



# Bridges Trade BioRes

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

Volume 10 • Number 7, 16 April 2010

## CLIMATE CHANGE

- Slow Progress in Bonn Confirms  
Fragility of Climate Talks ..... 2

## FISHERIES

- Controversial Whaling Proposal Inches  
Forward at Washington Meeting ..... 1

## In Brief

- Second of Three Panels Clears  
Climate Researchers ..... 4
- US Senate Climate Bill to be Revealed  
on 26 April..... 5
- New Report finds EU Subsidies Faulty..... 6
- IMO Launches New Initiative on  
Shipping Emissions..... 7

## EVENTS AND RESOURCES

- Events..... 8
- Resources ..... 10

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, Samantha Derksen, Ana Maria Kley Meyer, Paige McClanahan, and Sarah Worden.

The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz.

ISSN 1682-0843

## FISHERIES

### Controversial Whaling Proposal Inches Forward at Washington Meeting

A new proposal to overhaul global regulations on whaling seeks to find a middle ground through a combination of ten-year quotas on whale catches and stricter monitoring of the industry. The so-called “peace package” has been debated intensely this week at a meeting of a small group of countries key to the debate – including hunting nations Japan, Iceland, and Norway and opponents such as Australia, New Zealand, and Germany – in Washington, DC.

While the proposal has received strong opposition from both proponents and opponents of whaling, the BBC reports that the initiative is “almost certain” to be presented to the International Whaling Commission (IWC) by 22 April – the deadline for submissions to be voted on at the Commission’s annual meeting, set to kick off on 21 June in Agadir, Morocco. To take effect, a proposal must be approved by 75 percent of the IWC’s 88 member countries.

#### Current ban ineffective

Despite an international moratorium on commercial whaling that came into force in 1986, whaling catches have increased almost six-fold over the past two decades. The world’s three whaling nations – Iceland, Norway, and Japan – have long exploited loopholes in the international treaty by either opting out completely or claiming catches are for legitimate scientific research.

Similarly, the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) has implemented a ban on international trade of whale products, but the three whaling countries have registered exemptions – which essentially allows

the countries to trade among each other and other non-CITES members.

Trade in whale products made waves in recent weeks when a shipment of Icelandic whale meat, assumed to be en route to Japan, was intercepted by Greenpeace in a Dutch port. Imports of whale products to the Netherlands are illegal, but because the ultimate destination was Japan, the Dutch authorities allowed the shipment to pass through. Still, the shipping agency has now refused to continue with the final leg of delivery.

In other incidents, a shipment of whale meat from Iceland to Latvia was intercepted and a Los Angeles, US restaurant was closed after whale meat was discovered on their menu. DNA testing purported that some of the whale meat found in the restaurant was caught as a part of Japan's scientific research programme.

The new initiative being discussed at the Washington meeting proposes that a DNA monitoring system be implemented to allow for international tracking of all whaling catches.

### **A step backward or a step forward?**

Because the proposal suggests lifting the moratorium on whaling in exchange for moderate quotas, some anti-whaling activists have come out strongly against the initiative.

"It would overturn the '86 moratorium, eviscerate the South Ocean Whale Sanctuary, subordinate science and IWC precedent to reward countries that have refused to comply by allocating quotas to those three countries," said Patrick Ramage, the International Fund for Animal Welfare's global whale program director. "Rather than negotiate a treaty that brings commercial whaling to an end, they have created a system under which it will continue."

However, others have suggested that because a complete moratorium has proven to be unenforceable in practice, the potential deal – which has quotas below current catches – is preferable.

"We can't stop it; we can only try to control it," Monica Medina of the National Oceanic and

Atmospheric Administration and the US delegate to the IWO told the New York Times.

On the side of the whaling nations, Japan is rumoured to be open to modest cutbacks. However, Iceland appears to be resolute against agreeing to quotas and, more importantly, a clause stipulating that any whales caught cannot be exported. Iceland is determined to continue exporting whale products to Japan as a core element of their industry.

Officials attending the closed negotiations in Washington say the terms of the deal will likely be subject to major changes, but that over the ten-year implementation period the deal would cut current catches roughly in half. This would save some 5,000 whales from being slaughtered.

It remains unclear what would happen after the ten-year period outlined in the proposal expires. However, many studies show that despite support for whaling is high in Japan, demand for whale meat has been steadily declining in recent years.

Some expect a finalised proposal to be released on 22 April to coincide with Earth Day.

ICTSD Reporting; "Whaling peace plan to go forward this year," BBC NEWS, 15 April 2010; "U.S. Leads New Bid to Phase Out Whale Hunting," THE NEW YORK TIMES, 14 April 2010; "More than 5000 whales could be saved: report," NEW ZEALAND HERALD, 16 April 2010.

## **CLIMATE CHANGE**

### **Slow Progress in Bonn Confirms Fragility of Climate Talks**

UN climate talks held in Bonn, Germany last weekend produced only modest progress in the negotiations toward a global deal to cut emissions of greenhouse gases. The sluggish pace of the weekend discussions suggests that 2010 may turn out to be a painfully slow year for the multilateral climate talks.

The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) session, which ran from 9 to 11 April, had a fairly simple mandate: clarify the negotiation process to pave the way towards a global deal at the Conference of the Parties (COP) in Mexico this December. In essence, countries were asked to define the organisation of work and the methods of work for 2010.

Specifically, parties needed to determine whether additional meetings were necessary beyond the two-week session already scheduled for June in Bonn. They also needed to clarify the basis for negotiation - what text, which issues, what negotiating format — and to instruct the Chair, Margaret Mukahanana-Sangarwe of Zimbabwe, on the extent of her responsibilities for the next meeting. These issues were addressed and eventually hammered out in the wee hours of the morning on Monday.

#### **AWG-LCA, AWG-KP move slowly forward**

In the Ad-hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action (LCA), which adjourned two minutes before midnight on Sunday, officials agreed to plan two additional meetings in 2010, each of which will be at least one week in length (FCCC/LCA/AWG/2010/L.2). The locations of the meetings have not been confirmed, but France is rumoured to have offered the city of Lyon. The chair was also instructed to prepare a draft negotiating text “under her own responsibility” to facilitate negotiations. In reality, this text is prepared by the Secretariat with the chair’s involvement and final approval. Notably, the United States serves as vice-chair this year, meaning that Washington will most likely be deeply involved behind the scenes in this preparation process.

Officials also decided that the UNFCCC Subsidiary Body meeting in June should consider a proposal for a high-level session to provide policy direction prior to the Mexico COP. Finally, parties agreed that the draft text should be allowed to reference COP 15 decisions, without explicit mention of the Copenhagen Accord - the agreement brokered by a small group of heads-of-state in Copenhagen last December that failed to garner consensual support and was therefore

simply noted in the climate conference’s final decisions.

The Ad-hoc Working Group on the Kyoto Protocol gavelled the end of their meeting at 1:30 in the morning. Their conclusion covered the question of further commitments for developed countries, or “Annex 1 parties,” and their work programme for 2010 (FCCC/KP/AWG/2010/L.2). They agreed to focus in 2010 on Annex I parties’ aggregate and individual emission reductions beyond the Kyoto Protocol’s first commitment period, which ends in 2012, and to continue working on “other issues.” They echoed the LCA’s call for two more sessions before the COP in Mexico.

#### **G77/China position unchanged as EU shifts**

The Group of 77 and China - a large bloc of developing nations - continued to stress throughout the meeting the importance of maintaining the Bali Action Plan as the guide for the talks and keeping the negotiations within the purview of the United Nations Convention. The coalition’s language pointedly lashes out against a number of plurilateral climate debates that have sprung up alongside the fully inclusive multilateral UN process. The group believes that a multilateral agreement would be the most effective - and equitable - kind of deal.

The European Union, still recuperating from the disappointment of Copenhagen, which fell far short of their expectations, seemed to shift its tack slightly at this meeting, stressing the US\$2.4 billion of “fast start financing” that the bloc is putting forward to help developing countries adapt to climate change and reduce their emissions. While this number is only a fraction of the US\$30 billion of funding that was promised under the Copenhagen Accord, the EU’s pledge seems to indicate goodwill and a shift in approach to the negotiations.

The EU was previously reluctant to discuss specific finance numbers for developing countries until the latter offered more details on the extent to which they would reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. The G77 and China bloc has long held that the UN climate convention requires developed countries to provide them with

financial and technical support to help them reduce their emissions and adapt to a changing climate. The developing country coalition maintains that this commitment has never been fulfilled.

In addition to the EU pledge, France also announced that at a recent meeting of 54 countries to discuss reducing emissions from deforestation, countries agreed to put forward US\$3.5 billion of fast action financing to address climate change through forests.

### Notable proposals scuppered

Parties tabled a number of proposals early in the discussion that did not get sufficient traction or consensus, or that were crowded out by more contentious issues.

Early on, the EU asked for funding pledges from other developed countries and called for an implementation plan to spell out how the climate financing will be put to use. A number of countries asked to include reference to the UN Charter, principles, procedures, and process in addition to references to transparency and inclusiveness in the draft text. However, none of those proposals garnered enough support to be incorporated into parties' future work.

Several other issues were debated but ultimately left unresolved. Parties remain at odds over whether the chair can include the Copenhagen Accord in the negotiating text. They also left to future meetings questions relating to Mexico's role as COP President this December, a clear reaction to the blunders by the Danish government at last year's COP.

### Analysis

The discussions in Bonn reflect the current fragility of the UN system as the locus for producing a global solution to climate change. Many agree that the current international instruments that address climate change - the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol - are insufficient to respond to both the magnitude of the climate threat and the complexity of the economic and development challenges involved. The situation is further complicated by the enormous amount of

pressure that has built up around the international talks leading up to the Copenhagen COP, and the hangover that has lingered after the disappointing results of that meeting.

The question now is whether countries can restore enough commitment to the UNFCCC process for it to serve as the primary forum for the debate on climate change. If the multilateral stalemate continues, however, countries may turn their focus to national or regional initiatives, or perhaps even plurilateral agreements on specific pieces of the puzzle, such as forestry, energy, and technology.

ICTSD Reporting.

## IN BRIEF

### Second of Three Panels Clears Climate Researchers

Researchers accused by climate sceptics of manipulating data to exaggerate evidence of global warming have been cleared by an independent panel investigating the issue. The incident, dubbed by the media as "Climategate," was triggered last November when emails on computers at the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia in the UK were hacked and released to the public as evidence of unethical research by climate change scientists. However, the recently concluded investigation found that was not the case.

"We saw no evidence of any deliberate scientific malpractice," the panel, chaired by Ronald Oxburgh, a former UK government adviser, concluded. "We found absolutely no evidence of any impropriety whatsoever," Oxburgh said. "That doesn't mean that we agreed with all of their conclusions, but these people were doing their jobs honestly."

Given the timing of the incident, some environmentalists have suggested the hacking was highly organised and deliberate effort to derail United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) climate talks in

Copenhagen by reducing the sense of urgency and seriousness with respect to tackling climate change.

But while the panel found the scientists acted ethically, it did, however, criticise the climate the CRU researchers for not having worked more closely with professional statisticians. "We cannot help remarking that it is very surprising that research in an area that depends so heavily on statistical methods has not been carried out in close collaboration with professional statisticians," the report reads.

At the same time, Professor David Hand, president of the Royal Statistical Society and one of the members of the panel, commended the researchers of the CRU for being honest in their report regarding the uncertainty in the numbers.

Climate sceptics have been quick to dismiss the panel's findings. "The panel should have taken more time to come to more balanced and trustworthy conclusions," said Benny Peiser – director of the Global Warming Policy Foundation, a UK-based think tank that is critical of mainstream global warming science. The process was "rushed and superficial," Peiser said.

In addition, Oxburgh has been accused of partiality, as he currently is the president of the Carbon Capture and Storage Association and chairman of wind energy firm Falck Renewables. Critics claim that, taking into account the benefits that clean energy companies earn from policies tackling climate change, Oxburgh's impartiality cannot be guaranteed.

In response to the timeliness of the findings, Oxburgh argued that because of the nature and seriousness of the issue under investigation, it was necessary to present and publish the findings "as quickly as possible." They came to a unanimous conclusion and that there was no pre-conceived view, Oxburgh added.

The panel is the second of three inquiries into the research performed by the CRU. Last month, a British parliamentary committee also cleared the CRU of accusations of manipulation of data. The third, and most comprehensive inquiry is led by

former civil servant Muir Russell and is due at the end of May this year.

ICTSD Reporting; "No malpractice' by climate unit," BBC NEWS, 14 April 2010; "UK Inquiry Clears Climate Scientists In Email Row," REUTERS, 15 April 2010; "Review panel clears researchers in Climategate' controversy," LOS ANGELES TIMES, 14 April 2010.

---

## US Senate Climate Bill to be Revealed on 26 April

Three US senators are expected to introduce new climate change legislation on 26 April, media sources reported on Friday.

The bill – which has been crafted over the past six months by Senators John Kerry (a Democrat), Lindsey Graham (a Republican), and Joe Lieberman (an Independent) – reportedly keeps the cap-and-trade structure that was written into the version of the bill passed by the US House of Representatives last summer (See Bridges Trade BioRes, 26 June 2009, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/biores/49571/>). Under the Senate bill, however, the system would apply only to electric power plants until 2016, when it would be expanded to include other large manufacturers. Senator Kerry has insisted that the bill will maintain the goal of securing a 17 percent drop in heat-trapping emissions from 2005 levels by 2020, the same objective that was written into the House bill last year.

Political observer and Washington Post columnist Steven Pearlstein has estimated that the Kerry-Graham-Lieberman bill – or a simplified form of it – has a roughly 50-50 chance of being passed by the Senate this year. Somewhat less optimistic, Emilie Mazzacurati, an analyst at the consulting group Point Carbon, told journalists on Thursday that the bill had just a 30 percent chance of winning senators' approval in 2010, thanks in large part to opposition from lawmakers from oil- and coal-heavy states, Reuters reported.

Regardless of the bill's final fate, it will definitely find its way into the Senate's busy summer schedule, as Majority Leader Harry Reid has



vowed to carve out time for debates over the bill on the Senate floor, the New York Times reported.

On Thursday, a group of ten Democratic senators, most of whom represent industry-heavy states like Michigan and Ohio, wrote a letter to the bill's three sponsors urging them to draft the legislation so that it supports US manufacturing.

One of senators' key criteria was that the bill should include "border measures" that would slap a tariff or other form of adjustment on imports from countries that have not implemented emissions reduction requirements that are "comparable" to those taken by the United States. Such measures would encourage other countries to take similar actions to cut emissions, the senators wrote, and it would help guarantee that the climate bill "will be trade neutral."

But the notion of including some form of "border carbon adjustment" in a Senate climate bill will likely stir up controversy, both domestically and overseas. The Indian environment minister recently threatened to bring a WTO case against any country that imposes such measures, which are also reportedly being considered in the European Union (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 2 April 2010, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/biores/73561/>). Closer to home, US President Barack Obama spoke out against border carbon adjustment after lawmakers in the House included them in the climate bill they passed last summer (see Bridges Weekly, 1 July 2009, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/bridgesweekly/49962/>).

"I think we have to be very careful about sending any protectionist signals out there," Obama said at the time.

ICTSD reporting; "US climate bill seen raising gasoline prices," REUTERS, 15 April 2010; "Senate climate bill to be unveiled April 26," THE NEW YORK TIMES, 15 April 2010; "Congress worked out health care. Is climate change next?" THE WASHINGTON POST, 16 April 2010.

## New Report finds EU Subsidies Faulty

Less than one-fifth of EU subsidies earmarked for assisting fisherman to reduce fishing were used for the intended purpose, according to a new report published by the Pew Environment Group. According to the report, released in late March, only 17 percent of the funds distributed between 2000 and 2006 were used for scrapping vessels in an effort to reduce fishing capacity and protect marine sources.

The report found that rather than tackling the problem of overcapacity in the sector, subsidies instead went to support "negative measures." According to the Pew study, 29 percent of the funds went towards modernising or building new vessels – or other purposes that negatively impact fish stocks – while 54 percent were found to have little to no impact on fishing capacity at all.

The Pew report arrives shortly before the European Commission is expected to chart its own review of the effectiveness of the subsidy program. The EC is expected to analyse the overall effectiveness of the program among all 27 member countries, whereas the Pew report focused on just the 10 member countries that account for 93 percent of the subsidies, or €4.9 billion: Spain, Italy, France, Portugal, Greece, UK, Denmark, Germany, Poland, and Sweden. Spain alone received 46 percent of the subsidies, 41 percent of which went towards the aforementioned "negative measures."

The Pew report focuses on the environmental issues directly correlated to subsidies programs of the EU, such as fleet capacity, as well as the social implications of the aid, according to Tim Huntington, director of Poseidon Aquatic Resource, the UK organisation responsible for drafting the report. "EU fisheries subsidies and the overfishing of valuable fish stocks are clearly connected," he said.

Additionally, the change in schemes for distribution of the funds has caused concern over the removal of transparency, the study says. Subsidies were allocated in 2000-2006 under the Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance

(FIFG) program, which has been replaced for 2007-2013 by the European Fisheries Fund (EFF), aimed at "supporting sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources and a stable balance between these resources and the capacity of Community fishing fleet." Under the new program, another such study will be impossible. "Transparency has been removed with the new funding instrument," said Pew's policy and research director, Markus Knigge. "The public have a right to know what they have funded."

The EU's subsidies no longer fund new construction, but much funding still goes toward renovating and modernising vessels. EU spokesman Johan Reyniers, however, disagreed that these applications of the funds inherently lead to overfishing. "Support for vessel modernisation fosters the use of more selective fishing gear and fishing techniques reducing the negative impact on the environment," he claims. Reyniers also stated that many of the flaws of the subsidies program have already been addressed, and other outstanding issues will continue to be modified as the EU works to improve its policies and practices to increase fishing sustainability.

"Report sheds light on EU support for overfishing," EURACTIV, 31 March 2010; "EU subsidies overfishing, new study shows," FISHERIES SECRETARIAT, 31 March 2010; "Report: EU subsidies fund overfishing," BUSINESSWEEK, 31 March 2010; "EU subsidies helped drive overfishing- report," REUTERS, 31 March 2010; "EU subsidies linked to overfishing," ECOLOGIST, 31 March 2010; "EU Subsidies funding new fleets and over fishing," FISH2FORK NEWSROOM, 31 March 2010.

---

## IMO Launches New Initiative on Shipping Emissions

The International maritime Organisation (IMO) recently agreed to establish an expert group for the purpose of conducting a feasibility study on market-based instruments to cut greenhouse gas emissions from ships. The group will look critically at options such as bunker fuels and

emissions trading, and will ultimately prepare an impact-assessment report.

The creation of the group follows in the wake of some unilateral efforts outside the IMO aimed at reducing shipping emissions, such as the adoption of an Emissions Control Area around the US and Canadian Coastlines (See Bridges Trade BioRes, 2 April 2010, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/biores/73577/>).

International shipping currently contributes nearly 2.7 percent of global warming emissions, with some observers predicting that this number will rise dramatically by 2050. Still, the IMO has been slow in instituting emissions curbing regulations or programs; the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) has been under pressure to pick up the slack.

The UN's Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) outlined the purpose of the new group, also deciding to postpone finalising fuel-efficiency standards for ships. The MEPC stated they had drafted plans for an Energy Efficiency Design Index to ensure new ships meet certain environmental standards, as well as a Ship Energy Efficiency Management Plan for all current and future operating ships. However, MEPC deferred additional issues to be addressed in September by another working group.

Still, the UNFCCC's attempts to address the issue have been stymied by its principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, as well as the IMO's policy of equal treatment of ships. With their respective policies, the UNFCCC would require richer countries to bear higher costs, while the IMO would seek to have a tax distributed equally among all ships, due to the nature of cross-border activities and in effort to prevent interference in competition.

Considering this, Copenhagen climate talks saw the EU alone in its appeal for targets to address the issue. The US rejected discussing bunker fuels at all, while China, India, and other developing countries actively argued that market-based measures, and relevant debates, should be put on hold until a climate agreement was made.

The EU responded by saying it will set its own caps if neither international climate negotiations nor the IMO establish an effective regulation. In an effort to do so, the EU has already decided to add aviation to its emissions caps by 2010. "We have made clear that if the IMO cannot sort out things, if the UNFCCC cannot sort out things, by the end of next year, we will come up with proposals," said Jos Delbeke, director-general of the European Commission's new climate action department.

The EU's promise to address the issue is complicated by recent reports questioning the sustainability of EU biofuels targets, part of the program to curb emissions and combat climate change. (See Bridges BioRes, 2 April 2010, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/biores/73572/> and 19 March 2010, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/biores/72580/>).

ICTSD Reporting; "New UN expert group to study ship emissions," EURACTIV, 30 March 2010; "MEPC yet to finalise ship emission norms," EMIRATES BUSINESS, 28 March 2010.

## EVENTS AND RESOURCES

### Events

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

#### Coming up in the next two weeks (16 – 30 April)

18-19 April, Washington, US. MAJOR ECONOMIES FORUM. Hosted by US Climate Envoy, this meeting will bring together the 17 members of the Major Economies Forum to discuss six major international climate change issues: mitigation, transparency, financing, technology, forests, and adaptation. The Major Economies Forum is an informal diplomatic venue for countries with the world's highest greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and is separate from the formal negotiating process held under

the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

19-22 April, Cochabamba, Bolivia. WORLD PEOPLE'S CONFERENCE ON CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE RIGHTS OF MOTHER EARTH. This conference, called by Bolivian President Evo Morales, invites scientists, academics, lawyers and governments that want to work with their citizens to attend. Its objectives are to analyse structural and systemic causes of climate change, to discuss and agree on a project towards a Universal Declaration of Mother Earth Rights, to agree on proposals for new commitments to the Kyoto Protocol and UNFCCC projects and to analyse and develop an action plan to advance the establishment of a Climate Justice Tribunal, among other topics. For more information or to register, visit <http://pwccc.wordpress.com>.

21-23 April, Seoul, Republic of Korea. BUSINESS FOR ENVIRONMENT GLOBAL SUMMIT (B4E). This meeting will address resource efficiency, renewable energies, new business models and climate policy strategies. At the meeting, CEOs and senior executives will join leaders from government, international agencies, NGOs and media to discuss environmental issues, forge partnerships and explore innovative solutions for a greener future. For more information please contact: Michelle Ko; tel: +65 6534 8683; fax: +65 6534 8690; internet: [http://www.b4esummit.com/?page\\_id=106](http://www.b4esummit.com/?page_id=106)

22 April, Geneva, Switzerland. GENEVA TRADE AND BIODIVERSITY DAY. Co-Hosted by ICTSD and UNEP. Geneva Trade and Biodiversity Day will explore strategies to address new and existing trade and biodiversity issues and to promote the mutual supportiveness of trade and biodiversity policies in the context of sustainable development. The focus will be on areas where controversy has arisen in current negotiations and discussions in the WTO, World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and Multilateral Environmental Agreements such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Convention on International Trade in Species (CITES). They include the new trade and biodiversity related



issues in the transition toward a greener economy, in the upcoming regime on access and benefit sharing, in fisheries subsidies and management, in agricultural negotiations, and in relation to climate change negotiations and the Copenhagen Accord. For further information, visit <http://ictsd.org/i/events/dialogues/71583/> or contact Natalia Cubilla, email: [ncubilla@ictsd.ch](mailto:ncubilla@ictsd.ch).

27-30 April, Lisbon, Portugal. 35th SESSION OF THE FAO EUROPEAN FORESTRY COMMISSION. The European Forestry Commission (EFC) is one of six Regional Forestry Commissions established by the Food and Agricultural Organization to provide a policy and technical forum for countries to discuss and address forest-related issues on a regional basis. It meets every two years. The FAO encourages wide participation of government officials from forestry and other sectors as well as representatives of international, regional and sub regional organisations that deal with forest-related issues in the region, including NGOs, and the private sector. The working languages will be English, French, and Spanish. All relevant information and registration details regarding the meeting are available at <http://timber.unece.org/index.php?id=efc-lisbon>. For further information contact Paola Deda on [paola.deda@unece.org](mailto:paola.deda@unece.org).

### Other Upcoming Events:

13-14 May, London, UK. 2010 FORESTRY BIOMASS & SUSTAINABILITY CONFERENCE: INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND CARBON REDUCTIONS. This event will provide up-to-date analysis of the latest developments in policy, economics and financing of biomass and forestry projects, and help you identify new investment opportunities and risks in these rapidly growing markets. Keynote Speaker - Tim Rollinson, Director General, Forestry Commission of Great Britain; and Chairman, Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration. For further information on the conference and to register, visit: [www.environmental-finance.com](http://www.environmental-finance.com).

24-28 May, Guatemala City, Guatemala. 26TH SESSION OF THE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN FORESTRY COMMISSION. This

biennial meeting of the Latin American and Caribbean Forestry Commission (Comisión Forestal para América Latina y el Caribe or COFLAC), which advises the FAO on forestry policy in the region, aims to bring several Latin American countries together to discuss policy formulation, review and coordinate regional implementation, and act as a platform for information exchange between countries. For more information, visit <http://www.rlc.fao.org/es/comisiones/coflac/2010/default.htm> or contact Edwin Oliva: tel: 00 (502) 2321-4520; fax: 00 (502) 2321-4520; email: [eoliva@inab.gob.gt](mailto:eoliva@inab.gob.gt).

15-17 June, Belfast, UK. SUSTAINABLE OCEAN SUMMIT. The World Ocean Council, an international business leadership alliance on ocean sustainability and stewardship, has created the Sustainable Ocean Summit (SOS) in order to catalyse the growing interest among ocean businesses for more effective leadership and collaboration in addressing ocean environmental challenges. It will bring together a wide range of international industries that use marine space and resources to consider major ocean policy developments and sustainability challenges affecting the future of responsible commercial activities in the seas. For more information, contact Paul Holthus: tel: +1-808-277-9008; email: [paul.holthus@oceancouncil.org](mailto:paul.holthus@oceancouncil.org); internet: <http://www.oceancouncil.org/site/index.php>.

21-25 June, Agadir, Morocco. 62ND ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION. The Annual Meeting of the IWC is comprised of three parts: A meeting of IWC's Scientific Committee – usually around two weeks in length and attended by approximately 160 scientists; Meetings of the Commission's sub-committees – usually around 4 days and attended by approximately 250 people; Annual Commission Meeting – 4-5 days and attended by around 350 people including government delegates (some high ranking, such as Ministers, Ambassadors), observers from non-member governments, other intergovernmental organisations, and non-government organizations (NGOs), and the media. For more information, visit: <http://www.iwcoffice.org/meetings/meeting2010.htm>

17-19 September, New Haven, US. 2ND UNITAR-YALE GLOBAL CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRACY: STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS TO ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE AND ADVANCE A GREEN ECONOMY. This conference will take stock of and examine the role of institutional structures and decision-making procedures in fostering (or impeding) low carbon and climate resilient development. Papers and discussions will cover various levels of governance (i.e. global, regional, transnational, national, sub-national, and local) as well as specialized governance topics, including governance of climate change science, financing and forestry. Anticipated outcomes of the conference include a research agenda and enhanced knowledge sharing to better understand the openness, transparency, accountability and effectiveness of institutions engaged in action to address climate change. For more information about this event, visit <http://www.unitar.org/egp>.

27-28 September, Venice, Italy. TWELFTH ANNUAL BIOECON CONFERENCE - FROM THE WEALTH OF NATIONS TO THE WEALTH OF NATURE: RETHINKING ECONOMIC GROWTH. This event, hosted by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM) in association with Conservation International (CI) and the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), is targeted at researchers, environmental professionals, international organizations and policy-makers who are interested in working towards a better, more effective stewardship of natural capital. Conference updates will be posted on BIOECON web-site at <http://www.bioecon.ucl.ac.uk/>.

April 2010. Union for Ethical BioTrade. This resource was prepared in the context of the International Year of Biodiversity and other activities to raise awareness of the economic, social and environmental importance of biodiversity. The objective of the short fact sheet is to provide a brief, simple explanation of the relevance and main principles of ABS to companies and other organisations working with biodiversity. Additional information and resources on ABS are available on the website at [www.ethicalbiotrade.org/abs](http://www.ethicalbiotrade.org/abs).

FIFG 2000-2006 SHADOW EVALUATION. March 2010. Poseidon Aquatic Resource Management Ltd., commissioned by Pew Environment Group. This report assesses the environmental and social impacts of the Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (FIFG), running from 2000 to 2006, using a range of quantitative and qualitative information. EU allocations for FIFG totalled €3.2 billion, of which Spain received nearly half. Member State contributions brought the total allocation of FIFG funding to €4.9 billion. This report can be accessed at: <http://www.pewenvironment.eu/resources/FIFG-evaluation.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 BioRes staff to Andrew Aziz at [aaziz@ictsd.ch](mailto:aaziz@ictsd.ch).

BASIC INFORMATION FACT SHEET, ACCESS AND BENEFIT SHARING (ABS).