICTSD has chosen topics for its activities that are critical challenges currently facing the climate negotiations, such as the diffusion of climate-friendly technology, competitiveness, agriculture, bunker fuels, and developing countries' concerns. ICTSD's activities will be held at the official conference venue (the Bella Centre) and nearby facilities. ICTSD welcomes all who wish to participate (however, for some, registration in advance is required). For more information, please see <http://ictsd.org/climate-change/ictsds-activities-in-copenhagen/>

10-11 December, Istanbul, Turkey. SOLAR TURKEY: OUTLOOK ON TURKISH SOLAR PROJECTS, EXPANSION, AND INNOVATION PROGRAMMES. In recent years, the Turkish government has engaged itself in a thorough review and reassessment of its renewable energy infrastructures. Stemming from Turkey's capacity to efficiently produce solar energy, solar experts will gather at this conference

to discuss the potential of the solar market and its effect on Turkey's recovering economy, Turkey's upcoming legislation on renewable energy, infrastructure project financing, and solar manufacturing and research. For more information, contact William Todd: tel: +9714-813-5211; fax: +44-207-900-1853; email: william.t@greenpowerconferences.com; internet: <http://www2.greenpowerconferences.co.uk/>

Other Upcoming Events:

14-18 December, Geneva, Switzerland. EXECUTIVE BODY FOR THE CONVENTION ON LONG-RANGE TRANSBOUNDARY AIR POLLUTION (CLRTAP). The goal of CLRTAP is to protect the human environment by gradually reducing and preventing air pollution, including long-range transboundary air pollution. At this meeting, parties aim to review and revise past protocols, such as the Protocols on Persistent Organic Pollutants and Heavy Metals, and implementing these new changes. The work plan for the coming year will be discussed and current projects will be assessed. The secretariat will also report on relevant activities of bodies of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). For more information, contact Margaret Muindi: email: magaret.muindi@unece.org; internet: <http://www.unece.org/env/lrtap/ExecutiveBody/welcome.27.html>

5-7 February 2010, New Delhi, India. DELHI SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT SUMMIT (DSDS 2010): BEYOND COPENHAGEN: NEW PATHWAYS TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. This global forum will be one of the first major gatherings of leaders from various regions of the world after the Copenhagen Conference of the Parties in December 2009. DSDS 2010 will focus on the formulation and delineation of strategies to move the sustainable development agenda forward. Major themes include: accelerating socio-economic development as a key to adaptation, role of technology, building institutions for effective climate governance, and financing opportunities post Copenhagen. For more information, contact the Summit Secretariat: tel: +91-11-2468-2100; fax: +91-11-2468-2144;

email: dsds@teri.res.in; internet: <http://dsds.teriin.org/2010/index.php>

24-26 February 2010, Bali, Indonesia. 11TH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UNEP GOVERNING COUNCIL/GLOBAL MINISTERIAL ENVIRONMENT FORUM. In pursuance of General Assembly resolution 53/242 (Report of the Secretary-General on environment and human settlements) of 28 July 1999, 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. For more information, contact Jamil Ahmad: email: jamil.ahmad@unep.org; internet: http://www.unep.org/ecalendar/contents/details_view.asp?EventID=2079

18-29 October 2010, Nagoya, Japan. CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY TENTH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES (CBD COP 10). This event will allow all parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity to meet and discuss further implementation of the Protocol. In order to evaluate current progress, participants will develop a Revised Strategic Plan (including a biodiversity target and indicators), a Global Strategy for Planet Conservation, and a strategy for resource mobilisation. Moreover, this meeting will be used to consider in-depth issues such as inland water biodiversity, marine and coastal biodiversity, mountain diversity, protected areas, sustainable use of biodiversity, and the effects of climate change on biodiversity. Other topics that will be considered for discussion are agricultural and forest biodiversity, invasive alien species, biofuels and biodiversity, the Global Taxonomy Initiative, and incentive measures. For more information, contact the Secretariat: tel: +81-52-972-7778; fax: +81-52-972-7822; email: aichi-nagoya@cop15.jp; internet: <http://www.cbd.int/cop10/>

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 BioRes staff to Andrew Aziz at aaziz@ictsd.ch.

HAVE YOUR PRODUCTS BEEN LEGALLY PRODUCED? World Business Council for Sustainable Development and World Resources Institute. November 2009. This brochure is a reaction to recent amendments in the EU and the US, which require verification that imported or traded forest products have been legally produced. The sponsoring organisations have compiled excerpts from the report *Sustainable Procurement of Wood and Paper-based Products: Guide and Resource Kit* in order to inform the public about illegal logging and how to avoid it. The brochure contends that between 8 and 10 percent of global wood production is estimated to be illegal, much of it used domestically. Despite this, a considerable amount still enters the international market as raw materials or finished products. The organisers also maintain that international logging takes place in some countries where weak governance and corruption are problems. To access this brochure, visit:

http://www.wbcsd.org/DocRoot/eWJmEixWpXODbC6Yx5uJ/Legality_excerpts_brochure.pdf

CAPPING UNUSUALLY HIGH TARIFFS: THE WTO DOHA ROUND AND 'TARIFF PEAKS'. The International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development. November 2009. This information note examines the proposed tariff cap and what this would mean for countries with extremely high tariffs. The tariff peaks of Iceland, Japan, Norway and Switzerland are examined in closer detail. For more information, please see <http://ictsd.org/i/publications/60731/>. Connect with the ICTSD Agriculture Programme for the most relevant information on agricultural trade. [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#). Or join the [email list](#).

RISK RELOADED: RISK ANALYSIS OF GENETICALLY ENGINEERED PLANTS WITHIN THE EUROPEAN UNION. Testbiotech e.V. (Institute for Independent Impact Assessment in Biotechnology). October 2009. This is a report on the risk assessment procedure for genetically engineered (GE) plants in the EU. It claims that the current guidelines are insufficient for reliable risk assessment due to substantial loopholes and flaws in the procedure and practice of related institutions. The authors

provide a summary of the motivations for recent doubts about the safety of GE plants while providing examples of possible inconsistencies and failures in the European Food Safety Authority's (EFSA) risk assessment. The fundamental differences between conventional cultivation and genetic engineering of plants will also be highlighted, with a focus on recent genome research. Lastly, the authors offer suggestions on how testing systems can be enhanced to generate more data on the quality and safety of GE plants. To access this report, visit: http://www.testbiotech.net/sites/default/files/risk-reloaded_engl_sc.pdf

NEW CLIMATE PROTECTIONISM: ANALYSIS OF THE TRADE MEASURES IN THE US CLIMATE BILL. South Centre: South Bulletin (40), September 2009. By Vincent Paolo Yu. To begin this article, the author claims that developed countries should ensure that national policies on climate change do not penalise developing countries. With examples from Europe and the US, examples are given of proposals to implement carbon-based taxes on the grounds that developing countries already use less costly but higher carbon emitting production methods for numerous products, making them cheaper and more competitive than similar products produced by developing countries. Specific emphasis is given to certain US policies and programs and their effects: Waxman-Markey Bill, Emission Allowance Rebate Program, and International Reserve Allowance Program. The author concludes by asserting that the measures taken by the US will have a harmful effect on the UNFCCC negotiations on the Bali Action Plan. To access this article, visit: http://www.southcentre.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1084&Itemid=279

ANALYSIS OF THE NEW WTO AGRICULTURE AND NAMA TEXTS OF 6 DECEMBER 2008. By Martin Khor (Third World Network). 2009. One of the more recent attempts to break the deadlock in the Doha Round negotiations of the WTO includes the revised draft modalities texts for agriculture and non-agricultural market access (NAMA), released in December 2008, by the chairpersons of the negotiations in these areas. This paper examines the provisions of these two texts and discovers

that they retain many of the disparities present in previous drafts and proposals which could not gain consensus among the WTO membership. The author concludes that both the agriculture and NAMA texts cater to the sensitivities of developed countries, which would experience little, if any, substantial reduction in their applied tariffs and subsidies while many developing countries would have to assume severe tariff cuts without much flexibility to safeguard their policy space for future development strategies. To access this paper, visit: <http://www.twinside.org.sg/title2/t&d/tnd37.pdf>