



Bridges Trade BioRes

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

Volume 11 • Number 17, 3 October 2011

International Transport

- EU Aviation Emission Levy Critics
Join Forces at New-Delhi Meeting..... 1

Climate Change

- India Proposes Discussion of Trade Issues
for Durban Climate Meet..... 3
- EU Carbon Market Proposal Colours
UN Climate Talks..... 4

Clean Technology

- Too Many Strings Attached to Chinese
Electric Car Subsidy: GM..... 5

In Brief

- Washington Pushes for Environmental Goods
and Services Negotiations under APEC..... 7
- US Congressmen Expected to Propose
Biofuel Reforms..... 8

Events and Resources

- Events..... 9
- 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 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](#).

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](#).

Contributors to this issue are Andrew Aziz, Ana Maria Kleymeyer, Sonja Lubecki, John Maughan, Joachim Monkelbaan, and Paul Van Peursem. This edition of Bridges Trade BioRes is edited by Andrew Aziz.

The Publisher and Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz. The Editor in Chief is Andrew Crosby. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and should be directed to the [editor](#) or the [Editor in Chief](#).

ISSN 1682-0843

INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT

EU Aviation Emission Levy Critics Join Forces at New-Delhi Meeting

A group of 26 countries last week came together in New Delhi, India for a two-day meeting to protest against the EU's decision to charge airlines departing from and arriving in the EU for their emissions. The EU initiative to address emissions from the aviation sector has sparked strong opposition by several countries and airlines – some of which have now joined forces to dispute the EU decision.

The 29-30 September meeting, which was hosted by India, brought together members of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) – a UN aviation body, and other non-EU states, including the US, China, Canada, Russia, and South Africa. At the end of the meeting, delegates adopted a joint declaration, stating that the EU plan to include aviation in its Emissions Trading System (EU ETS) is “discriminatory” and a violation of international law. Other states have been invited to associate themselves with the statement.

“We think that the EU's proposal is illegal because it seeks to charge airlines for the lag of journey outside its airspace” SNA Zaidi, civil aviation secretary and chair of the meeting, said. “This is an extra-territorial principle, which is illegal.”

Delegates participating in the meeting have also decided to file a formal complaint against the EU initiative at the ICAO council's next summit, taking place in November, where the inclusion of aviation into the EU ETS will be discussed. The group of opposing countries is planning to submit a working paper on the issue to accompany the joint declaration in their fight against the EU proposal.

Foreign airlines crucial for initiative's success

Despite growing opposition, the EU is not backing down from its initiative. EU member states and the European Parliament have agreed to include aviation in its cap-and-trade carbon programme to help them reach their target of reducing CO₂ emissions to 20 percent below 1990 levels over the next decade.

The EU decision was sparked by the contribution of aviation to global emissions, accounting for nearly 4 percent of manmade CO₂ emissions, with its share growing rapidly. The creation of a global cap-and-trade scheme, which has been negotiated within the ICAO for over a decade, has produced no clear solution. Impatient with the slow progress, the EU has thus decided to move ahead unilaterally.

From January 2012, all airlines – regardless of their nationality – will need to surrender emission permits for intra-EU flights, as well as flights to and from the EU. The inclusion of all airlines is crucial to ensure the effectiveness of the initiative, the EU claims. It minimises carbon leakage, where the reduction of emissions by EU airlines would be offset by an increase of emissions from non-EU airlines.

Growing opposition

Non-EU states and airlines, however, oppose this particular design. India, China, Russia, the US and several other countries have clearly expressed their opposition to the EU plan.

“How can they dictate terms to us and why should we accept it?” India’s civil aviation minister Vayalar Ravi asked in an interview last week. “The permit is a penalty on all foreign carriers going to Europe,” he said, and added that India should not be penalised for its growing aviation industry.

China and Russia released a joint statement on 27 September, in which they describe the EU initiative as an attack on other countries’ sovereignty which will “have an extremely negative impact on the international aviation industry.”

In the statement, they censure the scheme for its lack of consultation. “We oppose any unilateral and mandatory moves that are taken without the agreement of involved parties on the aviation emission issue” the countries stated jointly.

Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Hong Lei further said that “China appreciates the EU’s efforts in climate change, but opposes the EU’s forced implementation of unilateral legislation” and called upon the EU to address this issue through consultation with other countries.

The US demands that the EU aviation emissions scheme will not be applied to foreign aircraft operators. The Air Transport Association of America, an aviation representative body, together with American Airlines and the United Continental Group is challenging the initiative at the European Court of Justice –the EU’s highest court (see Bridges Trade BioRes, [11 July 2011](#)). The Court is expected to release an advisory legal opinion on the law suit on 6 October, while a final judgement might be issued before the EU proposal enters into force next year.

Middle Eastern airlines have also joined the growing opposition and are calling for a global solution to address emissions from aviation.

A ‘tit-for-tat’ scenario

Some observers have expressed concerns about retaliation and the risk of a trade war. Binit Somaia, director for South Asia at CAPA Centre for Aviation, an Australia-based industry advising firm, said that by involving foreign airlines in its ETS, the EU is “overstepping its authority.”

“Retaliation could take the form of tit-for-tat taxes, restrictions on traffic rights for European carriers and could even impact European aircraft manufacturers,” Somaia warned.

The EU got its first taste of retaliation in June, when China blocked a US\$3.8 billion purchase from Airbus at the Paris air show because of its anger over the EU aviation scheme, industry sources claim. India and China have also pointed

to the possibility of retaliation if the EU initiative enters into force.

Defending the scheme

While foreign governments and airlines point out that the costs the aviation industry is expected to face under the scheme, the EU is defending its decision.

According to the European Commission, 85 percent of the emission allowances will be allocated for free in the first year of the initiative. Isaac Valero-Ladron, spokesman for the Climate Action Commissioner, described the allocation of allowances free of charge as “potential revenues” because airlines are expected to pass on a large share of the price increase to customers.

Airlines could also be exempted from the carbon charge if their countries have adopted equivalent climate policies. “This is not a tax,” Valero-Ladron said in email on 29 September. “If you emit less than the ceiling, you will not need to pay.”

The EU further expressed its willingness to revise its aviation emissions scheme if the ICAO reached a global agreement on the matter. “We’ve always said that we prefer a multilateral, global solution, and the most plausible forum for that right now is ICAO,” an EU official said.

ICTSD Reporting; “Airlines fear unfair competition,” FINANCIAL TIMES, 27 September 2011; “China calls for talks with EU on airline CO2 permits,” REUTERS, 28 September 2011; “Airlines Hit Emissions Plan,” ASSOCIATED PRESS, 28 September 2011; “China, Russia rail against EU aviation emission scheme,” CHINA DAILY, 28 September 2011; “Middle Eastern Airlines Join Opposition to E.U. Emissions Plan,” NEW YORK TIMES, 29 September 2011; “India Rallies 30 Nations Against EU Airline Emission Levy,” BLOOMBERG, 29 September 2011; “UN aviation body meeting opposes EU carbon plan – India,” REUTERS, 30 September 2011; “India, 25 others oppose EU airline carbon charge plan,” REUTERS, 30 September 2011; “26 countries join to protest

EU’s aircraft carbon emission norms,” THE ECONOMIC TIMES, 3 October 2011.

CLIMATE CHANGE

India Proposes Discussion of Trade Issues for Durban Climate Meet

On 21 September, the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) added three items to the provisional agenda for the 17th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 17), which will take place at the end of the year in Durban, South Africa. The move was sparked by India’s request on 26 May to include “intellectual property rights,” “equitable access to sustainable development,” and “unilateral trade measures” as additional issues for discussion at this year’s climate conference – a suggestion that has already caused tension between some developed and developing countries.

All countries will need to agree during the opening session of the COP whether to keep the issues on the agenda and thus give them a formal space for discussion during the meetings.

India has made clear that it would like to see these issues addressed under broader headings within the current COP agenda. In its request, India suggested including the subtheme “Accelerated access to critical mitigation and adaptation technologies and related intellectual property rights,” which would fall under the topic of “Development and transfer of technologies.” In addition, India proposed that “Equitable access to sustainable development” as well as “Unilateral trade measures” come under the topic of “Review of implementation of commitments and other provisions of the Convention.”

IP, trade, sustainable development issues spur debate

The agreement to create a new Technology Mechanism at last year’s COP in Cancun, Mexico raises the question of how or whether such a

mechanism will address the intellectual property rights (IPRs) developing countries need to access technologies that will help them address climate change. India suggested that the Technology Mechanism should include the removal of constraints on the development and availability of climate friendly technologies. These technologies and their IPRs should be treated as public goods, India said, to help countries reach the Convention's climate change goals.

On the issue of equitable access to sustainable development, India highlighted the decision under the Cancun agreement to limit the rise in world temperatures to 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels. According to India, the principle of equity contained in the Convention implies that the sustainable development of developing countries should not be compromised by the global goal for climate stabilisation. A formal discussion could consider possible means and measures to ensure, through the multilateral system or beyond, a country's sustainable development in practice.

Another issue on the table is the question of the use of unilateral trade measures (UTMs) by rich countries in the name of climate mitigation. The climate Convention and last year's Cancun agreement both stress "that measures taken to combat climate change including unilateral ones should not constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination or a disguised restriction on international trade." India urged Parties to prohibit UTMs on any grounds related to climate change. Such measures, it said, would simply pass the mitigation burden onto developing countries.

Several developed countries have opposed the inclusion of such topics in the Durban agenda, claiming that they have been sufficiently addressed at the 2010 climate talks in Cancun. The US has stressed that there has been no agreement on these issues in the past and that there is no prospect for any agreement on them in Durban, according to reports from the Third World Network, a development-focused NGO.

However, the majority of developing countries believe that the suggested items remain unresolved

and therefore see a need to allocate time for discussion during the Durban meetings.

Parties are currently meeting Panama City, Panama for a final round of negotiations prior to the Durban COP. These final talks are expected provide a temperature reading on what to expect in Durban, including on the increasingly contentious trade topics (see related story, this issue).

ICTSD reporting; "Proposals by India for the inclusion of additional agenda items in the provisional agenda of the seventeenth session of the Conference of the Parties," UNFCCC, 21 September 2011; "India proposal on neglected issues for Durban discussions raises controversy," THIRD WORLD NETWORK, 22 June 2011.

EU Carbon Market Proposal Colours UN Climate Talks

The European Union, clamoring for a life raft to save the carbon market, recently introduced a formal proposal to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) for a new market-based mechanism that would promote projects in developing countries. The proposal, if agreed, would provide a new basis for the carbon market in lieu of the Kyoto Protocol's Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), if countries are unable to clarify the future of the Protocol. The proposal came in the lead-up to this week's UN climate change negotiations, which are currently underway in Panama City, Panama.

One of the major points of friction in this year's negotiations – that will culminate in the annual Conference of the Parties (COP) in Durban, South Africa this December – is the future of the Kyoto Protocol. The Protocol is set to complete its first five-year commitment period at the end of 2012.

In recent years, countries have spent hundreds of hours negotiating the terms of the second commitment period. That process was derailed, however, as concurrent negotiations for a complementary agreement intended to strengthen

implementation of the Convention – known as the Ad-hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action, or LCA – progressed. The new agreement will increase participation of the United States as well as major developing country economies. These players account for nearly 50 percent of current global emissions.

The Kyoto-LCA gap

While the Protocol has not achieved significant reductions in emissions and, in fact, most countries bound by reduction targets were unable to achieve those targets, the end of the Protocol will effectively mean that no international process for reducing emissions will exist until emissions reductions are agreed under the LCA – a goal which is not yet in sight. Just last year, several countries, including Japan, Canada and Russia, publicly stated that they will not participate in a second commitment period of Kyoto. Developing countries, however, are unanimously and enthusiastically pushing for a second period.

Environmentalists say such a scenario bodes poorly in terms of achieving the levels of emissions reductions necessary to avoid more extreme levels of climate change. It also leaves a number of additional gaps. If countries do not agree to extend or renew the Protocol in Durban, any mechanisms or instruments that are part of the agreement would also terminate. The CDM, upon which the international carbon market is founded, is one such mechanism.

Proposal would not depend on Kyoto

In an apparent attempt to provide a solution to this problem, the EU – the group of countries most heavily invested in the carbon market – is proposing an alternative mechanism for agreement in Durban that would not depend on the Kyoto Protocol. The EU is calling for Durban to establish a common core set of global rules and procedures that would provide clear guidance on the characteristics of the new mechanism and a clear process and timeline to work out the additional details soon thereafter.

Observers say the proposal is likely to be controversial and will certainly not be a shoe-in for negotiations in Durban. Indeed, the move is tainted by the fact that many developing countries have spoken out strongly against a recent decision by the European Union to include aviation within their regional Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS). The outcry suggests that many countries are not particularly amenable to the market-based approach heavily promoted by the Europeans. Specifically, India managed to rally 30 other nations against the inclusion of non-EU airlines in the aviation part of EU ETS scheme (see related story, this issue).

Still, the proposal stands as a possible alternative path in a somewhat barren landscape of possibilities. Some decision regarding the future of the global carbon market, in addition to a solution of the Kyoto conundrum, could play off each other during the Durban meeting. If so, it would be one of the major results to emerge from this year's COP.

ICTSD Reporting; “India Rallies 30 Nations Against EU Airline Emission Levy,” BLOOMBERG, 29 September 2011; “China Opposes EU Aviation Emissions Plan,” THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, 28 September 2011.

CLEAN TECHNOLOGY

Too Many Strings Attached to Chinese Electric Car Subsidy: GM

General Motors last week announced that it would no longer seek to manufacture its newest electric car in China, eschewing a massive subsidy offer that would have forced the automaker to divulge technology secrets. GM will instead work with its Chinese joint venture partner to develop new electric technologies there.

China has been stepping up its efforts to leverage access to its booming economy as a bargaining chip for the transfer of new technologies. The massive subsidy in the GM case applies to “new energy” vehicles developed in China under a new

Chinese policy linking domestic production subsidies to access to foreign technologies. Some experts are questioning whether such tactics are in line with Beijing's WTO commitments.

According to the [New York Times](#), China is offering a consumer subsidy of more than US\$19,000 per unit for the sale of the next generation of electric cars in China, an amount that is nearly half the value of a new electric car such as the Chevrolet Volt – which sells for US\$41,000 in the US. The subsidy applies to “plug-in” hybrids, such as the Volt, which are predominantly electric, and does not apply to older “mild hybrids” like the Toyota Prius. The electric car market in China is expected to expand quickly in coming years, in response to government efforts to reduce emissions and promote high-tech innovation.

The proposed policy aims to encourage foreign firms to transfer cutting-edge technologies to Chinese joint ventures. In the GM case, transfer of one of three technologies would make it eligible: the Volt's electric motor, advanced electronic controls, or electricity storage device. But as GM showed last week, that price was too high. The decision mirrors that of other major electric car manufacturers who have their eyes on China, including Toyota, Hyundai, and Nissan.

GM says its ambition of tackling the Chinese auto market – now the largest in the world by volume – has not been impacted by the subsidy issue. The company will export a limited number of Volts to China later this year. They will be the first mass market plug-in hybrids to hit the Chinese market.

GM, like Hyundai and Nissan, will also work with its Chinese joint venture partners to develop future technologies in China. This ensures that GM's partners will contribute to the development of upcoming technologies and could allow future access to the subsidy.

China's trade partners protest

China's new policy has prompted a stiff reaction from foreign trade partners. Critics argue that if Chinese manufacturers are eligible for the subsidy while foreign importers are forced to refuse it

through onerous technology transfer requirements, it could effectively block foreign imports from a viable share of the electric car market in China. China's measure drew immediate complaints from industry representatives and officials from the US and EU. Nevertheless, China is expected to formalise the measure this week, which could prompt a more robust response from foreign governments.

A spokeswoman for the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) in Washington responded to questions about the subsidy by defending the principle of non-discrimination, a cornerstone of the multilateral trade system.

“While the United States shares China's desire to support the development and deployment of electric vehicles, we have been clear that it is important that we and other trading partners employ policies that do not discriminate against foreign enterprises and foreign products,” said USTR spokeswoman Nkenge Harmon.

Recently, US Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner was more outspoken about China's continued insistence on tying technology transfers to market access.

“We're seeing China continue to be very, very aggressive in a strategy they started several decades ago, which goes like this: you want to sell to our country, we want you to come produce here... if you want to come produce here, you need to transfer your technology to us,” Geithner said.

With China's formalisation of the policy imminent and political pressure mounting, the possibility that China's trade partners will take legal action appears to be growing.

Due to the sheer size of the subsidy, experts say it could create a gap between domestic prices and the prices of foreign imports which, in turn could make the “subsidy-for-technology” scheme forbidden under WTO rules. A key issue at play is whether or not tying the additional demand for technology transfer to the subsidy can be considered discriminatory. Ultimately, these issues

depend on the details of how the policy is formulated, which will become clearer when China formally announces the policy this week.

ICTSD Reporting; "Geithner slams China's intellectual property policies," REUTERS, 23 September 2011; "GM Plans to Develop Electric Cars With China," NEW YORK TIMES, 20 September 2011; "Road Gets Bumpy for GM in China," WALL STREET JOURNAL, 16 September 2011; "Hybrid in a Trade Squeeze," NEW YORK TIMES, 5 September 2011.

IN BRIEF

Washington Pushes for Environmental Goods and Services Negotiations under APEC

With efforts to liberalise environmental goods and services (EGS) at a standstill under the WTO's Doha Round, the United States is urging Asia Pacific economies to tackle the matter when they meet at an Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) conference in November. While rumours of negotiating the reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade in environmental goods like wind turbines and solar panels under other fora are not new, past efforts have not moved beyond the preliminary discussion phase.

"This is an issue that APEC has been talking about for a number of years and this year we're trying to actually see if we can get economies to commit to liberalise their regime," Wendy Cutler, assistant US trade representative for Japan, Korea and APEC affairs told Reuters last week.

The USTR argues that the sheer volume of trade between APEC economies – some 60 percent of global EGS trade – makes it a natural alternative forum to the WTO for discussing the issue. Representatives from the 21 APEC member economies have just concluded 10 days of talks in preparation for the November summit in Honolulu.

"We're trying to get the APEC economies to recognise that trade liberalisation in this sector is important and then work together to see what we could do to provide momentum to getting economies to reduce their tariffs, eliminate their tariffs and get rid of non-tariff measures," Cutler said.

She emphasised, however, that APEC itself is not a negotiating forum so talks on reducing the trade barriers would happen elsewhere. She was not specific, but a push from APEC members could lead to negotiations on an environmental goods and services pact within the WTO.

Steps to foster "green growth" and address global climate change are one of three main US themes this year, along with reducing regulatory barriers and pushing APEC closer to its long-term goal of regional free trade.

An important aspect of the green growth agenda is a push among APEC members to reduce and eliminate inefficient fossil fuel subsidies, said Kurt Tong, Washington's senior official for APEC.

There will be a paper released in Honolulu outlining the extent of the subsidies and an "outcome which describes what APEC is going to do about it," he said.

In the regulatory area, the push is toward a set of best practices that encourage countries to develop a coordinating body to assess government regulations for unexpected impacts, such as the role the White House Office of Management and Budget plays in the United States.

The United States also hopes for progress toward a long-envisioned Free Trade Area of the Asia Pacific. APEC has identified several different "pathways" toward its goal of regional free trade by 2020, including current talks on the proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) pact between the United States and eight other APEC members.

APEC trade ministers agreed earlier this year to develop plans by November to promote market-based innovation, increase the efficiency of supply chains and encourage small- and medium-sized enterprises to conduct more international trade.

Other issues to be addressed at the November meeting include food security and related export restraints, barriers to trade in remanufactured goods and waiving tariffs and other border taxes on small shipments of approximately US\$200 in value.

ICTSD Reporting; “U.S. pushes environmental trade agenda for APEC,” REUTERS, 26 September 2011.

US Congressmen Expected to Propose Biofuel Reforms

Talks are underway to reduce the federal mandate on fuel ethanol during times of low corn stocks, according to Reuters reports from 23 September. The proposed legislation, which reports say was confirmed by an unnamed congressional staff worker, would supposedly lower the share of corn set aside for the ethanol-blending industry. The guaranteed amounts were set up in the Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS), part of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Domestic dairy and livestock producers have complained that artificially increasing the demand for blended ethanol drives up corn prices across the board.

The likely sponsors of this bill, Representatives Bob Goodlatte and Bob Costa - a Virginia Republican and California Democrat, respectively, are both from districts where livestock is a key industry.

“This legislation would provide a mechanism that when the [US Department of Agriculture] reports that US corn supplies are tight, based upon corn stocks-to-expected-use, there would be a reduction made to the RFS,” a spokeswoman for Goodlatte explained, according to the Dow Jones Newswires.

The MF Global consulting firm has found that the legislation would “reduce the ethanol mandate by 25 percent when the corn stocks-to-use ratio is projected to be less than 7 percent and reduce it

by 50 percent when the ratio would be 5 percent or less,” Reuters reported.

This year has already seen efforts to change legislation surrounding ethanol blending. The Senate voted on 7 July to cut the 45 cent a gallon ethanol tax break and the 54 cent a gallon ethanol import tariff (see Bridges Weekly [13 July 2011](#)); however, the amendment was not expected to actually pass into law. Procedurally, all tax-related legislation must originate in the House of Representatives.

New subsidies were subsequently enacted for ethanol infrastructure.

Potential RFS changes spark responses on both sides

These possible changes to the RFS sparked a 23 September [statement](#) from the Renewable Fuels Association (RFA). The organisation’s CEO and President, Bob Dineen, insisted that “seeking to re-legislate the RFS in this manner would do nothing to address the concerns raised by livestock constituents.” He warned that a “knee-jerk policy” could cause a loss in fuel supply that “would hammer American consumers at the pump.”

Conversely, at a 14 September public hearing in the House Agriculture Committee’s Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry, various Congressmen and panellists directly asked for a change in ethanol legislation.

Dennis Cardoza, a ranking member in the subcommittee and a Democrat from the state of California, [urged](#) Congress “to stop picking winners and losers, which is causing a shortage of feed in our country.”

Some panellists pointed directly to changing the RFS, including Michael Welch who spoke on behalf of the National Chicken Council. In his [statement](#) he suggested either a full or partial waiver of the RFS, along with asking that states be allowed to “opt-out of the federal ethanol mandate and/or legislation mandating a stocks-to-use trigger mechanism for the RFS.”

ICTSD Reporting; “Ethanol critics target mandates as subsidy ends,” DESMOINES REGISTER, 10 September 2011; “Ethanol industry sees threat to fuel mandate in proposed bill,” DOW JONES NEWSWIRE, 26 September 2011; “Ethanol Industry Is Unruffled by Senate Vote Against Tax Breaks,” NEW YORK TIMES, 17 June 2011; “House bill would lower mandate to use ethanol,” REUTERS, 23 September 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 two weeks (3-17 October)

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](#).

11-12 October, Copenhagen, Denmark. FIRST GLOBAL GREEN GROWTH FORUM. The Global Green Growth Forum (3GF) is an initiative by the Danish Government, launched with the support of the Government of the Republic of Korea and developed in association with the international Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI). 3GF will hold annual high-level forums in Denmark for representatives from governments, global corporations, investors and experts in order to come up with solutions on how to reap the economic growth potential of the industrial transition to a green economy. 3GF is coordinating with the Clean Energy Ministerial

(CEM) and the World Economic Forum to strengthen public-private collaboration on clean energy as an important component of green growth. Selected outcomes and recommendations from the 3GF sessions will flow into the third meeting of the CEM in London in April 2012, as well as its related initiatives. More information is available on the official [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](#).

17-19 October, Beijing, China. CGIAR SCIENCE FORUM 2011. The biennial Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) Science Forum brings together scientists, practitioners, policy makers and funding agents to examine emerging challenges, identify key researchable issues and form new partnerships to address them. The theme of Science Forum 2011 is ‘The Agriculture-Environment Nexus.’ It will focus on new opportunities to adapt the agricultural research landscape to meet emerging challenges, such as: giving consideration to ecological efficiency in future agriculture; making agriculture and forestry net sinks of carbon and not sources; enabling agriculture to prosper with fewer non-renewable inputs; and developing innovative approaches for a low-carbon agriculture that mitigates climate change. More information is available on the CGIAR [website](#).

17-19 October, New York City, US. THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CLIMATE SERVICES. The International Conference on Climate Services aims to initiate a dialogue between experienced climate information providers and those who currently use or wish to use such information. The objective of the ICCS is to ultimately establish a climate services pilot

programme or network, with support from an international set of partners with experience in the implementation, design or use of climate information and services. The hope is that the conference will engender expressed commitments from conference participants. More information is available on the ICCS [website](#).

17-19 October, Bali, Indonesia. WORLD RENEWABLE ENERGY CONGRESS 2011. "Boosting the Use of Low Carbon Energy for a Better World" is the theme for the World Renewable Energy Congress 2011. Organisers say the event is expected to bring together over 1500 participants, including senior government officials, legislators, scientists, researchers, educators and academics, senior business executives, developers and professionals, bankers and fund managers, and NGOs in the field of renewable energy and energy efficiency. More information is available on the event [website](#).

Other Upcoming Events

3-4 November, Cannes, France. 2011 G20 SUMMIT. The 2011 Summit of the Group of 20 (G20), the sixth meeting of the Group's Heads of State or Government, will take place in Cannes, France, from 3-4 November 2011. More information is available on the official [website](#).

12-15 December, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. EYE ON EARTH SUMMIT. This event, co-organised by the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), Environment Agency Abu Dhabi, European Environment Agency, will launch the global environmental information network (EIN) strengthening initiative and address major policy and technical issues. Organisers say the Summit will produce clear statement on ways and means to strengthen existing initiatives and fill gaps towards informed policy making in support of a sustainable future. More information is available on the official [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](#).

FOOD RESERVES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: TRADE POLICY OPTIONS FOR IMPROVED FOOD SECURITY. Published by ICTSD Programme on Agricultural Trade and Sustainable Development (September 2011). Agricultural prices, along with the prices of primary commodities in general, have been both high and volatile over 2006-11. These developments impact the poor and other vulnerable non-farm households who devote a high proportion of their incomes to the purchase of food. This paper looks at international and national reserves policies that address food security. The full document is available [here](#).

IMPROVING THE INTERNATIONAL GOVERNANCE OF FOOD SECURITY AND TRADE. Published by ICTSD Programme on Agricultural Trade and Sustainable Development (September 2011). This paper critically examines the recent global initiatives to improve various elements of the international governance of food security and the institutional context of policymaking on trade and food security as well as making some suggestions for ways in which policymaking bodies could more effectively address food security concerns. The full paper can be accessed [here](#).