



Bridges Trade BioRes

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

Volume 11 · Number 15, 5 September 2011

Climate Change

BASIC Ministers Push Kyoto as Focus of
Durban Climate Meet 1

Environment at the WTO

No Surprises as China Appeals WTO Raw
Materials Decision 3

EU Joins Japan in Contesting Ontario Renewable
Energy Plan 4

Opinion

The Price of Export Quotas: Sino-European
Relations and China's WTO raw material case.... 6

In Brief

Malaysia under Scrutiny as Illegal Ivory Seizures
Spike in August 9

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 Ch. de Balexert 7, 1219 Geneva, Switzerland, tel: +41 (0)22-917-8492; fax: 917-8093. To subscribe to Bridges Trade BioRes or access back issues, visit the [homepage](http://www.bridges-trade-biores.org).

Bridges Trade BioRes is made possible through the generous support of the UK Department for International Development (DFID), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA); the Netherlands Directorate-General of Development Cooperation (DGIS); the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Danida; the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland; the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway; AusAID; and Oxfam Novib.

Copyright ICTSD, 2011. Readers are encouraged to quote and reproduce this material for educational, non-profit purposes, provided the source is acknowledged. This work is licensed under the [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No-Derivative Works 3.0 License](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

Your support to BioRes and the Bridges series of publications is most welcome; if interested, please contact Andrew Crosby, Managing Director by [email](mailto:andrew.crosby@ictsd.org) or at +41 (0)22 917 8335. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and should be directed to the [editor](mailto:andrew.crosby@ictsd.org) or the [director](mailto:andrew.crosby@ictsd.org).

Contributors to this issue are Andrew Aziz, Sofia Baliño, and Marie Wilke. This edition of Bridges Trade BioRes is edited by Andrew Aziz. The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz.

ISSN 1682-0843

CLIMATE CHANGE

BASIC Ministers Push Kyoto as Focus of Durban Climate Meet

Ministers from key developing countries have signalled their intention of making a second commitment period to the Kyoto Protocol the “central priority” of the end-of-year UN climate meet in Durban, South Africa. The officials, representing the BASIC countries (Brazil, South Africa, India, and China), insisted that Kyoto is a cornerstone of the multilateral efforts to combat climate change and that failure to agree to a second commitment period would undermine the UN Framework on Climate Change (UNFCCC) process.

“Agreeing on the second commitment period is the central priority for Durban, as failure in this regard would generate a challenge to multilateralism and would undermine the rules based multilateral response to climate change under the UNFCCC,” ministers attending the 26-27 August meeting in Brazil said in a joint statement.

The move comes at a time when a handful of crucial countries – Canada, Japan, and Russia – have openly rejected the idea of signing on to a second commitment period. But with Kyoto's first commitment period set to expire in 2012, developing countries appear poised to make the Durban Conference of the Parties (COP) a battleground for preserving the only legally-binding climate change agreement.

The EU, representing some 13 percent of global emissions, is the only representative of major developed countries that has signalled its tentative intention to negotiate a second commitment period. But the absence of major economies – particularly the US, which never signed Kyoto in

the first place – calls the usefulness of exercise into question.

In a pessimistic editorial, the Economist [opined last Thursday](#), “never has the UN’s Kyoto protocol looked sorrier.” The article goes on to stress that not only does Durban appear poised to determine little due to the question of Kyoto, but suggests that rich countries have also done little to ensure they are able to meet their commitments agreed to last December in Cancun (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [14 December 2010](#)).

Carbon levels unprecedented despite efforts

Another factor that will undoubtedly shape the way Kyoto is discussed in Durban is [data released earlier this year](#) by the International Energy Agency showing that 2010 marked the highest global carbon dioxide output levels ever recorded. With much of the carbon spike attributed to coal-reliant emerging countries – notably China, now the world’s largest polluter – developed countries have even less of an incentive to extend an international agreement to which developing countries have no binding commitments.

China has committed to reduce its “carbon intensity” – carbon emissions relative to production or consumption – by 40 percent by 2020 and Brazil has committed to reduce its overall emissions by 36 percent, but it is unclear whether gestures such as these will create any buy-in incentive for developed countries.

Further complicating matters is the continued poor economic outlook across the developed world, pushing politicians to focus their attention on domestic matters, such as job creation. But despite the gloomy outlook forwarded by some, Parties to the UNFCCC have proved that they have the capacity to find common ground when needed. After all, prospects for reaching a deal going into last year’s Cancun meeting were grim indeed.

Opportunity in adversity: Figueres

In an [interview with Reuters](#) last week, Christiana Figueres, the UNFCCC’s executive secretary, said world’s ongoing economic problems should be

seen as an opportunity, rather than an obstacle to act on climate change.

“Governments have a huge opportunity here to address some of that economic recovery while addressing climate change,” she said. “It is win-win.”

The climate chief said there are opportunities for hammering out some sort of deal on Kyoto and that an “important group of countries” are engaged in talks on the issue.

“I would say governments are in a creative phase and will explore what would be a middle ground which has to be acceptable to all countries,” she said.

But speaking Monday from the low lying archipelago Kiribati, UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon was less optimistic. “It is most unfortunate, but perhaps correct, to say that any further significant progress on climate change negotiations is highly unlikely in the near future,” he said.

However, Ban assured his audience that he would bring the concerns of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) back to the United Nations and to the Durban COP. Kiribati is one of the countries most threatened by rising sea levels resulting from climate change.

In the UNFCCC-context, there is discussion about countries’ response measures to mitigate climate change and their potential to have an impact on the social and economic development of other, in particular developing, countries. Several of these measures are trade-related, such as standards and labelling, subsidies, or border measures.

The increasingly dispersed landscape when it comes to carbon abatement policies is causing growing concern among Parties. Such unilateral measures were singled-out as an area of special concern by the BASIC Ministers last week. The prospect of Annex I (developed) country members choosing to present their unilateral emissions mitigation contributions under the Ad-hoc Working Group on Long Term Cooperative

Action (LCA), rather than under the Kyoto Protocol “can only be the reflection of reduced political will to cut their greenhouse gas emissions,” they said.

In recognition of this, the UNFCCC-secretariat has convened a three-day workshop dedicated to response measures, which will take place in Bonn later this month. The workshop is intended to bridge gaps between country positions on the issue before Durban gets underway.

ICTSD Reporting; “Pretty basic: Diplomacy ahead of the UN climate conference in Durban augurs little progress,” *THE ECONOMIST*, 3 September 2011; “U.N. Climate Boss Says Durban Talks Can Deliver,” *REUTERS*, 1 September 2011; “Worst ever carbon emissions leave climate on the brink,” *GUARDIAN*, 29 May 2011; “UN leader downbeat on short-term climate progress,” 5 September 2011.

ENVIRONMENT AT THE WTO

No Surprises as China Appeals WTO Raw Materials Decision

In a move widely anticipated, China has appealed a WTO dispute settlement panel decision that had rejected Beijing’s export control measures, which it argued were based on environmental grounds. The [decision](#) from July had found that Chinese export restrictions on raw materials including zinc, magnesium, and bauxite violated WTO law.

In the landmark dispute (DS394, 395, 398), the US, EU, and Mexico had challenged Chinese export restrictions imposed on nine different raw materials that are essential for the production of electronics, medicine, and steel. The three countries, all highly dependent on the exports, had argued that the quota system imposed by China had reduced global supply and could result in considerably higher world market prices.

The panel found that China’s export restriction regime violated both the prohibition of all quantitative restrictions as mandated by the

GATT agreement and China’s additional vow to eliminate all export tariffs.

China continues to argue with the EU, US, Japan, and many more over export quotas concerning rare earth – another group of raw materials essential for the production of high-tech electronics. The July ruling was quickly interpreted as not only rejecting the raw material restrictions subject to the dispute but also those on rare earths. An appeal by China, which had lost almost all arguments subject to the dispute, had thus been expected.

While the possibility of a successful appeal is moderate, according to many observers, Chinese industry representatives welcomed the move.

“It could take as long as two years for the WTO to review the appeals and make a final decision,” Sang Baichuan from the University of International Business and economics told *China Daily*. “That period leaves enough time for China’s industries and companies to make industrial adjustments and restructuring.”

Conservation grounds rejected

Beijing had tried to justify its export control regime on conservation grounds arguing that the limitation of exports resulted in a reduction of domestic extraction thereby conserving the finite resources. The policy reform had become necessary as some of the resources faced depletion within four to fifteen years time, Beijing said during the proceedings.

China furthermore noted that for some resources this scarcity would inevitably lead to a critical shortage of materials essential for the Chinese industry.

“The restrictions are thus also justified as measures ‘temporary applied to prevent or relieve critical shortages of essential products’ as provided for by WTO law,” China asserted.

The panel dismissed these arguments on several grounds. First, it noted that there was “no clear link between the way the duty and the quota are set and any conservation objective.” In fact it

disagreed that export restrictions could ever support conservation efforts as greater domestic supply could increase domestic demand over time thus stimulating increased extraction.

The panellists further found that the situation did not concern a “critical shortage” nor “temporarily applied measures.” In the words of the panel, a “critical shortage” by nature has to be a “temporary shortage” that could be relieved or prevented through the application of measures on a “temporary” basis. It was the first time ever that a WTO dispute settlement panel was confronted with this exception.

Article XX not applicable: Panel

Finally, China noted that the extraction of certain materials was harmful to the environment and health.

“The control of the export of high-energy-consumption, high pollution and resource-based products was utterly necessary for the [...] reduction of environmental pollution, freeing the economic development from the limitation by resource and alleviating the tense relations among coal, electricity, and oil,” China asserted.

While WTO law with Article XX GATT provides for sensitive exceptions to allow measures necessary to protect the environment and public health the panel nonetheless once more disagreed with Beijing’s position.

“Neither the measures implementing the export restrictions, nor the contemporaneous laws and regulations, convey in their texts that the export restrictions are contributing to, or form part of a comprehensive programme for the fulfilment of the stated environmental objective,” the panellists said.

More striking in this regard, however, was the panel’s finding that for those WTO law violations that rested on China’s accession protocol rather than one of the WTO agreements, Article XX GATT was not applicable. This decision, if upheld by the Appellate Body, would effectively place many of China’s WTO obligations outside the scope of GATT’s general exceptions including

those for public health, the environment, or resource conservation.

Though this matter continues to be disputed among WTO law experts, the panel’s firm finding came as a surprise to many. “The Appellate Body would be well advised to overrule this finding,” experts suggested during an [expert meeting part of the Dialogue Series “Talking Disputes”](#) organised by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (the publisher of BioRes) and WTI Advisors in July.

Amongst others, China has appealed the panel’s findings regarding the applicability of Article XX to its accession protocol, the interpretation of the term “critical shortage,” and the natural resource conservation justification. Officially, an appeal may take up to three months to reach a conclusion; in practice, however, rulings can take up to twice that long before they are issued. Experts say the ruling will be available for public in early 2012.

ICTSD Reporting.

EU Joins Japan in Contesting Ontario Renewable Energy Plan

The Canadian province of Ontario’s feed-in tariff (FIT) programme for renewable energy, which is already the subject of a trade row with Japan, came under fire again last month after the EU officially requested its own WTO consultations on the matter. The EU’s request, issued on 11 August, comes on the heels of the global trade body establishing a dispute panel to hear Japan’s complaints against Canada regarding the same programme (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [25 July 2011](#)).

In their August announcement, the EU noted that it had attempted to reach a negotiated solution with Canada on the subject, without any success. The EU noted that, while they welcomed the commitment of Ontario to encourage the use of renewable energy, the Canadian province’s current programme is not in line with Ottawa’s WTO obligations.

Brussels' show of concern over Ontario's FIT mechanism, established by the Ontario Green Energy and Green Economy Act 2009, is not new. When Japan first initiated WTO consultations on the FIT in September 2010, both the EU and US were quick to join the discussions (see Bridges Weekly, [7 October 2010](#)).

The EU, Japan, and the US are all major players in the green energy industry, which likely sparked their shared interest in the original case. In the EU's recent request for its own consultations, Brussels emphasised its role as a "significant" exporter to Canada of wind power and photovoltaic power generation equipment. The EU noted that exports ranged from €300-€600 million from 2007-2009, adding that "these figures could be higher should the local content requirements be removed from the legislation in question."

European FIT Programmes

EU member states maintain their own FIT programmes, including, for instance, a general renewable electricity purchase obligation for electricity network operators in Germany and a UK FIT programme supporting small-scale generation and on-site supply. These programmes, however, have refrained from introducing local content provisions, as a recent ICTSD [study](#) outlines. Also, Germany's FIT programme is the only measure that was subject to international court proceedings before Ontario found itself at the WTO. In 2001 the European Court of Justice ruled that the German FIT programme was legal.

The FIT mechanism acts as a purchasing guarantee for producers of renewable energy, ensuring access to power grids, providing long-term contracts, and guaranteeing electricity purchase prices. However, the controversy over the Ontario FIT stems not from the overall programme itself, but from a local contract provision that requires energy producers to source up to 60 percent of their inputs from within the province.

Both the EU and Japan allege that this "Buy Ontario" clause violates the national treatment

provisions of three WTO accords: the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMS), and is a "prohibited" subsidy under the Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM) Agreement.

The inclusion of the latter agreement in the EU's and Japan's complaints could serve to clarify the famously murky relationship between renewable energy support and WTO subsidy rules. The aforementioned ICTSD study found that current WTO rules on government support may apply to each national FIT programme differently.

As a result, WTO members will need to determine whether these options allow for "the right balance between a sufficient margin of manoeuvre to promote sustainable development and address climate change and protection against arbitrary trade restrictions," or whether the rules need to be re-examined and re-negotiated, the study concludes.

Shortly after the EU filed its complaint, Ontario Energy Minister Brad Duguid openly defended the renewable energy programme, insisting that the province would fight back against both domestic and international critics of the initiative.

"We're going to stand up for Ontario ... And we will against anybody outside of Ontario that wants to threaten our efforts to create jobs," he affirmed, according to the Toronto Star.

The spokeswoman for the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Caitlin Workman, has also affirmed that the department will "defend Canada's interests" in the matter.

FIT facing attacks on multiple fronts

Duguid's spirited support of the measure notwithstanding, the FIT has also elicited some harsh criticism within Canada itself. Ontario's opposition Progressive Conservative Party has already promised they would eliminate the programme should they win the 6 October provincial election. In addition, the editorial board of the National Post, a right-leaning Canadian newspaper, recently published a strongly-worded

[op-ed](#) lambasting the FIT only two days after Brussels' request for consultations.

In the op-ed, the editorial board admonished the proponents of the Ontario FIT, claiming that the programme had been unable to solve the problem of green energy not being “economically feasible.” Furthermore, they insisted, the programme has incurred significant expense with little result; they cautioned that Duguid might soon learn that “green dreams [die] hard.”

Along with facing potential WTO and domestic scrutiny, the Ontario FIT might soon become the subject of a North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) dispute case. In July, American renewable energy company Mesa Power Group announced its intent to file a complaint under the trade pact; the company is based in the US state of Texas, and is owned by billionaire T. Boone Pickens. The Mesa Power Group is claiming that the Ontario programme violates NAFTA's government procurement provisions, which are more comprehensive than their WTO counterparts (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [25 July 2011](#)).

ICTSD Reporting; “Europe Lodges WTO Complaint Against Canada Over Renewable Energy,” BLOOMBERG, 11 August 2011; “EU targets Ontario's green energy subsidies in WTO complaint,” THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 11 August 2011; “EU challenges Canadian green power rules at WTO,” REUTERS, 11 August 2011; “Ontario's green energy policies break trade rules, EU says,” TORONTO STAR, 11 August 2011.

OPINION

The Price of Export Quotas: Sino-European Relations and China's WTO raw material case

By Xin Wang

In contemporary China, tensions between the drive for economic growth and the need for environment and natural resource protection are well documented. Saddled with this delicate balance, in 2007 Beijing massively increased its use of restrictive export measures, such as export VAT rebates, export taxes, licenses, and quotas on environmentally harmful products. These policies are a part of China's domestic policy package aimed at developing a green economy. Chinese official documents consistently stated that the use of such policies is for environment and resource protection ends; these policies have also, however, occasionally served for other motives such as to ensure domestic market supply. Also, the WTO panel has ruled that such export restrictive policies can never support environmental grounds. Being an important and sometimes dominant global supplier of raw materials and resources, China's export restrictive measures can generate a global price increase which has now been the source of WTO disputes.

One of the recent WTO disputes that China has recently lost is Europe, the US, and Mexico's concern over China's export restrictions of nine raw resource materials in 2009. They argue that China's export restrictive measures enable its domestic firms cheaper access to resources, and moreover, that such measures violate China's Accession Protocol to the WTO which has clearly defined the gradual phase-out of export restrictions – both quantitative restrictions and export tariffs – following China's WTO membership. The latter is an unusual case and can only be found in a handful of recently acceded WTO members. Export tariffs are justified while export restrictions (quotas and licenses) are prohibited under GATT. Despite China's promotion of the environmental and resource protection, there is a general lack of

comprehensive and/or comparable domestic policies which can justify the use of export restrictions in eyes of WTO law. For example, China's domestic policies are dominated by command-and-control policies which are usually difficult to measure compared to economic instruments, such as taxes. While some domestic taxes – such as resource tax and consumption tax on goods disputed at the WTO – do exist, their tax level and coverage are still too low. However, a general reform has been launched recently to consolidate environmental taxation in China.

China fears that such a WTO decision on these nine raw materials could place the country at a disadvantage when facing potential disputes on China's use of export quotas on its rare earth as well as other resource and raw materials in the future. While one may question China's seemingly contradictory position on export restrictions against its eagerness for trade liberalisation (market access), this paper aims to discuss several issues surrounding Europe's policy coalition which risk lowering mutual trust of the Sino-European strategic friendship, within and beyond the international trade regime. A better understanding of each other's positions and challenges provides an important basis of enhancing mutual comprehension and trust in international governance.

EU's raw material strategy

In 2007, the EU published *State of Play of Work on Trade Restrictions Affecting Access to Raw Materials*, a progress report which states that “most countries, to date, have imposed trade restrictions on commodities or other less processed products.” And “this is logical since the measures such as export taxes usually are intended to promote higher value-added activities.” It further stated that “countries are imposing trade restrictions for non-trade objectives, as they deem fit, and in conjunction with other domestic measures. These circumstances include, among other things, addressing critical short supply or protecting the environment and natural resources [...] some of these could fall under ‘classical’ exemption grounds such as the exceptions allowed in the WTO and in our FTAs: restrictions imposed for

environmental purposes and to address a critical shortage.”

Based on these quotes, some may conclude that the EU generally accepts the use of export restrictive measures based on environmental protection grounds. However, in another document, namely the *Raw Material Initiative* which was published in 2008, the EU aims to ensure its access to raw materials, stating that “securing reliable and undistorted access to raw materials is increasingly becoming an important factor for the EU's competitiveness.” It continues by accentuating that “increasingly, many emerging economies are pursuing industrial strategies aimed at protecting their resource base to generate advantages for their downstream industries” and these measures “distort international trade in raw materials.” Therefore, an easily contradictory view from Chinese perspective is that export restrictions are logical in the case of promoting higher value added activities, environmental protection, and resource shortages, but not when they “hinder” the EU's access to raw materials.

EU's policy on Chinese coke exports

The nine products in the above mentioned WTO dispute include coke, which received zero export VAT refund and a 40 percent export tax in 2009. Interestingly, in 2007, the EU passed an anti-dumping decision on the same Chinese coke – which received at the time 5 percent export tax – for 6 months (see Regulation 1071/2007) following the complaints of EU coke producers. Although the two EU decisions may, in fact, be correct in WTO legal terms, such a seemingly contrarian position threatens to send a signal that China is never right on its price. If China lowers or cancels the export tax on coke following the WTO decision and if a higher domestic price of coke persists in China a lower export price of Chinese coke might generate further complaints by EU's domestic coke producers regarding “cheap” Chinese coke.

If such a situation comes to pass, would the EU then introduce anti-dumping measures on China's coke? Would China then respond by raising export taxes on coke, thereby equalising domestic and export prices in order to avoid “dumping”

accusations? If such a scenario thus unfolds, it could bring about an endless circle of export tax and dumping, leaving China's export price in a constant state of flux.

The dispute on China's export restriction on coke can also lead to another debate under trade and climate change regimes. In economic terms, in a world of unequal carbon prices, industries in countries having stringent and sufficiently high carbon prices face a higher carbon cost distortion comparing to industries in countries with lower or without carbon prices. This places them at a global competitive disadvantage. Industrial relocations and trade pattern changes under such unequal carbon prices could occur and could generate carbon leakage from countries with lower or zero carbon price, thus reducing the climate policy effectiveness of countries with higher carbon prices. Given that the first-best solution of a global effective carbon price cannot be reached in the short term, a border carbon pricing measure can be considered as a second-best option. However, while border carbon tax proposals in the EU and US – aimed at addressing carbon leakage – have received mixed political reactions thus far, the use of export taxes as well as other export restrictive policies on major energy and carbon intensive products in China could reduce the degree of carbon leakage and lessen the competitiveness problem.

According to related studies by Institut du Développement Durable et des Relations Internationales (IDDRI), export tax policies on energy and carbon intensive products in China generate an implicit carbon price comparable or even higher than that in the EU-ETS. However, although there is no explicit and predictable carbon price in these export tax policies. Such an already-implemented export tax can more or less be seen as positive in terms of climate change mitigation, but seen as negative in terms of trade policy (particularly for DG Trade of EU Commission). In the Chinese perspective, this would send a signal of a lack of policy coalition inside the European Commission.

Disguised free trade?

One of the arguments against China's use of export restrictive measures in the China-raw material WTO dispute is that China is failing to comply with its Accession Protocol to the WTO (WT/L/432). In this protocol, China agreed to a gradual phase-out period for export taxes and to consult with major trade partners in case of an implementation of new export taxes or an increase of export tax rates on existing policies. The current use of export taxes on some of the nine raw materials being disputed at the WTO clearly goes against this commitment in the logic of promoting free trade. However, it is interesting to note that China has also implemented export taxes on other energy intensive products, such as steel, since 2007. In 2009 where the current WTO dispute against China has been raised, some fifty steel products (HS-72) were subjected to export taxes while China's Accession Protocol only ensures the (progressively reduced) use of export tax on seventeen steel products (also in HS-72). With the same logic, the use of export taxes on steel products in 2009 also violates the WTO rules and could be deemed illegal by the WTO. However, such export taxes have not been the subject of any WTO dispute so far. One of the probable reasons, which would resonate in the Chinese perspective, is that Chinese steel is in competition with EU and US steel. The use of export taxes on Chinese steel will lower the competitiveness of China's steel exports in the global market, which might be convenient to EU and US steel producers and exporters. Such an interpretation risks making EU and US's dispute on raw materials export restriction in China a disguised free trade, with self-interest behind as true motive.

Conclusion

Based on the recent WTO decision on China's use of export restrictive measures on nine raw resource materials, this paper provides some alternatives for interpreting Chinese perspectives, within and beyond the international trade regime. It must be clearly stated that these perspectives may not be simply considered as a rejection or critique, but rather a basis for improving mutual understanding, thus enhancing reciprocal trust in

building better global governance on trade and climate change. A negotiation based on better and clearer understandings of each other's dilemma and challenges may be an efficient option *vis-a-vis* reciprocal trade measures. In the case of raw materials, strategic cooperative initiatives between China – as major supplier faced with development imperative and major environmental challenges due to resource over-exploitation – and the EU and US – as major consumers of key raw materials, which also face strategic development needs – this may be constructive in terms of solving both China's domestic environmental degradation and the world's need for strategic raw materials. Indeed, while trade measures can certainly generate immediate effects, it is sometimes better to move forward through comprehensive dialogue, within and outside the WTO regime, rather than simply through trade measures and tactics.

Xin Wang is with the Trade and Climate programme at IDDRI. The author would like to thank Thomas Spencer of IDDRI for his assistance.

IN BRIEF

Malaysia under Scrutiny as Illegal Ivory Seizures Spike in August

Late August saw a surge in arrests related to the illicit trade of African ivory with the seizure of two major shipments destined for markets in Asia. Tanzanian officials on 24 August announced the discovery of more than 1,000 elephant tusks hidden in a shipment of dried fish bound for Malaysia. Five days later, Hong Kong authorities intercepted a further 794 tusks – weighing close to two tonnes – from Malaysia bound for Mainland China.

The timing of the seizures coincides with a major illegal wildlife trade training session presented by the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) and Interpol in Gaborone, Botswana. Officials from IFAW said the Tanzanian shipment underscores the fact that more training is needed

to help save elephants – particularly those in the Congo Basin, which are most threatened.

“We need a global outcry to spur investment in creating the necessary wildlife law enforcement capacity to take on the international criminal syndicates who benefit from these massacres,” said James Isiche, IFAW's East Africa director.

Countries across sub-Saharan Africa have been struggling with how to effectively deal with poachers, who target elephants and rhinos for their tusks which are used for ornaments and in medicines, particularly in China.

Illicit trade in African ivory has been on the increase since 2004, with many experts pointing to increased disposable income in China as a major factor in growing demand. According to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), China is now the single biggest consumer of illegal ivory.

But Malaysia – the common link in the late-August seizures – is increasingly under scrutiny for its role as a hub for illegal wildlife shipments northward. In the past decade, Hong Kong authorities have intercepted two other major shipments of African ivory from the Southeast Asian country also destined for Mainland China.

In December 2009, Hong Kong customs officials seized a container shipped from Malaysia containing 186 pieces of Nigerian ivory. The container was erroneously labelled “white wood.” Similarly, in 2003, police seized 275 tusks en route from Malaysia, weighing nearly 2 tonnes. The Tusks had originally been shipped from Tanzania.

The Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS), an illegal ivory trade monitoring system operated by monitoring agency TRAFFIC on behalf of CITES, says Malaysia has progressively gained prominence as a transit country of choice for African ivory.

“This latest Hong Kong seizure further underscores Malaysia's role as an intermediary country in the illicit flow of African ivory to Asia,” said Tom Milliken, TRAFFIC's Elephant & Rhino Programme Coordinator. “It's time for Malaysia

to get tough on international ivory smugglers, who are tarnishing the country's reputation."

The shipment of Tanzanian elephant tusks concealed in sacks of dried sardines was also earmarked for export to Malaysia. Authorities in Zanzibar have arrested two suspects.

ICTSD Reporting; "Tanzania Police Seize Poached Elephant Tusks," REUTERS, 25 August 2011; "Tusks From Over 500 Elephants Seized in Zanzibar," ENVIRONMENT NEWS SERVICE, 25 August 2011; "Almost 2 tonnes of elephant ivory seized in Hong Kong," TRAFFIC, 30 August 2011; "More than 1000 ivory tusks seized in Tanzania," TRAFFIC, 26 August 2011; "China Consumerism Latest Threat To Africa's Elephants: Report," REUTERS, 30 August 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. For a more comprehensive list of events for the trade and environment community visit the [BioRes online calendar](#).

Coming up in the next six weeks (5-19 September)

3-5 September, Bonn, Germany. 64TH ANNUAL UN DPI/NGO CONFERENCE: SUSTAINABLE SOCIETIES; RESPONSIVE CITIZENS. This will be the 64th Annual Conference of NGOs and the UN Department of Public Information (DPI), and will seek to highlight effective means in which civil society can contribute to creating and maintaining sustainable societies. The conference will seek to contribute to civil society preparations for the UNCSO. For more information, visit the conference [website](#).

5-6 September, São Paulo, Brazil. INTERNATIONAL FORUM ON STRATEGIC STUDIES FOR AGRICULTURE AND LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT AND

RESPECT FOR THE CLIMATE - FEED 2011. This event, organised annually by the Brazilian Confederation of Agriculture and Livestock (CNA), aims to discuss, evaluate, and seek solutions to climate change impacts on the Brazilian agricultural and livestock activities. For further information, visit the [event website](#).

19-21 September, Geneva, Switzerland. WTO PUBLIC FORUM. The 2011 Public Forum will provide an opportunity for the public at large to identify the principal trade challenges that impact the multilateral trading system and consider solutions to ensure that the WTO effectively adapts and responds to our quickly changing world. The discussion will encompass four core themes: food security; trade in natural resources; made in the world and value-added trade; and what lies in store for the trading system. These themes will structure the discussion around the future of the multilateral trading system and how the WTO can promote coherence at the international level to better address world problems and contribute towards improved global governance. More information can be found on the event [website](#).

Other upcoming events

26 September, Chicago, US. ENHANCING DECISION MAKING: A ROUNDTABLE WORKSHOP ON IMPROVING UNDERSTANDING OF THE ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF CLIMATE CHANGE. This 1-day workshop is designed to foster cross-sector collaboration to develop tools and resources that will improve the understanding of the economic, environmental and operational implications of climate change. Hosted by the Association of Climate Change Officers (ACCO), US Global Change Research Program (USGCRP) and Local Governments for Sustainability USA (ICLEI) this workshop will bring participants together to identify needs and resources crucial to making the business and/or operations case for establishing sound climate change strategies. More information and registration details available [here](#).

27-28 September, Geneva, Switzerland. GOING GLOBAL: IS CHINA INC. SUSTAINABLE?

This Bridges China dialogue, jointly organized by ICTSD, the Swiss Chinese Chamber of Commerce, Business Europe, and China Entrepreneurs Magazine, will discuss a series of major questions regarding China's future, particularly with regards to sustainable development and global growth. These questions include how to interpret China's 12th Five Year Plan and Going Global Strategy; how China and Europe can work together to overcome the ongoing crisis; what are the key opportunities and challenges for China's rising Outward Investment (ODI); and what business opportunities are available for European companies and Chinese investors. The Bridges China Dialogue is an international forum committed to improving China's integration into the world economy in a sustainable manner. More details are available at the event [website](#).

1 October, Brussels, Belgium. GURN WORKSHOP ON GREEN ECONOMY. The Global Union Research Network (GURN) is a platform for trade unionists and researchers dealing with the challenges of globalisation from a labour perspective. In collaboration with the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), GURN is hosting a workshop that will bring together an international group of trade unionists and researchers to discuss the challenges that a green economy poses for organised labour. Papers will be presented on the following themes: Working Conditions in "Green Jobs"; Environmental Rights and Collective Bargaining on Environmental Issues; and Green Taxation and Fairness. Please note: this date is tentative, and could be changed; please visit the GURN [website](#) for more updates and final date confirmation.

10-14 October, Antalya, Turkey. ORMAN 2011: FORESTS IN A GREEN ECONOMY. This meeting, organised by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), will address sustainable forest management, the green economy, and will launch the European Forest Sector Outlook and other studies. For more information, visit the [UNECE website](#).

13 October, Geneva, Switzerland. TRADE, INVESTMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE: SEARCHING FOR PROGRESS ON KEY ISSUES. This conference, organised by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), will examine how unilateral action on climate change fits into the international trade and investment law regime. In particular, it will address the validity of green industrial policies and preventative measures for competitiveness loss and leakage, and explore the role of the trade community in securing international cooperation and solutions. For more information, [click here](#).

5-6 December, Durban, South Africa. THE DURBAN TRADE AND CLIMATE CHANGE SYMPOSIUM AT COP 17 / CMP 7. This symposium, jointly organised by ICTSD, the WTO and the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) of the Republic of South Africa, aims to generate proposals for fostering strong multilateral regimes on trade and climate change and help promote the transition to a low-carbon economy and a sustainable energy future. The event, which will take place on the sidelines of the UNFCCC's 17th Conference of the Parties and the 7th Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, will cover an array of issues linked to the trade and climate change nexus. More information can be found on www.ictsclimate.org. If your institution is interested in organising a panel session or sponsoring the event, please contact Adriana Verdier (avedier@icts.ch).

15-17 December, Geneva, Switzerland. EIGHTH WTO MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE. As agreed by the General Council at its meeting in October 2010, the WTO's Eighth Session of the Ministerial Conference will be held in Geneva from 15-17 December 2011. Like the December 2009 Ministerial, the 2011 conference will take place at the International Conference Centre Geneva (CICG), which is located near the Palais de Nations (UN). ICTSD will, of course, be providing multilingual daily updates from the event through [Bridges Daily Updates](#). For more information on the event, visit the [WTO website](#).

15-17 December, Geneva, Switzerland. GENEVA TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

SYMPOSIUM. ICTSD is organising a Geneva Trade and Development Symposium (GTDS), to take place over two days in parallel to the Eighth Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organization. Having taken place at prior ministerial conferences in Cancun (2003), Hong Kong (2005), and in Geneva (2009), these symposia have proved to be a valuable forum for policy makers, trade negotiators and representatives of inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations, academics, business people and others, to engage in substantive discussions in a non-negotiating context. More information on the event will be posted soon on the [ICTSD 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 to the [editor](#).

BIOMASS ENERGY: ANOTHER DRIVER OF LAND ACQUISITIONS? By Lorenzo Cotula, Lynn Finnegan, and Duncan Macqueen (IIED Briefing Paper, August 2011). Rapid expansion of biomass energy in the global North is fuelling demand for wood and increasing interest in tree plantations in the global South, the authors of this briefing paper posit. But if biomass is sourced from food-insecure countries where local land rights are weak, there is a real risk that people could lose the land they depend on for their livelihoods. The briefing discusses the potential social impacts of biomass plantations in developing countries and calls for greater public scrutiny and debate about the issue. The paper can be accessed on the [IIED website](#).

MAKING GLOBAL TRADE GOVERNANCE WORK FOR DEVELOPMENT: PERSPECTIVES AND PRIORITIES FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. Edited by: Carolyn Deere Birkbeck (University of Oxford, Global Economic Governance Programme, August 2011). Discussion of the governance of global trade and the multilateral trading system is too often dominated by developed-country

scholars and opinion-makers, with inadequate attention given to developing country perspectives, the editor asserts. Making Global Trade Governance Work for Development aims to gather a diversity of developing country views on how to improve the governance of global trade and the WTO to better advance sustainable development and respond to the needs of developing countries. With contributions by senior scholars, commentators and practitioners, the essays combine new, empirically-grounded research with practical insights about the trade policy-making process. They consider the specific governance issues of interest to developing countries and acknowledge the changing dynamics in the global economy and in trade decision-making. The book can be purchased on the [Cambridge University Press website](#).

CAN MARKETS PROTECT BIODIVERSITY? AN EVALUATION OF DIFFERENT FINANCIAL MECHANISMS. By Arild Vatn, David N. Barton, Henrik Lindhjem, Synne Movik, Irene Ring and Rui Santos (Norwegian University of Life Sciences, 2011). New varieties of financial mechanisms may potentially play a greater role in the future mix of instruments used to increase financing for conservation, and potentially create more appropriate incentives, the authors of this paper assert. This report discusses the strengths and weaknesses of increased use of market-based mechanisms in protecting biodiversity and its associated services. The study concluded that, inter alia, paying for eco-system services (PES) procurement auctions are considered an alternative or supplement to ordinary fixed-price or bilaterally negotiated PES schemes. The report also highlights ecological fiscal transfers as a new instrument that provides incentives for local governments to support and maintain nature conservation areas. The paper concludes that establishing relevant markets requires action by government and that many obstacles continue to stand in the way of the successful use of markets for biodiversity. The full study can be accessed on the [Norwegian University of Life Sciences website](#).