



# Bridges Trade BioRes

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

Volume 10 · Number 12, 25 June 2010

## Forestry

With Compromise Deal,  
EU Moves Toward Illegal Timber Ban ..... 1

## Fisheries

Whaling Talks Reach Impasse in Agadir ..... 3

## Intellectual Property

Animated TRIPS Council Meeting Tackles  
Biodiversity, Public Health, ACTA ..... 5

## In Brief

EU Plans to Import North African  
Solar Power Moving Forward ..... 7

Dutch Trial Underway in  
Toxic Dumping Case ..... 8

## EVENTS AND RESOURCES

Events ..... 9

Resources ..... 11

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

To subscribe to Bridges Trade BioRes or access back issues, visit [www.ictsd.net/news/biores/](http://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](mailto:aaziz@ictsd.ch). Contributors to this issue were Andrew Aziz, Sofia Baliño, Stephanie Dashiell, Ahmed Abdel Latif, and Paige McClanahan.

The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz.

ISSN 1682-0843

## FORESTRY

### With Compromise Deal, EU Moves Toward Illegal Timber Ban

After more than two years of negotiations, the European Council and European Parliament have signed a provisional agreement that, if approved, would ban illegal timber from entering the EU.

Finnish MEP Satu Hassi, who succeeded British MEP Caroline Lucas as the rapporteur for the regulation, called the proposed prohibition “an important precedent for taking responsibility for the external impacts of European consumption.”

European Parliament will vote on the provisional agreement on 7 July. If approved, it would then fall to the Council to formally adopt the text.

Legal timber is defined as timber that was “harvested in accordance with the relevant national legislation,” along with adhering to “relevant international conventions to which that country is party,” according to the text of the agreement. Brussels estimates that 20 to 40 percent of global industrial wood production is obtained illegally; up to one fifth of all of that illegal wood ends up in the EU.

Illegal logging exacerbates forest degradation and deforestation, releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, and is considered to have “social, political and economic implications,” according to the agreement. It has also been linked to armed conflicts.

The compromise between the Council and the Parliament contains two key provisions: the prohibition against bringing illegally logged timber into the European market, and the obligation that timber and timber products be traceable throughout the supply chain.

The agreement also puts into place a “due diligence” system that requires the operators who introduce the timber into the EU market to show that they have done everything possible to ensure that the timber comes from legal sources. This includes gathering all “relevant” information about the timber’s supply and source, conducting risk assessments based on that information, and then attempting to mitigate those risks.

The requirements for subsequent operators retailing in the EU market are less stringent. They are required to know where they bought the timber and to whom they sold it; they must also be able to present that information upon request.

### Difficult compromise

Though pleased with the agreement’s progress, Hassi, the Finnish MEP, mentioned her disappointment that member states “could not move closer to the Parliament’s position.”

Over the past two years, the Council and the Parliament have disagreed extensively over how stringent the final legislation should be. Until recently, the two bodies had been considering very different approaches to the issue, with the Parliament pushing for a harder stance.

For instance, prior to April’s debates on the draft proposal, Caroline Lucas - the regulation’s previous rapporteur - openly chastised the European Council’s approach in an interview with The Parliament Magazine.

“Several of these tough measures were deleted by the EU Council back in March, when they officially adopted a weak common position of the timber proposals, which fell far short of the progressive position backed by Parliament,” she said at the time. “For years the EU has preached against illegal timber but continued to provide one of the biggest markets for it,” she added.

Originally, the Council did not support the prohibition or the traceability obligation for subsequent actors, while Parliament wanted full-scale prohibition that would cover the subsequent operators after the first place on the market. These two requirements are, arguably, the key

tenets of the legislation, and did finally make it into the final compromise text.

Parliament also pushed for the regulation to cover a broader range of products, and for the most severe cases of illegal timber trade to be punishable by criminal sanctions. However, that request did not make it into the final agreement.

Portugal and Sweden have both signalled some level of hesitation over the proposed ban, according to Greenpeace EU. The environmental advocacy group expressed its support for the agreement, while noting concerns that the sanctions and penalties are “too weak” and that the date of the agreement’s application is “too late, two years after the entry into force.”

### Implications for existing VPAs

Over the past seven years, the EU has worked to establish a series of legally binding bilateral agreements - known as Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs) with timber-producing countries. These VPAs, which are part of the bloc’s Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Action plan, commit the two parties to only trade in legal timber.

The EU currently has VPAs in place with Ghana, the Congo-Brazzaville, and Cameroon (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [19 September 2008](#), [15 May 2009](#), and [14 May 2010](#)). The EU is also in negotiations to set up VPAs with the Central African Republic, Indonesia, Liberia, and Malaysia, according to the Chatham House website on illegal logging.

The new agreement is not meant to supplant or replace the existing VPA process. Rather, proponents of the agreement say they hope it will strengthen the existing FLEGT programme.

For instance, the main reason why the negotiators came up with the “due diligence” requirement was to avoid undermining the VPA process, according to Saskia Ozinga of the Brussels-based non-governmental organisation FERN, speaking to Bridges Trade BioRes.

The countries with which the EU has finalised VPAs negotiated these agreements “in good

faith.” However, having this general prohibition will help assuage the concerns of these exporting countries about whether their timber will be able to thrive in the EU market, given that they had previously been competing with both illegal and legal timber from other non-VPA countries.

However, Ozinga mentioned that there is some concern that countries not willing to address other issues that come up in the VPA process, such as forest governance, might now choose to avoid the VPA process. Some African civil society organisations also expressed worry that, once this law was adopted, the EU “would simply give up on” pursuing VPAs.

Ozinga explained that one of the strengths of the VPA process is that it forces the countries involved to look more thoroughly at the entire supply chain and the forest governance system in the timber-producing country. She noted that VPAs have the potential to truly transform the forest sectors of VPA signatories. In contrast, EU laws can “only send a signal” that it will be more difficult for illegal timber to enter their market.

To that end, Ozinga clarified that the new agreement has its limitations. “EU legislation cannot do more than the Lacey Act in the US,” she said, referring to the US law that has banned all imports of illegal timber since 2008. She explained that illegal logging in itself is not so much a problem as it is a “symptom” of poor forest governance, which is what the real underlying problem is and which VPAs are better-equipped to address.

ICTSD reporting; “EU set to ban illegal timber from 2012,” BBC NEWS, 17 June 2010; “Environment MEPs get tough on illegal timber trade,” EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, 11 May 2010; “EU parliament set to approve ban on ‘illegal’ timber trade,” THE PARLIAMENT, 13 April 2010.

## FISHERIES

### Whaling Talks Reach Impasse in Agadir

The 24-year-old moratorium on whaling will remain in place for at least another year after the collapse of talks on a controversial proposal to conditionally lift the ban. Negotiators at the annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) in Agadir, Morocco said that whaling countries and anti-whaling delegations were not able to find enough common ground to reach a deal.

“We had two days of useful talks but we still haven't got a consensus resolution,” said Geoffrey Palmer, head of the New Zealand delegation, which was hoping to have whaling completely banned from the Southern Ocean. “There is an absence of political will to bridge the gaps and to compromise.”

Talks will likely not resume until next year's annual IWC meeting.

#### New deal proposed ten-year phase out

The controversial draft proposal was issued on 22 April by IWC chairman Cristian Maquieira of Chile and vice chairman Anthony Liverpool of Antigua and Barbuda (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [30 April 2010](#)). The initiative would have set specific catch-limits for five years, followed by quota reductions that would have ultimately led to a zero-catch limit.

The IWC claims that these regulations – combined with rigorous enforcement and monitoring – could save between 4,000 and 18,000 whales over ten years.

The IWC draft also proposes the establishment a South Atlantic Sanctuary, but would open the Southern Ocean Whale sanctuary – something anti-whaling nations, particularly New Zealand, are resolutely against. Established in 1994, the Southern Ocean Whale sanctuary protects whales from all types of commercial whaling.

The proposal is based on the concept that – because whaling continues to occur under the moratorium – the practice can be phased out more easily by allowing whaling countries to freely hunt under a closely regulated framework. Recent discoveries of whale meat from Japan's scientific research programme in foreign markets suggest that an underground network may be distributing meat caught by the three whaling nations.

Norway and Iceland have continued their whaling programmes after making objections to the 1996 IWC moratorium. Meanwhile, Japan's Whale Research Programme exploits a loophole in the moratorium that allows surplus meat from lethal scientific whale research to be used.

Japan drew the ire of many anti-whaling countries and activists this month by launching a summer whaling expedition in the run-up to the Agadir meeting. In related news, whaling opponent Australia has launched a law suit against Japan, arguing that their scientific programme is not in line with the requirements of the 1986 ban (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [11 June 2010](#)).

All three whaling countries have taken more than 33,000 whales since the IWC moratorium took effect.

### **Reaction on the impasse mixed**

Australia expressed its satisfaction that the compromise deal had been shelved.

"Lifting the moratorium on commercial whaling would have been a serious and retrograde step," said Peter Garrett, Australia's Environment Minister. "That is why Australia has fought so hard against this proposal, along with many like-minded, pro-conservation nations both in the lead-up to the IWC and here on the floor of the commission."

New Zealand's foreign minister Mike McCully echoed Garrett's sentiments, with special emphasis on the need to eliminate whaling completely in the Southern Ocean.

Tokyo accepted certain elements of the plan, but took exception to its aim to of completely phase out whaling catches to zero after ten years. Yasue

Funayama, Japan's parliamentary secretary for agriculture, forestry and fisheries said her country had offered major concessions and agreed "to elements which are extremely difficult to accept." She blamed the derailment of the talks on anti-whaling countries' inflexibility and refusal to even consider the proposal as a basis for discussions.

Acting as a mediator between the opposing sides, the US attempted to play a neutral role in the Agadir discussions – despite the fact that Washington did not support the Chair's proposal. In a statement, the US expressed its disappointment that IWC members were unable to reach a compromise deal at the annual meeting.

"We regret that the IWC failed to reach agreement on a new paradigm that would improve the conservation of whales," the statement read. "Throughout this process, the United States has given its unwavering support to the commercial whaling moratorium and worked diligently to achieve an end to the lethal scientific and commercial whaling that continues to take place in spite of the moratorium."

### **Environmental groups react**

US-based Pew Environment Group, which has been pressuring IWC members for years to make progress on whale conservation, expressed their disappointment that countries were unable to agree upon a new deal.

"The lack of sufficient flexibility shown by Japan to phase out its whaling in the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary prevented a decision from being adopted," said Susan Lieberman, director of international policy for the Pew Environment Group in a statement. "Continuation of the impasse here may retain the whaling moratorium on paper, but unregulated whaling outside of IWC control, by Japan, Norway, and Iceland, will now be able to continue."

The environment group has said in the past that the controversial draft proposal had some acceptable elements, but the provision that would open the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary to Japanese vessels was intolerable.

Other groups were less diplomatic.

“Under a cloud of corruption allegations the IWC is taking a safe course, opting for a cooling off period that protects the moratorium and other IWC conservation measures,” said Patrick Ramage, director of the International Fund for Animal Welfare's Global Whale Campaign. “Had it been done here, this deal would have lived in infamy.”

ICTSD Reporting; “Nations fail to limit whaling, Japan still hunts,” ASSOCIATED PRESS, 24 June 2010; “Whaling 'peace deal' falls apart,” BBC ONLINE, 23 June 2010; “Global Whaling Moratorium Stands as IWC Shelves Compromise Plan,” ENVIRONMENT NEWS SERVICE, 23 June 2010; “Whaling Moratorium Talks Break Down-Delegates,” REUTERS, 24 June 2010.

## INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

### Animated TRIPS Council Meeting Tackles Biodiversity, Public Health, ACTA

The WTO's Council on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), had a lively meeting earlier this month as delegates took up a number contentious issues, including the links between biodiversity and intellectual property, the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA), and public health.

On the morning of 8 June, the first day of the meeting, the Council debated whether two items should be included on the meeting's agenda: a proposal from several developing countries on the implementation of the Paragraph 6 system, and a proposal from China and India on so-called TRIPS-Plus enforcement trends, which would look at whether some initiatives by developed countries have gone too far in strengthening enforcement of their IP rights.

On the China-India proposal, several rich countries argued that the enforcement discussions should be framed as neutrally as possible. Ultimately, it was decided that both items should be included on the agenda. The item on

enforcement, however, was re-titled “Enforcement Trends,” dropping the reference to TRIPS-plus in view of the opposition by developed countries.

### Biodiversity

Delegates at the meeting responded to a communication on biodiversity that Bolivia put forward in March. The document proposes a complete ban on all patents of biological entities or materials under Article 27.3(b) of the TRIPS Agreement.

Venezuela, Ecuador, and other developing countries voiced their support for Bolivia's proposal at the TRIPS Council meeting. Moreover, many developing countries expressed their support for a disclosure requirement for biological patents. Such a stipulation would require those who seek to patent biological entities or processes to disclose where that information comes from, prove that they had informed consent from the community from which it was obtained, and demonstrate that the community was receiving fair and equitable compensation because of the patent and resulting commodities.

Switzerland, the United States and the EU rejected the idea of a ban on patents of biotechnology. Article 23 of the TRIPS Agreement, they argued, was already sufficiently flexible to protect the needs of the WTO member countries. Both Switzerland and the EU emphasised that WTO members can establish sui generis systems for the protection of biologics; such systems are more appropriate because they can be tailored to meet individual country needs, they said.

### Public health and Paragraph 6

Turning to public health questions, delegates discussed the WTO's Paragraph 6 system, which is intended to help developing countries gain affordable access to critical medicines. The system – which is named after the relevant section of the Doha Declaration on Public Health – is based on a waiver that removes a requirement that generic drugs produced under compulsory licence should be used mainly in the domestic market. Since it was enacted in 2003, the system has been used



only once, for a shipment of HIV/AIDS drugs from Canada to Rwanda in 2008.

A discussion of the Paragraph 6 system had been requested by Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Peru, and Venezuela. Developing countries stated that the fact that Paragraph 6 has only been used once shows that the current system is burdensome and overly complicated to use.

The chair of the TRIPS Council, Martin Glass of Hong Kong, announced that during previous informal meetings, delegations had agreed by consensus that the second day of the October 2010 TRIPS Council meeting should be dedicated to a discussion of the implementation of the Paragraph 6 system. Countries also agreed that there should be a workshop on the matter prior to the October meeting.

But developed and developing countries disagreed over who should be invited to the workshop. China, India, and their supporters said that pharmaceutical companies and representatives of NGOs should be allowed to attend, while rich nations argued that the workshop should be restricted to WTO delegates.

### Enforcement trends

China and India – the countries that had requested the discussion on enforcement – expressed their concerns on this front at length. The two countries said they are concerned about the potential effects of the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) that is now under negotiation among a handful of mostly developed nations. The pact aims to establish a new legal framework for the enforcement of intellectual property rights. China and India also expressed worry over bilateral and regional trade deals that similarly impose new intellectual property standards outside the TRIPS framework.

Such deals, the countries said, go above and beyond what is allowed under the WTO's TRIPS Agreement and do not adequately consider the interests of developing countries. India acknowledged that TRIPS sets out minimum levels of IP protection, but added that the agreement also establishes certain ceilings on

government action – ceilings that these new deals often break. India stressed that its greatest concern regarding ACTA is that the deal might restrict access to medicines in poor countries – specifically, that it could allow for further seizures of generic pharmaceuticals.

Peru, Cuba, Bolivia, Ecuador, South Africa, Egypt, and other developing countries added their support to India and China's statements.

A representative from the United States responded to India and China's concerns. Bilateral and plurilateral agreements, including ACTA, are not at odds with TRIPS, the US delegate insisted. TRIPS is a minimum standard, the official argued, adding that ACTA is an independent initiative and does not interfere with TRIPS. Other members, including Korea, the EU, Japan, and Canada echoed these sentiments whereas Australia and New Zealand stated that they support transparency in the process.

The US' primary reason for joining ACTA is to address the growing problems of counterfeiting and piracy, the delegate said, adding that given the scope of such activities, members are looking for solutions outside the WTO. The EU and Switzerland also responded to China and India's concerns. They noted that the trade of legitimate generic medicines will not be stopped by new ACTA regulations as there is no ACTA provision on border-stopping for patented goods. The EU also noted that counterfeiting and piracy are problems that affect developing countries as well.

### Other items on the agenda

In other business, the chair, Martin Glass, announced that India and Brazil have requested consultations with the European Union (WT/DS408/1 and WT/DS409/1) regarding the detention of generic drugs in transit through European ports. Canada, Brazil, Turkey, China and Japan have asked to join India's consultations, while the Brazilian request has been seconded by Canada, Turkey, China, Japan and Ecuador. The TRIPS Council did not discuss the actual detentions, however; the chair presented the requests for consultation simply to keep members up to date.

The Council also heard from Rwanda and Bangladesh, as both countries presented the results of their respective assessments of their national technical and financial needs for TRIPS implementation and follow-up action plans. Backed by other developing countries, they called on developed nations to respond adequately to these submissions. The WTO secretariat also outlined its recent efforts to make needs assessments easier to carry out. Specific initiatives include a new guidebook now in preparation, a dedicated webpage on needs assessment Least Developed Countries (LDCs), as well as the other workshops that are taking place over the course of this year.

Ecuador concluded the meeting by presenting its recently successful issuance of compulsory license to allow importation of a key HIV/AIDS treatment drug. The Ecuadorian delegate noted that the drug in question was not under patent in the exporting country, and therefore the measure was taken under Article 31 of the TRIPS Agreement, rather than under Paragraph 6.

Several developing countries welcomed the move by Ecuador, emphasising that rich nations have made good use of compulsory licences, while developing countries have lagged behind in this respect. They noted that the Ecuadorian experience could help remove the stigma that is associated with the use of compulsory licenses in some developing countries.

ICTSD reporting.

## IN BRIEF

### EU Plans to Import North African Solar Power Moving Forward

Gunther Oettinger, Europe's Energy Commissioner, has announced that the EU is expected to begin importing hundreds of megawatts of solar energy from North Africa within the next five years. The Commissioner's comments came following a 20 June meeting with Algerian, Tunisian, and Moroccan ministers aimed

at moving the renewable energy initiative forward. Importing energy from arid regions south of the Mediterranean has been proposed by Brussels as one of several strategies for helping the EU to meet its long-term goal of decarbonising its economy.

The EU currently aims to have 20 percent of its total energy requirements come from renewable sources by 2020. To help meet this goal the EU is looking to import solar energy to supplement domestic renewable energy initiatives. The solar energy captured in northern African nations would be transmitted to Europe via an interconnector - a high voltage cable that will run under the Mediterranean Sea.

Launched in July 2009, the Desertec Industrial Initiative, which comprises 12 companies including Siemens, Deutsche Bank and REW, is in the process of developing a plan for solar power development in northern Africa. The consortium will seek public funding for its projects. The EU has stated that it will assist with updating regulations to allow transmission across European borders, coordinating stakeholders and conducting feasibility studies. The consortium has yet to produce a business plan for the proposed projects.

"I think some models starting in the next 5 years will bring some hundreds of megawatts to the European market," Oettinger told Reuters on Sunday after the meeting. The long-term vision for the project is to provide thousands of megawatts to Europe in the next 20-40 years. The project will require a projected investment of about €400 billion and will aim to provide 15 percent of EU electricity demand. Subsidies from the EU will not be considered until the consortium produces a business plan for the project but are expected to go towards the construction of the interconnector.

Because the cost of transmitting energy from North Africa will be significant, officials must first determine whether the costs are offset by the amount of green energy the EU will actually receive. Even if solar power plants in the Sahara exhibit much higher performance, there could be a significant energy loss in the transmission to the EU.

The ministers from Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco have agreed they are ready to start trade negotiations. In response to past concerns from Algerian officials regarding the EU's exploitation of North African resources, Oettinger responded in a Reuters interview by saying, "maybe a bigger percentage of the electricity will be exported to Europe but at the same time we have to export the technology, tools, machines, experts, and so it's a real partnership, not only a partnership by selling and by buying."

There are concerns over how the EU will ensure that the energy transmitted is, in fact, green energy, not cheap and dirty fossil fuels. Oettinger says the problem of monitoring must be resolved in the next couple of years.

ICTSD reporting; "EU sees solar power imported from Sahara in five years" REUTERS 23 June 2010; "Big EU imports of North African sun power coming soon?" THE REGISTER, 22 June 2010

---

### Dutch Trial Underway in Toxic Dumping Case

Almost four years after petrochemical waste was dumped in the Cote d'Ivoirian city of Abidjan, a multinational metals and oil trading firm is set to face criminal charges in the Netherlands. Dutch public prosecutor Luke Boogert claims that Trafigura Baheer BV, along with Amsterdam Port Services BV, and Amsterdam city authorities put "self interest above people's health and the environment" by illegally exporting hazardous cargo.

However, Trafigura denies any link between the waste and the casualties, calling the claims a "myth" concocted by green groups and the media. "It has not been proven that the events in Ivory Coast caused serious harm to the health of the population, or that they could have done," defence lawyer Mischa Wladimiroff told the court Thursday.

Dutch prosecutors say that in July of 2006, Trafigura's ship, Probo Koala, docked in Amsterdam and began offloading its hazardous

cargo. After a dispute over processing costs, the waste was reportedly pumped back on board the Probo Koala and the Amsterdam Port Services granted the ship permission to leave, which is illegal under Dutch law.

The Ivorian government claims that in 2006 the Probo Koala arrived in Abidjan, the country's economic centre, and unloaded 500 tons of petrochemical waste into 14 open pits. The government claims that the toxic sludge killed 16 people and caused respiratory and other health problems for thousands (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [8 September 2006](#)).

Dutch prosecutors argue that this saved the firm €400,000 in processing fees that it would have otherwise been paid in the Netherlands. Boogert claims Trafigura's decision to dump the waste in Africa was "cheap, but with consequences."

In 2007, Trafigura paid €157 million to Cote d'Ivoire in return for indemnity against prosecution. Then, in September 2009, the firm handed over another €33 million to 31,000 people who claimed in a British court to have been affected by the petrochemical waste. In 2008, two Nigerian officials who were involved in handling the dump in Abidjan were sentenced to imprisonment (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [31 October 2008](#)).

The trial, which is currently underway in the Netherlands, represents the first time that the multinational will face criminal charges. Boogert is seeking the maximum fine under Dutch law for each of three charges, totalling €2 million. Trafigura is fighting the charges, stating that they are "a company which holds high doing business in a socially responsible manner and it is convinced it has followed the rules that are at issue."

Boogert has also accused Amsterdam Port Services BV and Amsterdam city authorities of violating Dutch criminal and environmental law when they allowed Trafigura to depart with hazardous material. The hearings will be held on 9 July and the ruling is expected for 23 July.



According to a Basel Convention publication, the Abidjan incident falls within the regulations of a multitude of multilateral agreements including the Basel Convention, the Bamako Convention, MARPOL 73/78, the Rotterdam Convention, and the Stockholm Convention. However, the dumping case is often cited as a classic example showing the many loopholes that still exist in the toxic substance trade (see Bridges Monthly, [September 2006](#)).

In related news, the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) has announced the establishment of a laboratory Abidjan to improve the monitoring of hazardous materials. The new facility, developed jointly between UNEP and the Secretariat of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, is equipped to test for waste in ships entering the port.

ICTSD Reporting; "Trafigura in court over toxic waste," SWISS-INFO, 02 June 2010; Prosecutor urges top fine for Trafigura toxic waste," REUTERS, 22 June 2010; "Two men convicted in Abidjan toxic dumping scandal," Bridges Trade BioRes Vol. 8 Num. 19, 31 October 2008; "Abidjan waste dump reveals many loopholes," Bridges Monthly, September 2006. "Ivory coast still suffering from toxic spill," Basel Action Network, 15 December 2007; "UN agency helps set up laboratory in Ivorian port to monitor for toxic waste," UN NEWS CENTRE, 25 June 2010; "I.Coast toxic waste deaths a 'myth', say defence," AFP, 24 June 2010.

## EVENTS AND RESOURCES

### Events

For a more comprehensive list of events for the trade and environment community visit the [BioRes Online Calendar](#).

#### Coming up in the next two weeks (25 June-9 July)

28 June-2 July, Edinburgh, Scotland. 18TH COMMONWEALTH FORESTRY

CONFERENCE. Conference organisers say this conference will pull together some of the most influential and dynamic individuals with a professional interest in forestry to explore how restoring the Commonwealth's forests can contribute to the global challenge of tackling climate change. Public and private sector representatives from around the Commonwealth will discuss how forest restoration can be used to tackle issues such as community livelihoods, food security, biodiversity, energy, and governance. For more information, visit the [conference website](#).

28 June-1 July, Singapore. WORLD CITIES SUMMIT 2010: LIVEABLE & SUSTAINABLE CITIES FOR THE FUTURE. This four-day summit will focus on leadership and governance and building liveable and sustainable communities. The summit will focus on the challenges related to urban planning, infrastructure financing, public housing, waste management, urban biodiversity and climate change. Participants will discuss how to mitigate risks and build inclusive and harmonious cities. Partners of the Summit include the Asian Development Bank (ADB), UN-Habitat, the UN Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank, and the UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP). For more information visit the [World Cities website](#).

28 June-1 July, Paris, France. CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY: UPDATING THE GUIDELINES FOR MULTINATIONAL ENTERPRISES. This meeting will bring together the National Contact Points of the 42 governments adhering to the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. They will begin the process, which will be completed in 2011, of updating the guidelines to ensure they retain their role as the leading international instrument for the promotion of responsible business conduct. Discussions at the June meetings will centre on supply chains, human rights and environment/climate change. For more information visit the [event website](#).

29 June-1 July, Basel, Switzerland. AFRICA ENERGY FORUM. The 12th Africa Energy Forum will focus on African power, renewable energy, biofuels, and gas. This year, the programme will include discussions on how

environmental concerns, development goals, and power supply interconnect. Another major subject area will be the implications and necessary responses to adjust to the increasing pressure from consumers for clean and affordable power. For more information, visit the [forum website](#).

1 July, Geneva, Switzerland. DIALOGUE ON THE LIBERALISATION OF CLIMATE-FRIENDLY GOODS. This informal dialogue will increase understanding of the possible environmental, trade and developmental implications of the WTO negotiations on environmental good and services by analysing the case of climate-related single-use environmental goods. For more information visit the [event website](#).

5-6 July, Manila, Philippines. FIRST ASIA SOLAR ENERGY FORUM. This forum will focus on addressing the key barriers to the spread of solar energy in the Asia Pacific region and aims to create opportunities for private sector companies as well as for knowledge institutions and development partners. Organisers say the forum will give participants an opportunity to voice their thoughts on structuring and developing solar energy projects and to build an informed view on the potential market for solar energy in the region. For more information visit the [forum website](#).

7-9 July, Bogota, Colombia. UNEP CONSULTATIVE GROUP OF MINISTERS AND HIGH-LEVEL REPRESENTATIVES ON IEG. This UNEP meeting will consider broader reform of international environmental governance (IEG). A second meeting will take place in November 2010 in Helsinki, Finland. The purpose of these meetings is to prepare a report to inform the next meeting of the UNEP Governing Council in February 2011 and provide input to the UNCSD (also called Rio+20) process. For more information, visit the [UNEP environmental governance website](#).

8 July, London, UK. CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREEN DEVELOPMENT IN CHINA. This meeting, organised by the Chatham House, will address the impact of climate change in China and explain how China is responding to global

warming. The event is open to all interested members and the public. More information can be found on the [event website](#).

8 July, London, UK. AFRICAN AGRICULTURE: A TIME FOR CAUTIOUS OPTIMISM? The Overseas Development Institute will be hosting a seminar on the increased agriculture growth rates in Africa. The event will focus on the new opportunities for African farmers, such as higher prices, potential markets in Asia, and underused land, along with the potential challenges - including higher energy prices and climate change. The seminar's objective is to find a balance between these issues, and discuss what strategies should be adopted as a result. For more information, please visit the [seminar website](#).

#### Other Upcoming Events:

29 November-10 December, Cancun, Mexico. 16<sup>TH</sup> CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES (COP 16) / 6<sup>TH</sup> CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL (CMP 6) - UNFCCC. At this meeting, parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change will work to reach a global climate change pact. For more information, visit the [COP website](#).

5-11 September, Stockholm, Sweden. 2010 WORLD WATER WEEK. The 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of World Water Week will be hosted by the Stockholm International Water Institute. The programme will include plenaries, workshops, seminars, side events and award ceremonies related to the theme: "The Water Quality Challenge – Prevention, Wise Use and Abatement." Organisers say the event will help deepen the understanding of, stimulate ideas on, and engage the water community around the challenges related to water quality. For more information, view this [event website](#).

---

## Resources

EVALUATION OF THE COPENHAGEN ACCORD: CHANCES AND RISKS FOR THE 2°C CLIMATE GOAL. The Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, May 2010. This report, released by the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, discusses the Copenhagen Accord - more specifically, industrialised countries' submission of greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for 2020, and developing countries' submissions of possible actions for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The paper presents an overview of the global emission implications of these two sets of submissions, along with the potential abatement costs, and whether these submissions would help in meeting the two degree climate target that was specified in the Accord, among other subjects. For more information, or to download the paper, please refer to the [Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency's website](#).

FIGURING OUT THE DOHA ROUND. By Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Jeffrey J. Schott, and Woan Foong Wong. The Peterson Institute for International Economics, June 2010. This new book, released by the Peterson Institute for International Economics, defends the Doha Round and criticises recent attempts to abandon it, saying that it is more important than ever to sustain political support for the rules-based multilateral trade system. The study makes a series of recommendations for a Doha package that, while ambitious, would also be palatable for developed and developing countries. For more information, or to buy the book online, please visit the [PIIE bookstore](#).

MANOMET STUDY OF WOODY BIOMASS RELEASED. By the Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences, June 2010. This newly released report outlines the results of a 6-month study on the effects of using forest biomass for energy production in Massachusetts. The report describes a new carbon 'debt and dividend' framework for evaluating the greenhouse gas impacts of using forest biomass to produce energy. The study and various related materials can be downloaded from the [Manomet website](#).