



Bridges Trade BioRes

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

Volume 9 • Number 22, 14 December 2009

Note to Subscribers

Bridges Copenhagen Update #2

Half-time at COP15 1

WTO Negotiations

WTO Ministerial Lifts Hopes for Doha,
but Scepticism Lingers..... 6

In Brief

Brussels Provides Numbers on
Fisheries Subsidies..... 7

Indonesia-EU Timber Talks
take Step Backward..... 8

Malaysian Biosafety Act Enters into Force..... 9

Events and Resources

Events..... 10

Resources 11

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

To subscribe to Bridges Trade BioRes or access back issues, visit 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, Melissa Fourage, Ana Maria Kleymeyer, Paige McClanahan and Damon Vis-Dunbar.

The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz.

ISSN 1682-0843

NOTE TO SUBSCRIBERS

The publication of this edition of Bridges Trade BioRes was delayed to allow for analysis of trade issues emerging from the first week of the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties in Copenhagen, Denmark. We apologise for any inconvenience.

This is the final regular issue of Bridges Trade BioRes for the year 2009. However, a final Bridges Copenhagen Update will be disseminated to subscribers on 21 December. The first issue of 2010 – Vol. 10, No. 1 – will be published on 22 January 2010. The Bridges Trade BioRes team would like to thank our readers for their interest and feedback and our funders for their invaluable assistance. We send to you all our best wishes for the holiday season and 2010.

- The Bridges Trade BioRes Team

BRIDGES COPENHAGEN UPDATE #2

This is the second in a series of three special Updates on trade and climate change issues emerging from the fifteenth UNFCCC Conference of the Parties in Copenhagen, Denmark. These updates can be accessed in several languages at the following link: <http://ictsd.org/climate-change/copenhagen-updates/>

Half-time at COP15

Tens of thousands of activists marched through the streets of Copenhagen, Denmark, this past Friday, calling on the countries of the world to take bold united action to address climate change. The mounting public pressure on the international climate conference in Copenhagen has energised governments and activists alike. The boost is welcome; heading

into Copenhagen, morale was depressingly low following a series of high-level affairs, including the G8 and G20 meetings, the widely publicised bilateral meetings between the US and China, and the APEC Summit that failed to show decisive political intention for a new—more inclusive and responsive—global climate deal.

The confirmation of over a hundred and twenty heads of state to attend the high-level segment of the conference has helped to lift spirits. However, one week into the largest climate-change conference of all time, the distance between party positions on the key issues of mitigation commitments for developed countries and financial support for developing countries, as well as an array of finer details, remains substantial.

Persisting divisions on Kyoto

Tension continues around the question of whether the Kyoto Protocol will advance into a second commitment period, as per its original mandate. Although negotiations have been underway for nearly three years on the details of a second phase beginning in 2013, after the first period ends, and despite the fervent insistence by developing countries to strengthen the Protocol, developed countries are digging their heels in on the question of their next set of cuts, arguing that this should all be part of the new deal decision.

However, without a clear end date for that 'new deal', developing countries have refused to let go of what they admit is an insufficient tool for addressing climate change. For the time being, they see the new agreement as a complement to Kyoto. Thus, many developing countries insist that if there are no advances on Kyoto, the developed world should not expect much from the new deal. Nevertheless, the political visibility of the heads of state and government will mean some kind of deal is an absolute certainty,

although its makeup and effectiveness is yet to be revealed.

Of leaks and leakage

The past week was further complicated by a proliferation of draft texts as a basis for a final agreement. The first is the draft text that parties have been building and working on over the past two years, which at one point reached 200 pages of options and proposals. On the fourth day of the meetings, the chairs of the two negotiation tracks presented two texts on their own initiative, which were met with mixed reviews. On the same day, the Africa group and the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) presented their textual proposals for the 'new agreement'. In addition, there was general knowledge of limited consultation around two additional texts, one prepared by the Danish Government and another prepared by the BASIC group of large developing economies, that include Brazil, South Africa, India and China.

Among the flurry of draft texts that have circulated in the corridors of the Bella Center, a few have proven particularly controversial. Tempers flared on the second day of the conference when a draft document, dubbed the 'Danish text', was leaked to the public (and seen by some developing country delegations for the first time). The text, drafted by Denmark in consultation with other developed countries, was widely criticised for, among other things, contemplating binding emission cuts on developing countries. Apparently, the Danes were expecting to table this text mid-week into the final week of negotiations, yet broad dissatisfaction with the lack of ambition it contained has pretty much relegated it to the bin. Reportedly, the only country happy with the text as it stood was the United States.

In addition to the long-standing North-South divide, rumours spread of fissures forming

within the historically unified G77 plus China (a group of 132 developing countries who join their position to create a strong negotiating block). A number of powerful developing countries, including China, India and Saudi Arabia, disagreed with a proposal from the Polynesian microstate Tuvalu, which was widely supported by AOSIS. This led many observers to sense the unity of the G77 was deteriorating; however, the group quickly organised a number of press briefings to underline points of consensus and solidarity, clearly eager to show a solid front line.

Some rays of possibility broke through the clouds when the Chairs of the two negotiating tracks—the Kyoto Protocol and the group on Long-term Cooperative Action (LCA)—presented leaner versions of the current texts for the parties to consider as a basis for final decisions. The presentation came on Friday, a day before ministers were to arrive in Copenhagen. A number of parties were disgruntled at the Chairs for presenting text without request. Yet, the proliferation of texts is becoming unmanageable, increasing the likelihood that the Chairs' text may take the lead. While the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) and the Africa Group also presented draft texts the same day, and it is yet to be seen how these will be considered or, possibly, incorporated.

Trade issues prove contentious

In a number of respects, the climate-change negotiations impact on trade and development, and these have emerged as central points of contention in the negotiations. These include:

Financing

According to the World Bank, between US\$140 billion and US\$175 billion a year will be needed to help developing countries curb emissions to a level that will prevent the world from warming more than 2°C. Large sums are

also necessary to meet the cost of adapting to climate change: between US\$30 to \$100 billion, depending on the source. The financing commitments made so far in the negotiations have not reached these levels. On Friday, the EU pledged some US\$10 billion over the next three years towards a 'fast-track' fund. This is more than was originally expected to flow from the EU, although it remains far below the levels requested by developing countries. The pledges of other developed countries, as well longer-term financing commitments, remain in doubt. The US, for instance, is reluctant to commit to high levels of long-term financing, fearing it will not get Congressional approval.

Border measures

Governments also remain at loggerheads over unilateral trade measures, which some claim protect competitiveness, while others argue they help to address climate-change mitigation. Amidst fears in the US that emission cuts will harm American industry—driving it overseas to countries with more lax emission standards—interest groups have pushed for protection through border measures. Asked in Copenhagen whether the United States would consider sanctions as part of its policy response to climate change, US Commerce Secretary Gary Locke said, "it's very important that we have a level playing field for American companies." That message was echoed in Washington last week, where Ohio Democrat Sherrod Brown said a Senate climate change bill would not pass unless it contained a carbon tariff—a sentiment shared by others in the US Senate and Congress.

But carbon tariffs are fiercely opposed by developing economies, who view them as protectionist measures incompatible with multilateral trade rules. The G-77 and China is trying to include pre-emptive language against the use of unilateral trade measures for climate purposes. The negotiating groups covering the overarching "shared vision" and

the “economic and social consequences of response measures” are both discussing the issue.

Discussions on Economic and Social Consequences of Response Measures

- Discussions focused on two main points: the creation of a subsidiary body to deal with the economic and social consequences of response measures; and whether specific commitments should be established for developed countries.
- Developed countries asserted that the notification mechanisms already existent in the Framework Convention are sufficient, while developing countries said they are in favour of creating a subsidiary body. Developing countries said they are also in favour of commitments from developed countries on issues such as prohibition of unilateral measures and compensation for damage that has already occurred.
- The G77, in particular the African Group, support the establishment of a ‘Permanent Forum’ for dealing with the creation of an institutional mechanism.
- Developing countries said they are in favour of establishing detailed legally binding commitments for developed countries, a proposal that rich countries are against.
- India, in particular, said it supports the idea of creating a mechanism for preventing “arbitrary and unjustified” trade barriers. The Indian delegation was pushing for these barriers to be classified as “fiscal” and “non-fiscal” border measures related to carbon leakage.
- Consensus on trade and climate change remains elusive. The G77 supports the idea the text should make reference to article 3-5 of the Convention that prohibits the adoption of arbitrary or unjustified mitigation measures that could affect international trade.

By Saturday evening, agreement was achieved on an introductory paragraph, but the substance of the issue was yet to be resolved. Major developed countries, notably the US and EU prefer reference to the already existing Article 3.5 of the UNFCCC, which borrows language from GATT Article XX. Article 3.5 states, “Means taken to combat climate change, including unilateral ones, should not constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination or a disguised restriction on international trade...”

Technology transfer is proposed as one of the ways to address response measures, an interesting development that adds another layer to discussions on this topic in relation to technology’s role to address mitigation and adaptation. One paragraph still under discussion proposes the formation of a “forum to undertake activities including identifying and addressing negative economic and social consequences of response measures, sharing information, promoting and cooperating on issues relating to response strategies and exploring ways to minimise negative consequences, in particular in developing [countries]”. This novel proposal could open the way for constructive collaboration between trade and climate institutions and actors.

Agriculture

Discussions on “cooperative sectoral approaches” in the agriculture sector continue to advance and clearly raise trade concerns for parties. Although the text remains within brackets, language includes restrictions on the creation of international performance standards or “any other measure that may adversely affect sustainable development and result in barriers to, or distortion of, the international trade system of goods and products in the agricultural sector.” Principally, the operative language would promote cooperation on research, development and transfer of technologies for

mitigation in the sector, including those that could support adaptation. It also would extend the work of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice—a body under the UNFCCC—to mitigation in this sector “considering links to adaptation”, and establishing a programme of work under that body. Notably, unlike the version of a month ago, the new text takes into account the relationship between agriculture and food security, as well as the interests of small and marginal farmers and traditional knowledge, which are issues of particular importance to the poorest developing countries.

Bunker fuels

Another trade-related issue is regulations on maritime and aviation transport fuels, known as ‘bunker fuels’. A transport fuel tax would have clear implications for world trade: some 80 percent of products are transported internationally by ship. While the fuels used to power ships, along with airline fuels, are not covered under the Kyoto Protocol, they may form a part of a new climate change agreement. There are multiple proposals on the table in Copenhagen, ranging from a straight tax to a cap and trade system. Australia, Norway, Brazil, and India have endorsed discussion of bunker fuel taxes at the UNFCCC. Others, however, including Mexico, Singapore, Canada, US, Japan, Panama, and China, argue that the International Maritime Organization (IMO) should deal with bunker fuels. An EU proposal entails the UNFCCC setting goals, with the IMO in charge of implementation.

The week ahead

Ministers arrived over the weekend and have been meeting in small groups to address some of the most difficult outstanding issues. The Danes are consulting individually with countries as well as with groups. Although there is no official programme of work for the coming days, it is expected that they will be

working in groups, facilitated by ministers invited by Connie Hedegaard, the Danish Minister of Climate and Energy, who is presiding over the COP. It is possible that a select group of heads of state may be required to meet in order to break any remaining impasse while they are here on Wednesday and Thursday.

ICTSD will report on 21 December on the advances on trade issues and final outcome, as well as the perspective on the future, as it is accepted that negotiations on many details will continue past Copenhagen towards the 16th COP, which will be held in Mexico next December.

ICTSD Reporting.

WTO NEGOTIATIONS

WTO Ministerial Lifts Hopes for Doha, but Scepticism Lingers

The WTO's seventh ministerial conference, which ran from 30 November to 2 December, largely met expectations, trade delegates said following the meeting. But the ministerial, which was billed as a no-surprises 'housekeeping' exercise, also produced a somewhat unexpected political push for the WTO's Doha Round trade talks.

"It was a worthwhile ministerial insofar as it showed that the WTO was still alive," said one developing country delegate, who added that he was sure that the gathering will lead to "renewed optimism," at least for a time, in the Doha talks.

The Doha Round was officially off the agenda of the three-day meeting, which took place less than two kilometres from the WTO's headquarters in Geneva. But WTO Director-General Pascal Lamy said before the gathering that he hoped members would use the occasion to indicate "how they see engagement in the Doha negotiations post-December."

On several occasions in the past year, world leaders from a broad spectrum of countries have called for the talks, which were launched in the capital of Qatar in 2001, to be brought to a close by the end of next year. But trade officials say that if that goal is to be achieved, the negotiations will have to see significant progress over the next few months.

Ministers acknowledged as much last week, and began to set a tentative timetable for bringing the talks to a close. The G-20 developing-country coalition agreed before the meeting began that there should be a "multilateral opportunity, early next year" to drive progress. The Cairns Group of efficient farm exporters said the next day that a framework deal on agriculture should be struck by early next year, with ministers gathering "in the early part of 2010...to ensure the round is on track for conclusion." Those calls were echoed by similar statements from other ministers and groupings.

Finally, in the 'chair's summary' released on the final day of the meeting, the conference chair, Chilean Finance Minister Andrés Velasco, summed up the various calls: "Ministers reaffirmed the need to conclude the round in 2010 and for a stocktaking exercise to take place in the first quarter of next year," the document said.

The call for a stocktaking exercise "was not an official decision," said Mario Matus, Chile's Ambassador to the WTO, in an interview, but there was "a clear understanding" that such a gathering would take place, probably in March or April. He noted, however, that the 'level' of the meeting - namely, whether it would involve ministers - had not been set.

Matus described the outcome on 'stocktaking' as remarkable, given that the conference was not officially intended to produce any forward movement in the Doha talks.

All eyes on Washington

This is not the first time that trade officials have set a deadline for the Doha talks and promised to pick up the pace of the negotiations. WTO members have vowed at previous gatherings to conclude the Doha talks by the end of 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008. All of those deadlines were ultimately missed.

This time, many officials worry that one WTO member in particular - the United States - could cause the process to stumble.

Many delegates have been grumbling privately in recent weeks that the administration of US President Barack Obama has yet to fully engage in the trade talks. On 7 December, a high-ranking British official made such criticisms public.

"I think if you want a deal, you have to be active in the negotiations. And whether it's fair or not, I think there is a sense that there isn't that visible engagement" from the United States, Gareth Thomas, the British Minister for International Development, said during a visit to Washington, according to media reports.

"It was striking the number of countries' ministers who spoke to me, commenting on the apparent

lack of visible US activity on Doha...That was certainly the prevailing mood in Geneva last week,” Thomas added.

A developing country official confirmed that sentiment. The US is “the main stumbling block” to the conclusion of the Doha Round, the delegate said. Trade officials from Washington are saying that they need greater clarity on what the United States will gain from a Doha Round deal before they ask Congress to grant the administration greater negotiating authority. But the developing country delegate dismissed this argument as “disingenuous.”

Another official was more sympathetic to the US position. “It’s easy for people to [blame the US], to point to one country and say it’s up to them,” he said, noting that the situation was likely more complicated than it appeared.

‘Housekeeping’ and bilaterals

Beyond the Doha talks, last week’s ministerial conference saw ministers engage in ‘housekeeping’ exercises meant to review the overall functioning of the organisation. Ambassador Matus of Chile stressed that the meeting had proven that two of the ‘pillars’ of the WTO (implementation and dispute settlement) are “alive and well,” even if the third pillar (the negotiations) is struggling.

The official activities of the conference helped sharpen members’ focus on the WTO’s regular work, Matus added. He noted that the chair’s summary that was released at the end of the meeting included strong wording on the importance of maintaining a strong development focus on WTO activities, including for Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small and Vulnerable Economies (SVEs).

On the sidelines of the official ‘working sessions’ and plenary speeches that were organised by the WTO secretariat, ministers engaged in bilateral and group meetings that they had arranged themselves.

“Bilaterals were extremely useful,” Matus noted, adding that the closed-door meetings of ministers were much more numerous than had been expected.

Also on the sidelines of the meeting, the ministerial witnessed the signing of a South-South trade deal (see Bridges Daily Update, 2 December 2009, <http://ictsd.org/i/wto/geneva/daily-updates-2009/geneva-2009-bridges-daily-updates/63433/>) and some further progress toward an agreement on banana tariffs (see Bridges Daily Update, 1 December 2009, <http://ictsd.org/i/wto/geneva/daily-updates-2009/geneva-2009-bridges-daily-updates/63433/>).

The ministers also agreed that the WTO’s next ministerial conference should be held in two years’ time, as per the organisation’s rules. The location of that meeting has not been set.

ICTSD reporting; “US dragging heels in Doha Round talks - source,” REUTERS, 7 December 2009.

IN BRIEF

Brussels Provides Numbers on Fisheries Subsidies

Environmental groups say they were shocked last week when the full extent of EU subsidies to its Mediterranean tuna fishing fleet was revealed by EU Commissioner for Fisheries and Maritime Affairs Joe Borg. The announcement, prompted by a parliamentary question issued by Spanish Green MEP Raül Romeva i Rueda last September, said Brussels has handed out €34.5 million in subsidies between 2000 and 2008.

Of the €34.5 million provided by the EU, €23 million was used for constructing new fishing boats and €10.5 million was used to modernise existing vessels. Brussels also provided €1 million for decommissioning small-scale artisanal vessels. Overall, the funds applied to 611 vessels from Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Malta, and Spain.

“I am shocked at the scale of the subsidies given to the bluefin fleet,” Romeva i Rueda said. “This shows clearly the hypocrisy of the EU, which insists on the need to conserve fish stocks while

simultaneously encouraging the rapid expansion of a fleet that was already too large.”

Sergi Tudela of WWF says obtaining an accurate estimate of the extent of European fisheries subsidies has been difficult until now. “We’ve always suspected the amount of public subsidy was very high,” said Tudela. “European citizens have given a gift of €34.5 million to the bluefin tuna industry which has resulted in the collapse of an ancient fishery.”

Tudela also pointed out that the numbers are in fact much higher – perhaps as much as double – when national subsidies are factored in.

The revelations come at a time when the EU is being lobbied heavily by environmental groups to alleviate pressure on Mediterranean bluefin tuna stocks, which scientists say are being threatened by overfishing. 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.

The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) – the organisation responsible for regulating the bluefin tuna industry – reeled in 2010 catch quotas to 13,500 tonnes (from 22,000 tonnes in 2009) at its annual meeting in November. But environmentalists say the new benchmark does not account for widespread illegal, unregulated, and unreported (IUU) fishing (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 27 November 2009, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/biores/62325/>).

In addition to pushing for a CITES ban and reduced quotas imposed by ICCAT, environmental groups have also been pushing for fisheries subsidy reform at the WTO. But despite progress on fisheries talks at the WTO, the overall glacial pace of Doha Round negotiations – seen again at the organisation’s recent ministerial conference – has few depending on it in the short term (see related story, this issue).

ICTSD Reporting; ‘Hypocritical’ EU gives €34.5m to fleets fishing tuna to extinction,” TIMES ONLINE 4 December 2009.

Indonesia-EU Timber Talks take Step Backward

Indonesia says it will place a priority on “good governance,” rather than a voluntary partnership agreement (VPA) with the EU as a means to tackle illegal logging in the country. Government representatives say the country will be closely monitoring the functioning of the EU-Ghana VPA – finalised last month – to better understand how a similar deal would affect Indonesia.

The comments emerged from a 30 November-1 December bilateral meeting aimed at assessing the state of play following three years of negotiations. When discussions began in January 2007, negotiators believed they could have a deal signed by January 2008.

“We haven’t set a deadline as to when we will sign the VPA,” Hadi Daryanto, Indonesia’s chief delegate to the talks, told reporters attending the talks. Observers say Daryanto’s remarks suggest Indonesia is not as committed to establishing a VPA as they once were.

However, Julian Wilson, the EU Ambassador who headed the talks was more optimistic, saying that much progress has been made already. Wilson said the VPA would be greatly beneficial to Indonesia.

Indonesia is a major global timber exporter with one-third of its products destined for EU markets.

VPAs lie at the core of the European Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Action Plan – the EU’s response to a call for action at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa. Under the plan, timber exports from VPA signatory countries are fast tracked through EU customs because of the agreed measures and third-party audits that are meant to ensure only legally harvested timber enters the system.

VPA negotiations between the EU and African countries Ghana and Republic of Congo have progressed relatively smoothly, while discussions with major tropical timber exporting countries in Southeast Asia – such as Malaysia and Indonesia – have hit stumbling blocks. The expected signing date of a Malaysia-EU deal has been pushed back numerous times (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 21 August 2009, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/biores/53363/>).

Jakarta currently has a system in place to combat illegal logging. However, contraband timber continues to be serious problem in the country. According to a study released by US-based NGO Human Rights Watch on 1 December, more than half of all Indonesian timber is harvested from illegal sources. The report also said illegal logging resulted in some US\$2 billion in annual losses between 2003 and 2006.

Because there is currently no EU law preventing illegally harvested wood from entering the European market, environmentalists are cautiously optimistic about voluntary agreements, like the one between the EU and Ghana.

VPAs do not violate world trade rules because the deals are both voluntary and bilateral.

ICTSD Reporting; “RI reluctant to sign EU accord against illegal logging,” THE JAKARTA POST, 2 December 2009.

Malaysian Biosafety Act Enters into Force

The Malaysian government has implemented a new measure aimed at promoting biotechnology within the country, while complying with the standards set out by the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB). The Malaysian Biosafety Act 2007 was approved by the House of Representatives and entered into force on 1 December 2009.

Kuala Lumpur says the Act goes beyond the minimum requirements set out in the CPB, which Malaysia has been a Party to since December 2003. With this approval, the government will

establish a National Biosafety Board, which will include representatives from seven Ministries and another four experts from relevant fields. In addition, the Genetic Modification Advisory Committee (GMAC) – a group of scientists responsible for assessing whether live modified organisms (LMOs) are safe to be released into the environment – is now expected to become a formal body.

Malaysia has acknowledged that biotechnology will be an important driver of the country’s future economic growth. But despite the government’s stated aim to create legislation that would strike a balance between promoting biotechnology and protecting against the potential environmental and human health risks, the lead up to its implementation has been marred by disputes over whether the Act achieves this or not.

While the CPB focuses on regulating genetically modified organisms (GMOs) released into the environment via planting and field trials, Malaysia’s new Biosafety Act is much broader in scope, aiming to regulate all forms of GMOs. This includes not only LMOs released into the environment or imported, but also, for example, those used for food and other products made from GMOs. There is concern among some stakeholders regarding the effects such broad legislation will have in Malaysia on research and development, investment, and trade. However Kuala Lumpur has defended the Biosafety Act, saying it is precisely formulated to protect environmental and biological diversity, and human, plant and animal health, which is a necessary prerequisite to moving forward in the development of the biotech industry.

The Act is being hailed by others as an ambitious move to protect against the risks genetic modification could have on biodiversity and the environment, as well as a milestone in the creation of a legal framework for the biotech industry in Malaysia – one of the most biodiversity-dense countries in the world.

ICTSD Reporting; “Malaysian Biosafety Act in Force,” CROP BIOTECH UPDATE, 4 December 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.org/news/biores/events/>.

Upcoming Events

7-18 December, Copenhagen, Denmark. TRADE AND CLIMATE CHANGE EVENTS IN COPENHAGEN. This series of events, organised by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), are taking place on the sidelines of the official negotiations at the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties. Topics that will be covered include 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. Events are open to all who wish to participate; however, advance registration is required for some. For more information, please see <http://ictsd.org/climate-change/copenhagen-events/>.

7-18 December, Copenhagen, Denmark. 15TH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE UN FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE. Under the agenda agreed at the UN Climate Change Conference in Bali in December 2007, this conference is expected to finalise an agreement on a framework for combating climate change after the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol expires at the end of 2012. The sessions of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change are open to Parties of the Convention and observer states (governments), the United Nations System and observer organisations duly admitted by the Conference of the Parties. In addition, accredited press is allowed to cover the proceedings of the Convention. For more information, please see <http://unfccc.int/meetings/items/4749.php>.

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: margaret.muindi@unece.org; internet: <http://www.unece.org/env/lrtap/ExecutiveBody/welcome.27.html>

20 January, London, UK. DIALOGUE ON FORESTS, GOVERNANCE, AND CLIMATE CHANGE NO.3. This is the third in the series of Chatham House-RRI Dialogue on Forests, Governance and Climate Change. This event will provide a key opportunity to discuss the implications of what has - or has not - been agreed at the Copenhagen climate conference in December 2009. For more information, contact Lucy Ellinas: internet: <http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/events/view/-/id/1369/>

27-28 January, London, UK. INTRODUCTION TO RENEWABLES: A 2-DAY COMPREHENSIVE OVERVIEW OF RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES, TECHNOLOGIES, AND MARKETS. This training course will educate participants on the economic factors and technologies that drive the renewable energy/power industries. It also aims to evaluate renewable energy resources and the market conditions and economic cases that may argue for or against them. The different technologies available to gather and store renewable energy will also be explored. Varying types of renewable energy – including solar, biofuels, wind, and geothermal – will be discussed along with their capacity to contribute to current energy needs. For more information, contact the organisers: tel: +44-(0)207-099-0600; email: info@greenpowerconferences.com; internet: <http://www2.greenpowerconferences.co.uk/v8->

12/Prospectus/Index.php?sEventCode=TRE1001UK

1-4 February, Amman, Jordan. INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FOOD SECURITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE IN DRY AREAS. At this conference, participants will discuss the current status of climate change in dry areas and how it affects food security. The impacts of climate change on the availability of natural resources (particularly water), environmental degradation in dry areas, and agricultural production systems will also be explored. Another major theme will be identifying economic/policy options, development priorities, and technologies in certain regions to cope with climate change through the implementation of strategies for adaptation, mitigation, and ecosystem resilience. There will also be a chance to exchange experiences with national and international experts on food security issues expected to be effected by climate change, especially in dry areas. For more information, contact Nasri Haddad: fax: +926-6-552-5930; email: n.haddad@cgiar.org; internet: http://www.icarda.cgiar.org/Announcement/2009/IntlConfnc_FoodSecurity/FoodSecurityAndClimateChangeInDryAreas_2009.htm

11-13 February, TROPICAL FORESTS UNDER A CHANGING CLIMATE: LINKING IMPACTS, MITIGATION, AND ADAPTATION. The Yale Chapter of the International Society of Tropical Foresters will gather practitioners and researchers from government, communities, academia, and environment and development organisations to explore the relationship between tropical forests and climate change. Participants will be given a chance to discuss how climate change impacts tropical forest biodiversity, ecology, ecosystems services, and the communities and economies that rely on them. Other themes include strategies and management practices that could be employed by governments, communities, and organisations in order to mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change. For more information, contact the organisers: email: yaleist@gmail.com; internet: <http://www.goforwood.info/it/news.php?id=28046> or <http://www.yale.edu/istf>

15-16 April, Paris, France. WORKSHOP ON ADVANCING THE AQUACULTURE AGENDA: POLICIES TO ENSURE A SUSTAINABLE AQUACULTURE SECTOR. The main objective of this workshop is to provide a platform for participants to examine policy challenges that members of the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) face in aquaculture development. This event will be organised into four sessions, each covering a different theme: overview of the latest developments in aquaculture, best practices in aquaculture management and development, enhancing economic conditions for aquaculture, and how to develop national and international policy strategies for aquaculture development. For more information, contact the organisers: tel: +33-1-45-24-82-00; fax: +33-1-45-24-85-00; email: tad@contact.oecd.org; internet: http://www.oecd.org/document/3/0,3343,en_2649_33901_44041283_1_1_1_37401,00.html

Resources

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

PUSHING 'RESET' ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. By Alan AtKisson (Boston University and Sustainable Development Knowledge Partnership). Sustainable Development Insights. October 2009. The main question presented in this paper is how to continue advancing sustainable development in a time of financial crisis and if sustainable development requires a "reset." In other words, must we take a different course, according to emerging trends and current conditions, in order to realise our goals? The author argues that sustainability should set the standards for future goals because we cannot return to our previous state, which has led us to an unstable world economically and environmentally. To access this paper, visit: http://www.bu.edu/pardee/files/2009/11/UNsd_kp001sin.pdf

COMPANY-LED APPROACHES TO CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN THE FOREST SECTOR. By Emma Wilson (International Institute for Environment and Development). April 2009. This paper investigates the potential for using company-led tools and mechanisms to address conflicts in the forest sector. A controversial issue for many in the forestry sector is recognising and negotiating rights to land and resources. The author explains that there is a lack of understanding and skills within countless companies – large and small – when it pertains to developing and implementing effective conflict management procedures, especially in relation to complex issues. This paper offers examples of tools and approaches that are being utilised by companies and non-industry players to address conflict-related issues. Two key approaches include: 1) rights based approaches (favoured by non-industry respondents) which focus primarily on helping communities to identify and defend their rights to land and resources and 2) stakeholder management systems (favoured by companies as part of their overall management systems). In practice, there is considerable overlap between the two approaches. The author concludes that the methods and tools related to each of the approaches are still evolving in the forest sector. To access this report, visit: <http://www.iied.org/pubs/pdfs/G02510.pdf>

TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION AND USE OF RESOURCES: ASSESSING BIOFUELS. United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP). October 2009. Based on a review of published research up to mid-2009, including input from independent experts worldwide, this report by the UNEP International Panel for Sustainable Resource Management maintains that the research accrued over recent years portrays a complex and uncertain picture of the risks and benefits of biofuels. This report's core argument is that biofuels' costs and benefits are context-specific, and therefore simplistic approaches to managing biofuel production are unlikely to yield environmentally positive results. Considering not only biofuels for transport, but biomass as a whole, various topics are discussed: the full life-cycle approach needed to completely account for the impacts of biofuels, the issue of land-use change, options for more efficient and sustainable production, and strategies to enhance

resource productivity. This report intends to provide information on the assessment of the environmental and social costs and benefits of biofuels. It examines both the concerns of critical developments and illustrates options for a more sustainable use of biomass and measures to increase resource productivity. To access this report, visit: http://www.unep.fr/scp/rpanel/pdf/Assessing_Biofuels_Full_Report.pdf

THE ECONOMIC AND POVERTY IMPACTS OF MAIZE RESEARCH IN WEST AND CENTRAL AFRICA. By Arega Alene, Abebe Menkir, S.O. Ajala, B. Badu-Apraku, A.S. Olanrewaju, V.M. Manyong, and Abdou Ndiaye (Agricultural Economics 40:5). 5 September 2009. This article gathers the results of three multi-country surveys in order to calculate the social rates of return on public investments in maize research in a specific region. These surveys are based on variety performance and adoption patterns in order to gauge the impacts of maize research in West and Central Africa from 1981 to 2005. This article also studies how many people were able to move out of poverty through the adoption of new maize varieties. The authors claim that much of the end results are attributable to international maize research at Agricultural Research for Development in Africa (IITA) and the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT). It concludes with a discussion of strategic options to boost the influence of maize research in the region. Available for purchase at: <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/bsc/ag/ec/2009/00000040/00000005/art00004>

AGRICULTURAL SUBSIDIES IN THE WTO GREEN BOX: ENSURING COHERENCE WITH SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS. Edited by Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz, Christophe Bellmann and Jonathan Hepburn, Cambridge University Press, December 2009. Do the World Trade Organization's rules on 'green box' farm subsidies allow both rich and poor countries to achieve important goals such as food security, or do they worsen poverty, distort trade and harm the environment? Current WTO requirements set no ceiling on the amount of green box subsidies that governments can provide, on the basis that these payments cause only

minimal trade distortion. Governments are thus increasingly shifting their subsidy spending into this category, as they come under pressure to reduce subsidies that are more directly linked to production. However, growing evidence nonetheless suggests that green box payments can affect production and trade, harm farmers in developing countries and cause environmental damage. By bringing together new research and critical thinking, this book examines the relationship between green box subsidies and the achievement of sustainable development goals, and explores options for future reform. To learn more or purchase a copy of the book, please visit <http://www.cambridge.org/uk/catalogue/catalogue.asp?isbn=9780521519694>.