



# Bridges Trade BioRes

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

Volume 11 · Number 12, 27 June 2011

## Chemicals Trade

Canada Slammed for Stance on  
Asbestos Trade ..... 1

## Climate Change

Bonn Climate Meet Spawns  
Autumn Session..... 3

Ministers Voice Concern over European  
2050 Emissions Goals ..... 4

## Sustainable Land Management

Peru Revamps Environment Law  
in Line with Trade Obligations ..... 6

## Sustainable Agriculture

Biofuels Remain Key Obstacle to  
Food Price Challenge: Study..... 7

## In Brief

Canada-Japan Renewable Energy Spat  
Arrives at WTO ..... 8

WTO Dispute Panel Established in  
East Europe Enviro Trade Row ..... 9

## Events and Resources

Events..... 10

Resources ..... 11

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

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](mailto: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/](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, [aaaziz@ictsd.ch](mailto:aaaziz@ictsd.ch).

Contributors to this issue were Pratima Arapakota, Andrew Aziz, Sofia Baliño, Abigail Hunter, and Marie Wilke. The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz. ISSN 1682-0843

## CHEMICALS TRADE

### Canada Slammed for Stance on Asbestos Trade

Canada last week emerged as the only developed country to oppose the listing of chrysotile asbestos to the Rotterdam Convention, prompting a litany of criticism from around the world. If approved, the known carcinogen would have been listed on Annex III of the hazardous chemicals convention, which would require exporters to warn recipient countries of any health hazards.

The discussions took place in Geneva at the fifth Conference of the Parties (COP 5) to the Rotterdam Convention, which ran from 20-24 June. In addition to chrysotile asbestos, parties were tasked with considering the inclusion of the pesticides endosulfan and aldicarb, as well as the herbicide alachlor in Annex III.

While endosulfan was the only one of the four to become a new addition to the list, it was the asbestos debate that monopolised much of the attention last week in Switzerland.

Canada is one of only a handful of countries – including Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine, and Vietnam – that continue to export asbestos. Use of the substance in the developed world – including Canada – has plummeted since the 1970s, when awareness of the respiratory health risks became more widespread.

Asbestos continues to be used in the construction industry of various developing countries, notably China, India, and the Philippines. Canada argues that as long as appropriate safety precautions are observed, the mineral can be used without adverse health effects. But critics argue that such measures are regularly not taken in developing countries,

where health and safety standards are typically more lax.

The addition of asbestos to Annex III also played a prominent role when parties last met at COP 4 in 2008. But in the voting process, India – Canada’s primary asbestos trading partner – actively lobbied to keep the substance off the list, thereby allowing Canada to remain silent on the issue (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [14 November 2008](#)).

### **India’s about-face rattles exporters**

Last Wednesday, however, India surprised many delegates by announcing it had reconsidered its previous opposition and would now support the listing. Delhi’s new position on the issue prompted several asbestos exporting countries to reconsider their stance as well; one by one, opposition to the listing soon disappeared. Finding itself alone on the issue, Canada unilaterally blocked consensus. The move reportedly provoked hostility from some delegates.

In the hours following Ottawa’s opposition, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine, and Vietnam again reconsidered their position and realigned themselves with Canada. Ukraine and Kazakhstan maintain there is a lack of scientific data to support listing the substance on Annex III, while Canada has not fully explained its position.

When pressed on the issue on Thursday, Canada insisted that the country has “actively promoted safe and controlled use of the substance domestically and internationally.” But with the use of chrysotile asbestos virtually banned across Canada, critics have accused Ottawa of acting irresponsibly.

When the ruling Conservative government was pressed on the issue by opposition parties back in Ottawa, Industry Minister Christian Paradis staunchly defended the government’s position.

"We know that chrysotile [asbestos] can be used in a safe fashion in a controlled environment," Paradis told Canadian parliament last week.

But with Paradis’ electoral district being home to Canada’s last remaining asbestos mine, some critics have accused him of promoting policy out of self-interest.

In a final move to express their displeasure at the blockage of asbestos, Australia – supported by the African Group – introduced a declaration by the EU and 66 countries stating that, in their trade practices, they will make every attempt to make information regarding asbestos hazards known. The Declaration also states the countries’ intent to ensure asbestos is ultimately listed in Annex III. Delegates had been discussing potential alternatives for dealing with recommended chemicals that do not manage to achieve a consensus. While the declaration is external to the Convention itself, its existence is noted in the formal meeting report.

Adopted in 1998, the Rotterdam Convention requires exporting countries to obtain prior informed consent (PIC) from importing countries before listed chemicals can be delivered. This is accomplished through the use of proper labelling, safe handling instructions, and the disclosure of any known restrictions or bans.

With the addition of endosulfan, there are now a total of 41 chemicals listed in the convention, including 30 pesticides and 11 industrial chemicals.

ICTSD Reporting; “Pic COP5 Highlights,” EARTH NEGOTIATIONS BULLETIN, 22 June 2011; “Canada blocks move to deem asbestos hazardous,” CBC, 22 June 2011; “Canada Asbestos Debate Rages On at Geneva Summit, Refuses To List Chrysotile As Hazardous,” CANADIAN PRESS, 23 June 2011.

## CLIMATE CHANGE

### Bonn Climate Meet Spawns Autumn Session

The UN climate secretariat has confirmed that they will be holding an additional major meeting this year, a sign some read as a positive harbinger for end of year climate talks in Durban, South Africa. The announcement was made at the closing plenary of the 6-17 June meeting, which was held in Bonn, Germany.

Heading into the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change's (UNFCCC) mid-year conference, which wrapped up on 17 June, many observers speculated that slow movement in climate talks showed a lack of enthusiasm for progress in 2011. This opinion was bolstered early in the first week of the meeting when precious negotiating days were wasted haggling over the content of the negotiation agenda (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [13 June 2011](#)).

As the session neared its end, one outstanding question was whether an inter-sessional negotiation would take place prior to the Durban Conference of the Parties (COP). Inter-sessionals have become standard fare in the climate negotiations, yet some parties maintained that, in the absence of progress in Bonn, the expense and time of another week of talks would be a waste. In the corridors, a number of delegates and observers explained that the failure of any party to offer funding for an inter-sessional meeting was a procedural block to hinder further advance on topics key countries were not ready to agree on in Durban.

Apparently, sufficient pressure and progress were made to merit further discussion, prompting UNFCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres to announce the establishment of an autumn inter-sessional meeting to continue ongoing discussions in the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) and the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA).

Eventually, the two bodies suspended their sessions with the intention of resuming negotiations at the newly announced meeting.

It was announced that the meeting would take place during the last week of September and the first week of October, but exact dates have not been confirmed. While a venue has not been officially announced, sources say Panama is a frontrunner.

### Question of Kyoto looms

The future of the Kyoto Protocol continues to bedevil the negotiations. Executive Secretary Figueres recently noted that Parties have already missed the deadline to finalise a second commitment period to begin in 2013 as the first period expires, since parties would need a full year after finalising talks to line up the new period's terms for implementation. Negotiating mitigation commitments has become a particularly sensitive area of discussions, with expectations that it will become even more so as the 2012 end of the first period of the Protocol approaches.

Most developing countries, however, say that procedural issues are fixable and insist that implementing a second phase of Kyoto is the only way forward in the climate talks. In the absence of a new agreement under the LCA on emissions reduction targets and pathways for all countries, they say, terminating the Protocol leaves the world completely empty handed.

While the possibility of extending Kyoto has not been ruled out, the declaration of Japan, Canada, and Russia that they have no intention of signing on to such a deal suggests the second phase would be weaker than the historic first agreement. In response, some developing countries are now suggesting that the three countries should be excluded from discussions shaping the rules for the second commitment period.

In Bonn, Figueres insisted that leaders need work together to find a compromise on the issue to ensure talks move forward. Many agree that the Kyoto crisis is now essentially a political question, whose resolution requires involvement from the top.

“Governments are realising that this link needs to be dealt with to get to a global solution and that will require high-level leadership during the year,” she said. “They can double their efforts and come forward with middle ground solutions and options which are acceptable to all sides.”

### Trade featured prominently in Bonn

Trade issues received significant traction over the two-week meeting as the chairs of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) and Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) convened a forum on the impact of “response measures,” climate-speak for how to address the negative consequences on developing countries of efforts to mitigate GHG emissions. In Cancun, countries agreed to convene such a forum in Bonn and Durban.

Chairs of the SBI and SBSTA eventually merged the forum with a contact group on the same topic, thereby bringing a negotiating component to the forum. Still lingering is the question of how or whether the forum will take place in Durban. Notably, numerous presentations by countries and expert organisations contained explicit references to the potential effects on international trade of mitigation measures, such as border taxes, free allowances in emissions trading schemes, and access to climate-friendly goods and technology, with many pointing out that an ongoing space to discuss and address these issues is necessary.

The forum provided input to a separate informal group under the AWG-LCA that considered how to address the impacts of response measures - such as the establishment of a permanent forum, the use of existing channels to share information on the issue, and barriers to trade. These discussions are expected to be picked up again when the autumn inter-sessional gets underway.

ICTSD Reporting.

## Ministers Voice Concern over European 2050 Emissions Goals

EU transport ministers have warned the European Commission that the proposed objective to cut transport emissions 60 percent by 2050 would put European companies at a competitive disadvantage to Asian and American firms. This cautionary message on taking unilateral action with the emissions trading system (ETS) runs alongside intensifying pressure from the US, China, and now Russia to scale back carbon taxes on aviation.

“In order to maintain the Union’s competitiveness, similar commitments should be sought at international level,” transport ministers proclaimed at a meeting in Luxembourg on 16 June.

The proposed ETS reforms will oblige all airlines to pay to offset any emissions that exceed “free allowances” allocated them by the EU (See Bridges Trade BioRes, [13 June 2011](#)). A separate legislative act will increase the Eurovignette road haulage tax to include additional charges for polluters.

These revisions have incited concern internally from Eastern European states over the wide disparities in transport infrastructure throughout Europe and how it could be harmful for domestic industries under a blanket European transport emissions tax.

Other EU countries expressed doubts that 60 percent reduction targets would be possible without an upheaval of the transport sector and its reliance on fossil fuels. “Today there are no alternative to fossil fuels competitive in terms of technology and price,” admitted transport ministers.

While Eastern Europe worries of short run competitiveness, Western Europe remains strong yet cautious, maintaining that the 60 percent objective was “generally accepted” as long as it remains indicative.

European Commission director-general for transport, Marjeta Jager, warned in May, that failure to act without delay towards reducing fossil fuel dependency would constitute a “fatal mistake” for Europe.

### **Consequences of extension of ETS on aviation**

Internationally, tensions are beginning to boil over the extension of the ETS to aviation, with Russia joining the US and China in public disapproval and Airbus potentially facing the loss of a multi-billion euro deal with Hong Kong Airlines.

The International Air Transport Association (IATA), initially a supporter of the inclusion of aviation in the EU ETS, is now encouraging Russia to be more vocal with its opposition to this extension of the cap-and-trade scheme, starting in 2012.

“Europe’s plan could not be more wrong,” IATA Chief Executive Officer, Giovanni Bisignani said upon the conclusion of a meeting with Russian Transport Minister Igor Levitin on 20 June. “Europe needs to understand that imposing EU ETS on sovereign states like Russia, China and the US could lead to consequences, not just for its airlines, but for the weak European economy.”

Chinese discontent with the emissions legislation is suspected to be the reason a multi-billion euro contract between Hong Kong Airlines and Airbus was not announced as expected at a Paris air show over the weekend (24-26 June). An AFP source said he was aware of “the possibility that China could put the deal on ice” because “the Chinese government is very unhappy” about the extension of the ETS to airlines operating in Europe.

In a joint letter to Hedegaard, Airbus chief executive, Tom Enders, and various European airlines called it “madness to risk retaliation” from influential players like China.

The Chinese are anxious after an initial appraisal of the country’s aviation sector estimated that an additional cost of €86.33 million a year on flights originating or landing in Europe would be faced by the industry, increasing four-fold by 2020.

In the meantime, US companies are preparing for a 5 July legal battle against the ETS extension in a Luxemburg court with decision to come before the end of 2011, according to media reports. US government officials also publically demanded an exemption from the EU scheme at a recent aviation meeting in Oslo.

### **Commission remains committed to carbon reduction**

Amongst internal and external pressure Europe outwardly retains its resolve to meet emission targets by 2050. “Whatever the Chinese or Americans are saying, there is no Plan B – we don’t intend to back down,” said Isaac Valero Ladron, spokesperson for EU climate action commissioner Connie Hedegaard.

The European Commission is “confident” its case for the ETS extension will stand up against multinational companies in court.

Holding fast to the legislation approved by MEPs and national governments in 2008, Ladron points to a provision in the regulation that provides exemption to the carbon permits scheme, if airlines arrive in or fly out of nations with “equivalent measures.”

“Some of our partners who criticise us would do better for themselves and the planet if they joined us instead in this effort,” Commission president Jose Manuel Barroso commented at a conference in Brussels earlier this month.

A Commission representative hinted at the EU taking action in shipping as well if no agreement on emissions reduction by the International Maritime Organisation can be reached by the end of the year.

### **ICTSD Reporting**

ICTSD Reporting; “EU countries put brakes on transport emissions goal,” EURACTIV, 17 June 2011; “Reducing polluting emissions: EU might act alone,” EUROPOLITICS, 23 June 2011; “EU stands firm as polluting tax row threatens Airbus sales,” AFP, 26 June 2011; “IATA Encourages



Russia to Resist European Union Carbon Curbs on Aviation,” BLOOMBERG, 20 June 2011; “EU ‘won’t back down’ in China aviation row,” EUOBSERVER, 27 June 2011.

## SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

### Peru Revamps Environment Law in Line with Trade Obligations

Peruvian Congress on 16 June approved the establishment of a revamped forestry and wildlife law, in line with its commitments under the US-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement (TPA). The contentious law has ping-ponged between government branches since its repeal in 2009 when massive indigenous protests over private procurement of natural resources resulted in over 30 deaths (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [26 June 2009](#)).

“This law sets out key reforms called for under the US-Peru TPA Annex on Forest Sector Governance aimed at combating illegal logging and illegal trade in wildlife,” praised US Trade Ambassador Ron Kirk in his official press release. “We welcome the passage of this important law and look forward to continuing to work with the Government of Peru to further implement its TPA commitments.”

According to the USTR, the US-Peru TPA is the first bilateral trade agreement to obligate environmental protective action through the inclusion of an Annex on Forest Sector governance. It was designed to promote better environmental sustainability measures in Peru, which is second most forested nation in South America.

After several attempts to pass forest regulation, the current texts were finalised following months of consultations with civil society groups. These meetings led to “substantial modifications,” say Peruvian government representatives.

The legislation sets forth improvements in forest governance - including renovation of forest authorities, anti-corruption measures, and redesign of institutional competencies – along with safeguards for forest coverage and biodiversity. It also includes sustainable development strategies for afforestation to be led by local communities and protection of rights of indigenous peoples.

In addition, it establishes a Ministry of Environment to watch over protected natural reserves and lead environmental policy-making in the country.

“It is about fruitful work for the country,” commented Aníbal Huerta Díaz, President of the Peruvian Agrarian Commission. “We are satisfied to have a harmonised bill within the framework of the consultation.”

#### Dubious path for forest legislation

The original forestry and wildlife law was suspended in June 2009 after indigenous groups, such as The Confederation of Amazonian Nationalities of Peru (CONAP), vehemently protested. According to CONAP, the law would have made it easier for companies to procure natural resources on native lands.

Since 2009, the bill went through a series of consultations with a variety of stakeholders, and was passed by the Congress in 2010. However, President Alan García rejected the law - which covered mining and energy sectors along with forestry - and sent it back to congress to be reformed.

As the law was swatted back and forth between branches of government and public consultations, the Ministry of Energy and Mines was left to set its own rules on mining, oil and gas, and energy projects. Over this period, contracts were drawn up for the construction of 20 hydroelectric plants along the Marañón River – a prominent tributary to the Amazon – and were approved by President García in April 2011.

Under the revised law, indigenous land rights and forests receive much greater protection but energy and mining are excluded.

“Now there is no reason to continue with protests,” said Mercedes Cabanillas, Minister of the Interior.

The legislation will now proceed to the president’s office for approval. But in the wake of a political shake up in Lima, it is unclear how the revised law will be received.

Run-off presidential elections in June ousted García’s right-wing party from the executive post and, come July 28, far left leaning Ollanta Humala will take office. Humala has promised to set up a commission to review all current commitments to international trade agreements.

“If the new government is serious about protecting indigenous communities’ rights, it must commit to signing the consultation law in its original form,” said Robert Espinosa, technical advisor to the Indigenous Association for the Development of the Peruvian Amazon (AIDESEP).

ICTSD Reporting

USTR Kirk press release can be accessed [here](#).

ICTSD Reporting; “Indigenous Peoples in Peru Hope New President Keeps His Promise,” INDIAN COUNTRY TODAY MEDIA NETWORK, 20 June 2011; “Transparencia y sostenibilidad de nuestros Bosques, es una tarea urgente del Nuevo Gobierno,” ECOPORTAL, 17 June 2011; “La Ley Forestal lista para su debate,” PERU21, 10 June 2011; “Cesar Zumaeta recibe texto consensuado de ley forestal y fauna Silvestre,” PSYN NOTICIAS, 9 June 2011; “Left-winger Humala wins Peru election, markets dive,” REUTERS, 6 June 2011.

## SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE

### Biofuels Remain Key Obstacle to Food Price Challenge: Study

High global food prices and volatile commodity markets are expected to persist over the next decade, according to a joint report from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). The report points to biofuel production as a key challenge to reigning in commodity prices.

The [Agricultural Outlook 2011-2020](#), released on 17 June, focuses on the global state of agriculture for the next ten years. The report indicates that although strong harvests are expected to push down commodity prices later this year, real prices are projected to be an average of 20 percent higher for cereals and 30 percent higher for meats over the 2011-2020 period, in comparison with the last decade.

Continued high food prices could be disastrous for populations in developing countries.

“While higher prices are generally good news for farmers, the impact on the poor in developing countries who spend a high proportion of their income on food can be devastating,” OECD Secretary-General Angel Gurría stated at a [press conference](#) for the report’s release. “People are going to be forced, either to literally eat less, or find other sources of income.”

Adding to these problems, the average annual growth rate for global agricultural production is projected to decline from 2.6 percent to 1.7 percent in the next decade due to high energy and fertiliser costs.

The report does suggest a possible solution to volatile food prices in the form of farm investments. In a [statement](#), FAO Director-General Jacques Diouf emphasised the importance of “boosting investment in agriculture and reinforcing rural development,” especially for

smallholder farmers in low-income food-deficit countries.

Price volatility could also be mitigated if governments provide better information on commodity markets, the report suggests.

“If we’re trying to avoid volatility, information is absolutely of the essence,” said Gurriá. Diouf affirmed Gurriá’s statement, noting that an improved information system would also be key for improving the transparency of these markets.

One positive finding of the report was that global agriculture production is expected to continue outpacing population growth, with production per capita rising slightly. However, this is not the case for all regions: in sub-Saharan Africa, local production is unlikely to keep pace with population-driven demand, leading to increased food deficits.

### **Biofuels deemed a culprit in food price increases**

Invigorating the “food for fuel” debate, the Outlook reports that the projected rise in commodity prices can be blamed on expanding biofuel production. By 2020, it is expected that 13 percent of global coarse grain production, 15 percent of vegetable oil production, and 30 percent of sugar cane production will be used for the production of biofuels.

Diouf called for cuts to biofuel subsidies, arguing that “the problem is not biofuels themselves...the problem is the policies adopted by certain governments to encourage the development of biofuels.”

Similar concerns over the impact of biofuel subsidies on food prices were voiced in a [June 2011 ICTSD study](#), prepared by economics professor Bruce Babcock of Iowa State University. His findings revealed that US ethanol subsidies - which amount to approximately US\$6 billion a year - magnified increases in maize prices, which were already rising due to market-driven growth in ethanol demand.

Maize prices were inflated by as much as 17 percent in this year alone, according to Babcock’s findings. In addition, had US ethanol production not increased from its 2004 levels, 2009 maize prices would have been 21 percent lower than they actually were.

Last Thursday, the US Senate voted to make substantial cuts to ethanol subsidies; however, the bill still requires approval from the US House of Representatives and President Barack Obama to become law. The Senate also voted to cut a tariff on imported ethanol (see Bridges Weekly, [22 June 2011](#)).

ICTSD Reporting; “World faces century of hunger without farm deal, France’s Le Maire says,” BLOOMBERG, 17 June 2011; “Decade of soaring food prices forecast,” FINANCIAL TIMES, 17 June 2011; “Senate vote marks start of end for ethanol subsidies,” REUTERS; 16 June 2011; “High food prices here to stay, says UN and OECD,” THE TELEGRAPH, 18 June 2011.

## **IN BRIEF**

### **Canada-Japan Renewable Energy Spat Arrives at WTO**

Canada on 17 June deferred Japan’s first request that the WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) establish a panel over renewable energy incentives provided by the province of Ontario as part of its green energy plan.

Ontario’s feed-in tariff (FIT) programme for renewable energy has been an area of contention between Ottawa and Tokyo since last autumn. Under the FIT programme, Ontario supports the generation of green energy by guaranteeing electricity purchase prices, grid access, and long-term contracts to renewable energy producers thus limiting their risks and supporting needed investments. Around 75 similar programmes are currently in place worldwide.

However, it was not the FIT programme itself but a local content provision within the programme



that landed Canada at the WTO. To receive FIT support, renewable energy producers must ensure that a certain percentage of the goods and services used for setting up the facility comes from Ontario. This can be as high as 60 percent. Japan alleges that the measure violates the national treatment provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMS).

Tokyo also claims that the local content requirement makes the FIT a “prohibited subsidy,” under the terms of the WTO’s Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM) Agreement.

Japan’s request for a dispute panel, which was issued on 1 June and deferred at a DSB meeting 16 days later, comes several months after Tokyo initiated the case. Japan requested consultations with the Canadian government on 13 September 2010. Shortly thereafter, the EU and the US submitted requests to join those consultations, given their own interests in renewable energy generation (see Bridges Weekly, [7 October 2010](#)).

The Japan Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, in a [1 June press release on the dispute](#), cited concern over the “possible proliferation of such protectionist measures all over the world” as their motivation for seeking the WTO’s assistance on this matter. They noted that their consultations with Canada in October did not provide them with the intended result, given that Canada “raised a local content requirement from 50 percent to 60 percent on 1 January 2011.”

Under WTO rules, targeted countries are allowed to refuse the first request for a dispute panel. As such, Canada blocked the creation of the panel at the 17 June meeting of the DSB. However, Japan can present the request a second time, at which point a panel of arbitrators will automatically be established.

Environmental issues featured prominently at the DSB meeting earlier this month with the body granting Ukraine’s request for a panel to adjudicate its dispute with Moldova on discriminatory “environmental charges” (see related story, [this issue](#)).

For a detailed analysis of the potential legal implications of the Canada renewables dispute, please refer to the [Spring 2011](#) issue of Bridges Trade BioRes Review.

ICTSD Reporting; “Japan challenges Canada at WTO over green energy programme,” AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE, 18 June 2011; “Japan challenges Canada’s energy measures at WTO,” REUTERS, 17 June 2011; “Japan takes Canada to WTO on green buy-local rules,” 1 June 2011.

---

## WTO Dispute Panel Established in East Europe Enviro Trade Row

The WTO’s Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) on 17 June established a panel for a dispute between Moldova and Ukraine. Kiev had issued its initial panel request on 24 May, which Moldova blocked – a standard response in such cases at the WTO (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [30 May 2011](#)).

The Ukraine case stems from a 1998 Moldovan law that allows customs officials to apply charges to imports whose use contaminates the environment, in addition to other duties or taxes. The fee ranges from 0.5 to 5 percent of the customs value of those products.

Kiev said bilateral consultations had failed to resolve the issue, forcing it to take up the matter in Geneva.

National treatment provisions laid out in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) 1994 play a significant role in the Environmental Charges dispute. Ukraine alleges that Moldova’s actions are in violation of GATT because they do not apply similar charges to like domestic products.

Kiev also claims that Moldova charges importers an environmental fee for plastic or “tetra-pack” packages containing imported goods, without applying the same charge to like domestic goods.

Argentina, China, and the European Union have already reserved their third party rights to the dispute. The EU had also joined on to the initial

consultations in March of this year. However, the Ukraine submission from 13 May ([WT/DS421/4](#)) claimed that “consultations were not possible since Ukraine had neither received any written reply nor had the Moldovan experts enter[ed] the consultations within a period as provided in ... the [Dispute Settlement Understanding].”

Moldova has said it is reviewing its legislation, but has given no details on what it is considering.

ICTSD Reporting; “WTO sets up dispute panel on Ukraine-Moldova row,” REUTERS, 17 June 2011.

## EVENTS AND RESOURCES

### Events

If you would like to see your event listed here or are interested in finding out more about publicising your event through ICTSD, write to [biores@ictsd.ch](mailto:biores@ictsd.ch). 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 (27 June – 11 July)

27-28 June, Dresden, Germany. FOR LIFE, FOR THE FUTURE: BIOSPHERE RESERVES AND CLIMATE CHANGE. This conference is held on the occasion of the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) Man and the Biosphere (MAB) programme. It will bring together high-level political and scientific representatives, both from climate and nature conservation politics, from administration, science and practice from all over the world, including several ministers. This conference aims to demonstrate how more than 560 UNESCO biosphere reserves can act as model regions for sustainable development. Further information is available on the official [website](#).

28 June, Washington DC, US. HOW US ANTIDUMPING POLICY UNDERMINES US

COMPETITIVENESS: A PRO-REFORM PERSPECTIVE. This Cato Institute event will discuss US anti-dumping policy and how it must be reformed if the Obama administration and Congress are truly concerned about US manufacturing competitiveness and increasing export opportunities. Three panels of experts will discuss various features of US antidumping law that undermine those objectives and offer proposals for reform. The meeting will be available as a webcast. The agenda for the meeting is available [here](#).

28 June, Paris, France. OECD DAC GREEN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP. This Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) workshop will offer an interactive platform for discussion of the relevance of green growth to developing countries. It will involve four chaired roundtable discussions on: how a green growth lens could be applied on the way to the 2012 UN Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20); the potential impacts of a global green growth transition on developing and least developed countries; how green growth short-run costs and technology requirements can be met; and opportunities for green growth to influence discussions at UNFCCC COP 17 in December. Further details are available [on the OECD website](#).

30 June, London, UK. FROM CANCUN TO DURBAN: IMPLICATIONS FOR CLIMATE AND MULTILATERAL DIPLOMACY. In advance of COP 17 in Durban in December, Patricia Espinosa will discuss the prospects and conditions post Cancun for successful multilateral engagement in climate change negotiations at this Chatham House event. More information on the event is available [here](#).

#### Other upcoming events

18-20 July, Las Vegas, US. THE NATIONAL R4 CONFERENCE. The US Chamber of Commerce BCLC National R4 Conference is for business, government and non-profit leaders who are developing new technologies and approaches to

environmental challenges and who want to promote market-based solutions and public-private partnerships to achieve their goals. This National Conference will showcase innovative solutions across the areas of revitalisation, reinvention, resilience and responsibility. Further information on the conference is on the official [website](#).

26-27 October, Fontainebleau, France. A NEW ERA OF DEVELOPMENT: THE CHANGING ROLE & RESPONSIBILITIES OF BUSINESS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. As the theme for the 2011 EABIS Colloquium, participants will consider “A New Era of Development” in the context of the profound shifts that have taken place in geopolitics and economic power in the past few years. The challenges presented by these profound shifts will be addressed with an interdisciplinary approach considering social sciences, economics, applied sciences and technology. The colloquium will be a place for knowledge exchange, agenda setting in business research and education, and will open the field of corporate responsibility to development issues and perspectives. More details are available [here](#).

4-6 November, Amritsar, India. 3<sup>RD</sup> ANNUAL SEMINAR ON WATER SECURITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE. This seminar, hosted by the Guru Arjan Institute of Development Studies, endeavours to share latest as well as traditional water knowledge and best practices on water security and climate change while discussing possible options for integrated water resource management. Issues mentioned as the priorities in the ‘National Water Mission’ portion of the National Action Plan on Climate Change will be the focus for discussion, interaction and dissemination of information. More details on the seminar and registration details are available [here](#).

---

## Resources

If you have a relevant resource (books, papers, bulletins, etc.) you would like to see announced in this section, please contact the [BioRes Team](#).

THE ROAD TO AN ANTI-BIOPIRACY AGREEMENT. Second edition published by TWN (2011). Almost 6 years of negotiations held under the aegis of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) culminated in October 2010 with the adoption of an international treaty that seeks to prevent biopiracy, or the misappropriation of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities. As a compilation of articles from Third World Network publications, this book follows the progress of CBD negotiations, driven by major differences among countries that are CBD Parties over ways to regulate access to genetic resources and ensure the fair and equitable distribution of benefits stemming from their use. This updated second edition contains reports on the decisive round of talks in Nagoya which finally approved the Nagoya Protocol on access and benefit sharing. Also included are some preliminary analyses of the Protocol and the extent to which it can effectively combat the serious threat of biopiracy. The book can be downloaded from the [TWN website](#).

REGIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS – TREATMENT OF AGRICULTURE. OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Working Paper No 44 (May 2011). South-South and Latin American regional trade agreements (RTAs) have made the most progress in eliminating agricultural trade tariffs, according to this study of over 50 such agreements. Agricultural export subsidies are banned in over half the agreements under study, signalling greater trade liberalisation in conformity with Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). However, traditionally sensitive sectors such as dairy, meat, sugar and cereals are still covered by numerous exemptions and tariff rate quotas (TRQs). This study develops earlier work on the treatment of agriculture in regional trade agreements for Latin America by extending the geographic coverage to Asia Pacific and selected agreements in Africa. It analyses these agreements with respect to market access, subsidies, trade remedies, and requirements relating to sanitary and phytosanitary measures (SPS) and technical barriers to trade (TBT). The paper is available [here](#).

TRANSNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW. A journal published by Cambridge University Press (2011). This publication is a new peer-reviewed journal dedicated to the study of environmental law and governance beyond the state. It approaches legal and regulatory developments with an interest in the contribution of non-state actors and an awareness of the multi-level governance context in which contemporary environmental law unfolds in a global context. It can be accessed online [here](#).

A POCKET GUIDE TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOVERNANCE. Published by the Rio+20 Stakeholder Forum and Commonwealth Secretariat (2011). This guide was initiated by the Stakeholder Forum and the Commonwealth Secretariat in response to the perceived “knowledge gap” on the history and dynamics of global governance for sustainable development. As the “institutional framework for sustainable development” has been Development (UNCSD 2012), the guide hopes to provide the necessary background information on global sustainable development governance to allow both governmental and non-governmental stakeholders to familiarise themselves with the key issues more comprehensively. The guide is open to public comment through July 2011 and can be found online [here](#).