



Bridges Trade BioRes

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

Volume 10 · Number 19, 25 October 2010

Biodiversity

Pessimism Prevails as CBD COP Resumes
in Nagoya 1

Fisheries

WTO Fisheries Negotiations 'On' Again 3

Sustainable Agriculture

Brussels to Propose Greener,
More Targeted Farm Support 5

Opinion

Wronged by the Wrong Language:
The International Regime on
Access and Benefit-Sharing 7

In Brief

Nagoya Meeting Spawns New Biosafety Treaty.. 8
APEC Ministers Call for Urgent
Action on Marine Ecosystems 10

Events and Resources

Events..... 10
Resources 12

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.

Bridges Trade BioRes is made possible through the generous support of the Government of the United Kingdom (DFID) and ICTSD's core donors including the governments of Australia, Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden. Your financial or in-kind support to BRIDGES and the BRIDGES series of publications is a direct and visible commitment to advancing sustainable development in global policymaking. For more details contact Andrew Crosby, Managing Director at acrosby@ictsd.ch or +41 (0)22 917 8335.

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 Andrew Aziz, Trineesh Biswas, Jonathan Hepburn, and Marie Wilke.

The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz.

ISSN 1682-0843

BIODIVERSITY

Pessimism Prevails as CBD COP Resumes in Nagoya

Despite several days of protracted negotiations, a pessimistic tone has emerged in Nagoya, Japan where government negotiators are meeting at the Convention on Biological Diversity's Tenth Conference of the Parties (CBD COP 10). Entrenched positions and generally slow progress in negotiations – particularly on the issue of Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) – have had many observers suggesting that clinching a deal in Nagoya is now unlikely.

The establishment of an ABS protocol is an important goal for this year's Conference of the Parties, the CBD's tenth. The prospective international protocol would set the terms for commercial access to genetic resources and traditional knowledge, and the sharing of benefits arising from products incorporating those resources or knowledge with the communities in which they originate. The issue is closely watched by the environment and trade community, which views an agreement on ABS as crucial for creating incentives for biodiversity protection, as well as for fighting biopiracy.

Many commercial pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, and biochemicals have been derived from plants and animals found in nature. And because the most biodiverse countries in the world are in poorer regions, while the users of genetic resources are typically located in the developed world, ABS has long been an important priority on the agenda of developing countries. But while all parties involved in the negotiations generally agree that countries and communities should be fairly compensated by industry, consensus on the details has eluded negotiators for more than six years.

Formerly agreed text re-opened

ABS Co-Chairs Timothy Hodges and Fernando Casas have been pushing negotiators to overcome differences and remove brackets from the protocol draft text during two recent negotiating sessions in Montreal, Canada and a pre-COP 10 meeting in Nagoya from 13-16 October (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [24 September 2010](#), [23 July 2010](#), and [9 July 2010](#)). But while most early reports from Nagoya suggested that an escalated pace of negotiations had yielded some success, most articles remain unresolved. Many of these articles are pending only one or two issues, but these relate to difficult language on sensitive issues.

At a plenary last Friday, Hodges and Casas called on members to be better prepared to move to the centre and to ensure they had revised instructions from capitals that would allow them to better achieve compromise on key issues. The Co-Chairs were reacting to the fact that in late hour sessions on 20 October some parties began revising text that had already had brackets removed and was considered “clean.”

At the plenary, NGO representatives remarked that the situation emerging in Nagoya was reminiscent of last December’s meeting of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in Copenhagen, Denmark. The UNFCCC COP was notable for the inability of developed and developing countries to find compromise and the hesitancy of parties to agree to legally binding commitments.

Outstanding issues

Developed-developing country conflicts in the ABS negotiations generally revolve around political differences and the highly technical and complex nature of the topic. This latter issue became apparent during the Montreal talks when negotiators had difficulty agreeing on the meaning of the terms “genetic resource,” “derivates,” and “utilisation of genetic recourses.” Other outstanding issues include clarifying the scope of the protocol, the inclusion of associated traditional knowledge, and enforcement (which is addressed in a number of provisions on monitoring and tracking and on compliance).

Traditional knowledge, derivatives, compliance, financing, and temporal scope – the duration for which the protocol will be retroactive, once it enters into force – continue to be sticking points in the negotiations. Traditional knowledge was addressed last week by both ABS negotiators and CBD Working Group looking at CBD Article 8(j) – which covers traditional knowledge, innovations, and practices – on Thursday. However, progress was reportedly stalled by the European Commission and Canada.

Small groups addressed compliance, primarily the appropriate role of patent offices – or similar national institutions – last week and reportedly made surprising progress. Another small group working on the relationship between the protocol and other international agreements introduced text referring to the provision of affordable treatment to those in need, with an emphasis on developing countries. The text is notable because it differs from the WTO’s Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), and appears to offer possible compromise on the issue.

But progress in specific areas has failed to lead to an overall sense of optimism at the COP. As Brazil pointed out at a press conference last Thursday, agreement in certain areas means little while there is disagreement elsewhere. “It is a package,” the Brazilian representative said. “We are not bluffing. We are very clear on this.”

All eyes on ministers

ABS negotiations were scheduled to be completed by the end of last week. However, negotiators requested an extension. Casas said this request is a positive sign that pointed to a format that is working. “Openness, transparency and good will have characterized the talks,” the Co-Chair said.

But despite his positive tone, Casas cautioned delegates that much work needs to be done to finalise a deal. “Significant positions have been agreed on,” Casas said at Friday’s plenary. “Yet we must observe the well known principle that ‘nothing is agreed until everything is agreed.’”

The group plans to finalise work by Thursday at the latest.

On Wednesday, 110 ministers or representatives will arrive in Nagoya for the high-level portion of the meeting. There will be one high-level segment specific to ABS that will take place in parallel to the general meeting. It remains unclear whether negotiators will be able to overcome their differences to finalise a text.

More information

For detailed legal analysis on the ABS negotiations, view the special Nagoya issue of [*Bridges Trade BioRes Review*](#).

ICTSD Reporting.

FISHERIES

WTO Fisheries Negotiations 'On' Again

Negotiators at the WTO are hailing a “new environment” in ongoing talks on how to discipline government payments to the fisheries sector, a major factor contributing to declining fish stocks in the world’s oceans. The negotiations - which have been exceedingly slow since early 2008 – earlier this month saw countries engaging once again in specific and technical exchanges (albeit without discernible forward movement).

Part of the reason for the change is delegations’ desire to make their respective cases to the new chair of the Negotiating Group on Rules. An additional impetus has come from a process involving a group of ambassadors who have been meeting regularly to examine their differences on the entire spectrum of issues in the Doha Round negotiations, including fisheries subsidies.

Members met in plenary on 4-5 October to discuss ways to cut subsidies that contribute to overfishing. Sources described the talks as taking place in a sort of “listening and learning” mode, given that Ambassador Dennis Francis (Trinidad and Tobago) only became chair of the committee in July (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [23 July 2010](#)).

According to one delegate, this process was conducive to engagement. Countries were eager to show the chair why they were satisfied or unhappy with the draft negotiating text, drafted by the then-chair Uruguayan Ambassador Guillermo Valles Galmés in December 2007. “When both sides are trying to convince the chair of something, the negotiations are on again,” the official said.

S&DT comes to the fore

The “Friends of Fish” countries, such as Australia and New Zealand highlighted the need for strong rules prohibiting subsidies. Japan and Korea, and to some extent the EU, explained that they were looking for a more flexible approach, with more exceptions permitting payments than are present in the chair’s text.

Nevertheless, sources report that there have been some shifts in negotiating position in recognition of ‘red lines’ in the talks. For instance, Japan, which initially was opposed to blanket bans on any kinds of subsidies, now accepts in principle that there will be prohibitions on some kinds of payments that lead to overcapacity and overfishing, such as subsidies for the construction of new vessels, the source says.

The concerns of many developing countries looking for solutions for effective special and differential treatment (S&DT) also came to fore. Indeed, developing countries have made numerous submissions over the past three years seeking to find ways to operationalise S&DT. In the plenary session, negotiators continued to debate a paper by Brazil and India, among others, on S&DT (TN/RL/GEN/163, available on the [WTO website](#)).

New submissions

Discussions also touched on a submission by the US (GEN/165). In addition, there were two new papers by Australia (GEN/167) and Korea (GEN/168), respectively. The Australian submission proposed adding a new category of prohibited subsidies, focusing on destructive fishing practices. These would include bottom trawling and large-scale drift-nets in territorial waters as well as on the high seas. Bottom trawling

often leads to the destruction of marine habitats with negative effects that reach far beyond the target species. Images of large bottom trawlers that wipe the sea floor clean of vibrant ecosystems, such as coral reefs, and leave barren ocean deserts behind, have become well known to the public. The Australian paper also suggested tightening some of the language on the allowed subsidies that can support efforts to reduce the pressure on fisheries. In addition, Australia wanted to increase transparency, adding to the reporting and peer review obligations.

The Korean submission focused on a 'traffic light' approach to the subsidies, making some actionable rather than directly prohibited. This approach is in line with the 'bottom-up' - rather than 'top-down' - approach to subsidies long favoured by Korea. The Friends of Fish generally opposed this approach, feeling it would water down the current draft.

Discussions also took place among smaller groups of delegates. Among issues discussed were potential subsidies to small-scale, artisanal fisheries in developed countries. Originally, such exceptions were envisioned for developing country small-scale and artisanal fisheries only, taking into account food security and livelihood concerns. However, some parties, such as Korea (GEN/168), have stressed their desire to support their own small-scale fishers, due to the relative poverty of these groups. One of the problems in the context of the discussion on small-scale and artisanal fishers is the lack of a definition - if defined a certain way, a large majority of a country's catch might be deemed to come from "small-scale" fishing operations.

At the close of the meetings, Chair Francis commented that "It's very clear to me that all delegations remain highly committed and have shown a very constructive disposition."

Potential for early harvest?

Fishery subsidies have been on the agenda of a small group of ambassadors, who have been meeting regularly to try to better understand each other's positions across the spectrum of the struggling Doha Round talks, not limited to the well-established differences on agriculture and

industrial goods. These conversations have seen ambassadors getting into the technicalities of the fisheries negotiating text for the first time - a step generally seen as positive by negotiators.

With no end in sight for the Doha Round, there have been calls for an "early harvest" that would have members' agree on terms for fisheries subsidy cuts and start implementing them. However, negotiators remain sceptical that a stand-alone deal could sell politically, particularly in countries that perceive themselves to be "losing" in the fish subsidies talks. "I think it's very difficult," said one negotiator. "Some of the countries that are losing could sell it as part of a broader package. How do you go home and say 'I agreed to an early harvest [on fisheries subsidies], but nothing else is moving?'"

Courtney Sakai of Oceana, a marine conservation advocacy group that supports strong curbs on fisheries subsidy spending, said she was "excited and encouraged" by the WTO members' focus on the issue, including at the ambassadorial level. Many countries were searching for compromises that would protect both fish stocks and vulnerable livelihoods, she said. "We see a lot of countries moving forward with trying to grapple with the challenge of how do you promote sustainable development."

The next meeting of the Negotiating Group on Rules is scheduled to take place in December, although whether or not fisheries will be discussed remains open.

ICTSD reporting.

SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE

Brussels to Propose Greener, More Targeted Farm Support

A leaked draft proposal from the European Commission outlines plans to maintain the bloc's substantial farm subsidy scheme in the post-2013 seven year budgetary cycle, but refocus spending on more clearly-defined policy outcomes such as environmental goals. However, the unofficial proposals have drawn fire from farm groups fearing increased costs, as well as from environmentalists, development agencies and others seeking more ambitious reforms.

Prepared by the Commission's Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development, the draft document recommends that a future Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) for Europe should focus on three objectives: viable food production, sustainable management of natural resources, and balanced territorial development. The leaked text was posted to the capreform.eu website on 8 October.

The proposal argues that, in order to achieve viable food production within the EU, a future farm policy needs to contribute to farm incomes, and help EU farmers to face competition from the world market (including in areas with natural constraints). It suggests that the CAP needs to provide environmental public goods, foster innovation, and enable farming to mitigate and adapt to climate change. Finally, it sees agriculture as important for supporting rural employment, promoting diversification and contributing to the "attractiveness and identity of rural areas".

Policy instruments

The outline communication proposes maintaining a decoupled basic income payment for all farmers, plus additional support that would be linked to environmental measures. EU member states would retain the discretion to provide small amounts of production-linked support at the national level, the document suggests, and farmers in areas less conducive to agricultural production

would also continue to benefit from additional payments.

The document suggests that the EU maintain "a two pillar structure" for farm support, with one pillar covering support paid to all farmers on a yearly basis and another covering other shared European objectives, such as rural development. To cope with "income uncertainties and market volatility", members would also be able to make use of a new "risk management toolkit," which would include policy options "ranging from a new WTO green box compatible income stabilisation tool, to strengthened support to insurance instruments and mutual funds."

The Commission proposes establishing a new ceiling on direct payments to large individual farms, in a bid to improve the much-criticised concentration of support on the largest farms - although this measure could also take into consideration the extent to which large farms contribute to rural employment. In a bid to respond to criticism from the European Court of Auditors, payments would be limited to "active farmers." In recent months, transparency campaigners have highlighted the extent to which payments go to large landowners and food processing firms, and reported that some of the beneficiaries of taxpayers' largesse include groups such as accordion and billiard clubs.

The leaked document proposes introducing "more equity in the distribution of direct payments between Member States," although it appears to reject proposals for a single flat rate direct payment available to all producers. Currently, payments are skewed away from farmers in the Eastern European countries that most recently joined the EU, a situation which their governments seek to rectify. Instead, the proposal floats the idea that farmers in all member states could receive on average a minimum share of the EU-wide average level of direct payments.

Three options for reform

The draft outlines three possible reform scenarios: an "enhanced status quo" option, a "radical" option abolishing market and income support, and a mid-way reform option focused on "more

balanced, targeted and sustainable support.” The impact of each option will be analysed before the Commission makes a final decision on its CAP proposal, the draft suggests.

While the status quo option would be restricted to “limited improvements in specific areas,” such as greater equity in the distribution of direct payments between member states, the draft suggests this could “arguably represent a missed opportunity” for reform. However, the document is even less enthusiastic about the radical option: if the EU were to abolish market and income support, and focus entirely on environmental and climate change objectives, it warns that this could “lead to a significant reduction in production levels, farm income, and number of farmers for the most vulnerable sectors and areas, as well as cause land abandonment in some areas and intensification of production in other areas, with serious potential environmental and social consequences.”

The mid-way option would ensure that the EU’s farm policy becomes more sustainable, the draft argues, and improve the balance between different policy objectives. More targeted measures would also “be more understandable to the EU citizen”. The size and complexity of the existing policy framework has been repeatedly criticised in recent years, and the draft acknowledges that simplifying existing measures would be helpful.

“Too early”

Officials familiar with the policy-making process warned that it may still be “too early” to comment meaningfully on the draft document. Although marked “*version finale*” (final version), it remains unclear whether the document has gone through intra-departmental consultations, or through vetting by other EU departments with responsibility for trade or development.

The document is also devoid of any figures on the size of the eventual budget for the bloc’s agricultural policy - a discussion which reportedly is due to take place between the EU’s badly squeezed finance ministers, with potentially important repercussions for agriculture. Furthermore, the draft gives no indication of the

relative importance of the main policy instruments, such as the basic income support payments or the environmental subsidy component.

Initial reactions

The leaked document provoked a hostile reaction from COPA-COGECA, a European farmers’ group, which warned in a press release that “the Commission plans will increase costs even further for EU farmers, threatening their competitiveness [sic] and economic viability”. The group advised that “reinforcing the economic production role of farmers must be central to the future CAP.” Environmental organisations, in contrast, have argued that a reformed farm policy must focus instead on the delivery of public goods such as environmental and developmental benefits.

In comments to Bridges, COPA-COGECA Secretary-General Pekka Pesonen cautioned against introducing additional environmental requirements on top of those that EU farmers have to comply with already. European farm income fell by 12 percent in 2009, Pesonen said, and increased costs of production could mean “farm income levels would plummet further.”

Ariel Brunner, head of EU policy at environmental group Birdlife International, told Bridges that the draft was “horribly timid.” While welcoming the overall direction of proposed reform, with a clearer focus on targeted measures and on delivering public goods, he also cautioned that plans to establish a new risk management toolkit covering income stabilisation and insurance “could become another monster very quickly.” Brunner also queried whether food security should be an overriding objective for the CAP, noting that “Europe doesn’t have an issue of food security,” while many developing countries face problems with hunger and malnutrition.

Some of his concerns were echoed by Nils Jakobsen, ActionAid’s head of policy and campaigns in Denmark. Jakobsen argued that the draft document does not “recognise the CAP has a negative impact - and is certainly trade-distorting - for developing countries.” He suggested that governments should reconsider the criteria

determining which subsidies can be classified as ‘green box’ at the WTO - a category of payments that is exempt from any cap or reduction commitments, on the basis that they cause no more than minimal trade-distortion.

The Commission’s finalised CAP proposal is expected in November.

More information

The leaked proposals can be viewed [here](#).

ICTSD reporting.

OPINION

Wronged by the Wrong Language: The International Regime on Access and Benefit-Sharing

By Joseph Henry Vogel and Manuel Ruiz

Nomenclature matters. Harvard naturalist E.O. Wilson insists that “[t]he first step to wisdom, as the Chinese say, is getting things by their right names.”¹ Getting things by the wrong name, albeit unwise, need not be fatal. In *Through the Looking Glass*, Humpty Dumpty tells Alice that names can mean whatever he chooses for them to mean. For the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) “genetic resources” means “material of actual or potential value” where “genetic material” means “any material of plant, animal, microbial or other origin that contains functional units of heredity.” “Material” is synonymous with “tangible” and so “genetic material is [anything tangible] of plant, animal, microbial or other origin that contains functional units of heredity”² However, the object of biological research is intangible, as evidenced by “genetic information,” a ubiquitous term in the

scientific literature. An economics of information exists and its prescriptions are unambiguous: policies that enhance efficiency and equity for tangibles aggravate inefficiency and inequity for intangibles. The CBD has gotten both the name (“genetic resources”) and the meaning (“material of any plant, [etc.]”) wrong and the combination is fatal for the International Regime on Access and Benefit-Sharing (ABS). In other words, the Conference of the Parties (COP) has embarked on the wrong road and must turn back.

Ancients would often kill the messenger of bad news; through wilful ignorance, moderns achieve the same effect. The politician who was wrong says to the wronged constituency “No one could have foreseen the [fill in the blank for the crisis du jour].” The truth is that almost every big piece of bad news was foreseeable and foreseen by [fill in the blank for an expert]. Salient examples are the absence of weapons of mass destruction and Hans Blix, or financial collapse through massive leveraging and Nouriel Roubini. The failure of the CBD to achieve fair and equitable ABS is no exception. In 1996, USAID commissioned the first author of this piece to assemble case studies for The Summit of the Americas on Sustainable Development. Case Number Six was entitled “The Impossibility of a Successful Case of Bioprospecting without a Cartel.”³ But even then the argument was not new, having been launched in book form in 1992, the year of the signing of the CBD.⁴ Over the next eighteen years, various publications pondering the implications of genetic resources as information appeared, the latest being “The Museum of Bioprospecting, Intellectual Property, and the Public Domain: A Place, A

¹ Wilson, E.O. *Consilience* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998), 4.

² Convention on Biological Diversity, Article 2. <http://www.cbd.int/convention/convention.shtml>

³ Vogel, Joseph Henry. “White Paper: The Successful Use of Economic Instruments to Foster the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity: Six Cases from Latin America and the Caribbean”. *Biopolicy Journal*, volume 2, Paper 5 (PY97005), 1997

⁴ Vogel, Joseph Henry. *Privatisation as a Conservation Policy* (Melbourne, Australia: Centre for International Research on Communication and Information Technologies, 1992).

Process, A Philosophy.”⁵ A Google search will prove fruitful.

In a nutshell, the justification for oligopoly rights over genetic information is the same as for monopoly intellectual property rights.

Nevertheless, as late as July 2010, CBD experts were still writing about political economy and the International Regime without any utterance of the rationale for a cartel, even as minimum requirements are discussed.⁶ The ancients would be proud.

How can the International Regime turn back? Over an illustrious career, John Kenneth Galbraith (1908-2006) envisioned academia as a countervailing power to vested interests. In the concluding chapter of *Collapse*, Jared Diamond writes something similar with regards to the role of NGOs.⁷ As an academic and a program director for an NGO, the authors of this piece are less sanguine. COP delegates seem impervious to dissent, be it from the academy or an NGO. We look to the cracks in the existing power structure.

An analogy between carbon emissions and ABS may be useful: just as the insurance industry is pitted against Big Oil and Coal, certain elements within biotechnology are unaligned with those of Big Pharma and Agro. Especially hopeful is the International Barcode of Life (iBOL), which must secure access to achieve its mission. So far, its strategy has been to split hairs between commercial and non-commercial research and join the long list of wannabe CBD exceptions.⁸ We believe that that beaten path is the wrong road and urge iBOL to elevate Plan B, viz. the biodiversity cartel, to Plan A. The cartel-as-

International Regime gets the nomenclature right while doing right by the stakeholders.

The mechanism of the cartel-as-International Regime is simple. Genetic resources would flow freely with disclosure of the species bioprospected in the patent application. Any resultant royalties would be distributed proportional to the range within the countries of origin. For species so widely distributed that the costs of determining the range outstrip the royalties collected, the sum “should be used to diminish the fixed costs of the gargantuan database.”⁹ These words were published in *Genes for Sale* (1994), before anyone imagined that iBOL would emerge as the gargantuan database.

Early reviews of *Genes for Sale* obsessed with the database: it did not exist and would not exist for many years.¹⁰ COPX delegates, who wrongly conceive “genetic resources” as tangibles, can save face by claiming that only with the formal activation of iBOL in October 2010 is the Biodiversity Cartel possible, Google be damned.

Joseph Henry Vogel is a Professor at the University of Puerto Rico-Río Piedras and Manuel Ruiz is Programme Director at the Peruvian Society of Environmental Law.

IN BRIEF

Nagoya Meeting Spawns New Biosafety Treaty

Officials from 116 countries have approved a new international treaty that establishes rules on how industry would be liable if imported living genetically modified organisms end up polluting ecosystems. But while the treaty has been held up by many as a symbol of success for multilateral environmental negotiation, critics raised concerns

⁵ Vogel, Joseph Henry, ed. *The Museum of Bioprospecting, Intellectual Property, and the Public Domain: A Place, A Process, A Philosophy* (Anthem Press, 2010).

⁶ Cabrera Medaglia, Jorge. “The Political Economy of the International ABS Regime Negotiations: Options and Synergies with Relevant IPR Instruments and Processes” (Geneva, Switzerland: International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, 2010).

⁷ Diamond, Jared. *How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed* (New York, NY: Penguin, 2005).

⁸ Tvedt, Morten Walloe and Olivier Rukundo. “Functionality of an ABS Protocol” (Lysaker, Norway: Fridtjof Nansen Institute, 2010).

⁹ Vogel, Joseph Henry *Genes for Sale* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 87.

¹⁰ Rolston III, Holmes. “Genes for Sale; Gargantuan Computer System Wanted,” *Conservation Biology* 9(1995):1657-1658.

over the legal effectiveness of the pact and suggested the final text has been significantly watered down over the six year negotiating process.

The Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety was finalised during an 11-15 October meeting that immediately preceded the Convention on Biological Diversity's Tenth Conference of the Parties (CBD COP 10) in Nagoya, Japan (see related story, this issue).

The Cartagena Protocol addresses the safe transfer (i.e., through transboundary trade), handling, and use of Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) that have the potential to adversely affect biodiversity – including human health. The Protocol sets procedures for the importation of GM organisms that are intended to be released into the environment. Cartagena entered into force on 11 September 2003.

By addressing liability and redress, the Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur treaty fills an important gap in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol. The new Protocol is supplementary to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety which, in turn, is supplementary to the CBD.

Upon the adoption of the Protocol, Masayo Tanabu of host country Japan congratulated delegates and reminded delegates that any challenge can be overcome by the spirit of cooperation. Ahmed Djoghlaif, the CBD's Executive Secretary, lauded the cooperation between developed and developing countries at the meeting but cautioned that funding to implement the Secretariat's work was lacking.

The Secretariat's budget has grown slightly over the past two years and many observers say it does not have the funds to fully implement its mission. If funding is completely exhausted, developing countries will have to rely on donations from other members and donors to participate.

At the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, developed countries agreed to commit the financial resources to implement the Rio Conventions, which include climate change (UNFCCC), desertification (UNCCD), and biodiversity (CBD).

"There remain serious issues in need of priority consideration and urgent action," said Sebastian Marino of Palau, one of two officials representing Asia-Pacific countries. Marino said that before the Protocol can be successfully carried out, his region must address shortages in capacity building, financial resources, information exchange, and technology transfer.

"In addition, the Asia and Pacific group would like to highlight the equal importance of socio-economic considerations," Marino said, alluding to the right of developing countries to refuse to import GM products if they are perceived to damage the socio-economic well-being of the country or community into which it is being introduced.

This contentious issue has been difficult to overcome in the past, with some countries arguing that a socio-economic veto could, if abused, act as a barrier to trade. To overcome this issue, countries agreed to hold a series of workshops to discuss the issue. To this end, Norway pledged US\$75,000 to help support the workshops.

The Nagoya-Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress will open for signatures at the UN headquarters at some point in March 2011. The treaty would then take effect 90 days after it has been ratified.

ICTSD Reporting; "Summary of the Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety," EARTH NEGOTIATIONS BULLETIN, 18 October 2010; "New Biosafety Treaty Faces Tough Tests Ahead," IPS, 16 October 2010; "Japan biodiversity meet adopts rules on GM crop damages," AFP, 16 October 2010.

APEC Ministers Call for Urgent Action on Marine Ecosystems

Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) oceans-related ministers meeting in Paracas, Peru say that urgent action is needed to help improve the conservation of marine ecosystems in the Asia-Pacific region.

Delegates said that 80 percent of the world's fish population is over-exploited and pointed to several studies that show that the health of the marine environment and its resources are in a state of continuous degradation.

A major focus of the 11-12 October meeting was the role of fisheries in supporting food security in the Asia-Pacific region. Delegates highlighted the important role of trade in ocean resources for strengthening food security in the region and discussed the trade and investment challenges for the sector. Areas of concern included tariffs, the role of eco-certification or eco-labelling, increased sanitary and phyto-sanitary requirements, traceability, subsidies, and overcapacity.

The ministers stressed the need for free and open trade and investment to ensure the fisheries industry can maximise its impact on tackling food security in the region.

The ministers also discussed environmental issues that are leading to the degradation of the marine ecosystem – especially climate change. Jorge Villasante, Peru's Minister of Production, said that the effects of global warming on ocean life are irreversible and put marine species at risk.

"There is no denying that the planet's oceans are in crisis due to climate change, destructive fishing practices, increased illegal fishing and over-fishing," Villasante said. "These are major threats to the marine environment."

Those attending the meeting, which is being held under the theme "Healthy Oceans and Fisheries Management towards Food Security," looked at climate change has altered the migration routes of fish poses significant challenges on fisheries and other marine industries. These changes include the movement of marine species from tropical seas

toward cooler waters to avoid rising water temperatures in certain areas.

The outcome of the Paracas meeting – dubbed the 3rd APEC Oceans-related Ministerial Meeting – was presented to the first APEC Ministerial Meeting on Food Security, which was held from 16-17 October, in Niigata, Japan. APEC leaders will also hear the results when they meet in Yokohama, Japan in November.

ICTSD Reporting.

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 October – 8 November)

25-27 October, Mechelen, Belgium. ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD) GLOBAL FORUM ON ENVIRONMENT: SUSTAINABLE MATERIALS MANAGEMENT. The Public Waste Agency of Flanders will be hosting a forum, organised by the OECD, to discuss new sustainable materials management (SSM) practices, policies for implementing these practices, to follow-up on reports from two prior SSM workshops that were also held by the OECD. Participation is open to OECD countries, delegates from invited non-member economies, and other invited experts. The organisers are also inviting the UN Resource panel, along with representatives from the business and NGO communities. For more information, including a preliminary agenda, refer to the [event website](#).

25-27 October, Moscow, Russia. IEA ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGIES WORKSHOP. This workshop will discuss clean coal technologies and policy to improve the efficiency of coal-fired

electricity generation and carbon capture and storage (CCS), concentrating on the particular circumstances of the Russian Federation. Taking place in multiple venues, including the Skochinsky Institute of Mining and the All-Russian Thermal Engineering Institute, key Russian stakeholders and international actors will participate to review methods to maximise the utility of coal use and reduce the environmental impact of coal energy generation. For more information visit the [event website](#).

1-5 November, Maputo, Mozambique. FIRST ALL-AFRICA ENERGY WEEK. The First All Africa Energy Week (AAEW) is organised by the African Development Bank (AfDB), in cooperation with the African Union Commission (AUC) and the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), under the theme: “Energy Infrastructure and Services in the Context of Climate Challenges.” The overall objectives of the AAEW are to achieve more efficient, coherent and co-ordinated actions towards increasing energy access and developing the energy sector in Africa; and to accelerate progress through dialogue and partnerships in scaling up investments in the African energy sector. The All-Africa Energy Week will be organised jointly with the Pan African Investment Forum and the AU Conference of African Energy Ministers. For more information visit the [event website](#).

1-3 November, London, UK. CROP WORLD 2010. CropWorld 2010, the global congress and exhibition for all those at the forefront of sustainable crop production, will feature conferences and exhibitions with key decision makers and experts from across the crop production industry. The conference programme will encompass nearly every aspect of the crop production value chain from soil preparation and seeds to shops and store shelves. The three day conference will include a series of plenary sessions led by key stakeholder organisations in global crop production, including top government representatives, chief scientists, influential business leaders and many more. For more information visit the CropWorld 2010 [website](#).

2-3 November, Cairo, Egypt. FIFTH ITU SYMPOSIUM ON ICTs AND THE ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE.

The International Telecommunication Union’s (ITU) fifth Symposium on Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) and the Environment and Climate Change will be hosted and co-organised by Egypt’s Ministry of Communications and Information Technology and Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs. It will focus on the issue of ICTs, the environment and climate change in Africa, as well as the needs of developing countries. The symposium will issue the “Cairo Road Map,” a set of recommendations for action in relation to ICTs, the Environment and Climate Change. For more information visit the [event website](#).

3-5 November, Lilongwe, Malawi. SOUTHERN AFRICAN YOUTH CONFERENCE ON CLIMATE CHANGE. The Sustainable Rural Growth and Development Initiative (SRGDI), in collaboration with a consortium of non-governmental organisations, the private sector, research and academic institutions, and the government of Malawi, are partnering with the African Youth Initiative on Climate Change (AYICC) to host the Southern Africa Youth Conference on Climate Change (SAYCCC). The conference aims to attract young leaders, professionals, academics, politicians, development workers, parliamentarians, and the media from Southern Africa. This gathering of Southern African youth has three thematic areas: adaptation, mitigation, lobbying, and advocacy. This conference will lead to a three year climate change programme that will be implemented through a regional climate change youth network. For more information visit the [AYICC website](#).

Other upcoming events

29 November-10 December, Cancun, Mexico. 16TH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES (COP 16) / 6TH 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](#).

14 December, Paris, France. 26TH OECD MINISTERIAL ROUNDTABLE ON

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT – GREEN GROWTH. This roundtable of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) will bring ministers together with business and policy experts. Former political leaders will also be invited to explain what policy advice is needed to turn an idea like green growth into practical and politically realistic policy solutions. For more information, visit the [OECD website](#).

15-18 December, Amaya Hills, Kandy, Sri Lanka, FIFTH ASIAN BIOTECHNOLOGY & DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE 2010. This conference, hosted by the Council for Agricultural Research Policy (CARP), will focus on the theme “How Small Countries can benefit from Biotechnology.” The key objectives of the conference are to review the current status of biotechnology capacity in Asia, discuss strategies and options for developing and delivering biotechnology products to farmers and consumers, and to learn from small countries who have already benefited from biotechnology. For more information, visit [this website](#).

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 Team at biores@ictsd.ch.

LIVING PLANET REPORT 2010: BIODIVERSITY, BIOCAPACITY AND DEVELOPMENT. By WWF, Global Footprint Network, and the Zoological Society of London, October 2010. WWF calls the Living Planet Report the “the world's leading, science-based analysis on the health of our only planet and the impact of human activity.” The report finds that the demands of human beings exceed the Earth's capacity. A business-as-usual scenario will result in the need for the capacity of two Earths to keep up with the global populations natural resources demands, the report predicts. The report proposes alternatives that the authors say could close gap. Issues covered in the Living Planet Report include biodiversity, human demand, ecological footprinting in relation to fresh water, fisheries

and forests, terrestrial carbon storage, trade issues, and the green economy. The full report is available [here](#).

WHO BENEFITS FROM GM CROPS? THE GREAT CLIMATE CHANGE SWINDLE. By Friends of the Earth International, September 2010. This annual report by Friends of the Earth International looks at the evidence used by the International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-Biotech Applications (ISAAA) when they look at successful genetically modified (GM) plants. This year's report shows that in contrast to ISAAA's claims, there is significant and growing opposition to gm crops in many parts of the world. The report also looks at a new claim it says is arising that GM plants can help be a solution to climate change. The report challenges this claim as a myth. To access this report, [click here](#).

WHEN DOES RIGOROUS IMPACT EVALUATION MAKE A DIFFERENCE? THE CASE OF MILLENNIUM VILLAGES. By Michael Clemens and Gabriel Demombynes, Center for Global Development, 11 October 2010. When is the rigorous impact evaluation of development projects a luxury, and when is it a necessity? The authors study one high-profile case: the Millennium Villages Project (MVP), an experimental and intensive package intervention to spark sustained local economic development in rural Africa. They attempt to illustrate the benefits of rigorous impact evaluation in this setting by showing that estimates of the project's effects depend heavily on the evaluation method. They describe how the next wave of the intervention could be designed to allow proper evaluation of the MVP's impact at little additional cost. To access this working paper, [click here](#).