

BRIDGES WEEKLY

Global trade news from a sustainable development perspective

VOLUME 18, ISSUE 29, 10 SEPTEMBER 2014

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

WTO Members Return to Geneva, Hoping to Bridge TFA Gap 1

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

US-Japan Farm Trade Divides Persist as TPP Chief Negotiators End Hanoi Meet..... 4

AFRICA

FAO: Ebola Outbreak Putting West African Trade, Food Security in Jeopardy 6

RENEWABLE ENERGY

India Decides Against Solar Import Duties, Continues Renewables Push..... 8

DISPUTES

Argentina Pledges to Appeal WTO Ruling on Import Restrictions 10

NATURAL RESOURCES

Australia Scraps Mining Tax 12

WTO Appellate Body Confirms China Rare Earths Export Restrictions Illegal..... 14

TRADE REMEDIES

US, India Appeal WTO Panel Findings in Steel Dispute 17

China, US Trade Remedy Dispute Advances to WTO Appeals Stage 19

EVENTS & RESOURCES

Events..... 21

Resources..... 23

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

WTO Members Return to Geneva, Hoping to Bridge TFA Gap

A flurry of meetings is scheduled for the coming weeks as WTO members – having now returned to Geneva following their annual August break – try to pick up the pieces after missing a key implementation deadline this past July.

The 31 July missed deadline was for adopting a "Protocol of Amendment," which would have incorporated the WTO's new Trade Facilitation Agreement, or TFA, into the global trade body's legal framework. The step is crucial in order to allow WTO members to take the trade deal – agreed in Bali, Indonesia in December 2013 – back to their domestic legislatures for ratification, particularly given the end-July 2015 deadline to bring the deal into force.

The process of adopting this Protocol had stumbled after India said that it would not be able to allow TFA to move forward unless it saw signs of movement toward a "permanent solution" on the issue of public food stockholding, another issue from the Bali 2013 meeting.

An "interim solution" on the latter subject was adopted in Bali, effectively committing members to refrain from challenging subsidised purchases of farm goods under public food stockholding schemes, in return for more information on the scale and type of support being given to farmers.

The interim solution is set to last until at least 2017, in order to give members time to negotiate a permanent solution. However, India had asked in July to see a permanent solution by 31 December 2014, and refused to back the TFA Protocol without it.

The prospect of re-negotiating the Bali timelines – and thus potentially re-opening the hard-won deal – was deemed untenable for many WTO members, with the US being among the most vocal in this regard.

"We have not been able to find a solution that would allow us to bridge that gap," WTO Director-General Roberto Azevêdo said shortly before midnight on 31 July, when it was clear that meeting the Protocol deadline was no longer possible.

"This will have consequences," he warned at the time. "And it seems to me, from what I hear in my conversations with you, that the consequences are likely to be significant."

Informal HoDs meeting next Monday

Before WTO members adjourned for the August break, the Director-General urged them to use the holiday as an opportunity to “think carefully” about potential next steps, asking them to “reflect long and hard on the ramifications of this setback.”

Negotiating group chairs, along with those of the regular WTO bodies, would also be directed to consult with members on what to do next, he said.

Little seems to have happened over the summer, sources indicated recently, with some noting that both sides appear to be awaiting the other's next move. “It's still a bit early,” one delegate acknowledged.

Since WTO members returned to Geneva earlier this month, ambassadors have reportedly been meeting one another in small groups to discuss the situation further.

All WTO members are then set to meet next Monday, 15 September for a meeting at the level of Heads of Delegations (HoDs), which is expected to serve as an opportunity to kick off the consultations process and review any discussions that have been held, informally or otherwise, over the August break.

The following day, an informal meeting of the Committee on Agriculture is scheduled, with sources confirming that the chair's goal for those discussions is to “take stock of members' positions on the implementation of the Bali outcomes and to exchange views on the way ahead.”

The “special session” of the Committee on Agriculture, which specifically deals with agriculture-related negotiations, is then set to meet the following Tuesday on 23 September, with the same stated purpose.

On 29 September, the Preparatory Committee on Trade Facilitation will then meet. While the same stocktaking exercise is planned informally, the meeting will also formally review the notifications that developing country members have sent in of their Category A commitments – in other words, those commitments that will take effect once the TFA does enter into force.

Trade sources say that 32 new notifications on Category A commitments have been received since the last meeting of the Preparatory Committee, which was held in early July.

Some sources have indicated that special sessions on all other negotiating issues could be forthcoming, and that the Trade Negotiations Committee – tasked with the Doha Round trade talks – may meet in early October, ahead of the scheduled General Council meeting later that same month.

Chair's statement versus General Council decision

In the weeks since the 31 July deadline passed, more details have emerged about how close members actually were to a deal that day.

The difference, sources say, was between whether to adopt a chair's statement, versus a formal General Council decision on the public food stockholding subject. While the US had wanted the former, unwilling to adopt anything that might potentially reopen the Bali deal, India had sought the latter, which ostensibly would have carried more legal weight.

Sources say that negotiators had also explored options for a clear process for moving towards a permanent solution. Dates for meetings of the Committee on Agriculture and specific topics had been mooted as part of a possible deal.

Meanwhile, the US had also effectively clarified that the interim agreement announced in Bali would be effectively "open-ended." The issue had been "fudged" through constructive ambiguity at the Bali conference, leaving open the question of whether the interim solution was temporary – and thus with a 2017 expiration date – or if it would last for however long it takes to reach a permanent solution.

Meeting at the White House

One potentially pivotal event on the international trade calendar is a planned meeting on 29-30 September in Washington between new Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi, who took office in late May, and US President Barack Obama.

According to a [White House statement](#) on the event, the two leaders will discuss "a range of issues of mutual interest," such as ways to ramp up economic growth and improve cooperation on security issues.

Sources speaking to Bridges noted that some members are pinning their hopes on the leaders' meeting as a chance to resolve the stalemate. Others, however, have questioned whether the WTO issue is likely to be given priority within the much more wide-ranging agenda that the two leaders are set to address.

Work programme timeline

What effect the TFA situation will have on another key WTO front – that of preparing a work programme aimed at resolving the various outstanding issues in the Doha Round talks – is another significant question for negotiators as they resume their work.

Trade ministers had agreed in Bali that this work programme should be agreed by December of this year, and would build both on the decisions taken during last year's conference as well as the other issues "under the Doha mandate that are central to concluding the Round."

Furthermore, ministers said at the time, those issues in the Bali deal where legally binding outcomes were not possible must take priority, while work on issues not addressed during the end-2013 event would need to resume in the relevant WTO committees or negotiating groups.

However, various WTO members, particularly the US and EU, have made clear that unless the Bali deal is implemented, there is no point in trying to craft a post-Bali agenda.

"Many members, including developing country members, have noted that, if the Bali package fails, there can be no post-Bali," said US Ambassador Michael Punke in July. "It is with regret that we agree with them."

Whether these issues can be resolved in time to meet the upcoming deadlines is an open question, and has fuelled much speculation and commentary since 31 July. The WTO has already struggled for years to convince a sceptical public that it remains capable of reaching multilateral agreements on international trade, with the Bali package being seen as a potential turning point for the organisation's troubled negotiating function.

ICTSD reporting.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

US-Japan Farm Trade Divides Persist as TPP Chief Negotiators End Hanoi Meet

Chief negotiators from 12 Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) countries concluded a 10-day meeting in Hanoi, Vietnam, earlier today, in an effort to pare down some of their remaining differences. While progress was reported in some areas of the trade talks, a concurrent set of bilateral meetings in Tokyo between the US and Japan showed that the two sides remain at odds on the key issue of agricultural tariffs.

Issues on the 1-10 September agenda for the TPP group included investment, rules of origin, intellectual property, state-owned enterprises, financial services, and the environment, according to an Australian [government summary](#) published ahead of the talks.

US trade negotiator Barbara Weisel, speaking to Bloomberg, said that the week had yielded "important progress," particularly in the area of state-owned enterprises. However, "we are not done and further work is needed," she clarified, noting that parties are trying to address country-specific sensitivities without undermining TPP goals.

Advances were also made in sanitary standards involving agriculture, Weisel told the news agency, without going into specifics.

Chief negotiators had last met in the Canadian city of Ottawa in July, touting progress in areas such as labour and sanitary and phytosanitary standards (SPS), without reporting any major breakthroughs in the more controversial areas. (See Bridges Weekly, [17 July 2014](#))

US-Japan: little progress on farm trade talks

The TPP's members include Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, the US, and Vietnam. However, the spotlight has lately been on the US and Japan as they attempt to hammer out a bilateral deal on agriculture trade within the TPP context, as well as a separate agreement on automobiles.

The farm trade subject has been particularly difficult, with Tokyo pushing to keep protections on a series of "sacred" agricultural products, such as beef, dairy, pork, rice, and sugar. The US had previously pushed for full tariff elimination on these items, while Japan had asked for more flexibility, given how politically sensitive the issue of farm trade is domestically.

Meetings between American and Japanese negotiators on these subjects were held this week, in an effort to narrow differences in these areas. These were held away from the main TPP negotiating site in Hanoi, in the Japanese capital of Tokyo. Some had hoped that progress here could pave the way for a ministerial-level meeting between the two trading partners later this month.

"We were not able to make as much progress as we had expected," said Hiroshi Oe, Japan's deputy chief negotiator for the TPP, afterward in comments reported by Kyodo News. Oe, who was referring specifically to the agriculture discussions, added that "considerable gaps" remain between the two sides.

The slow pace of the US-Japan farm talks has sown impatience among agricultural producers in other TPP members, given that whatever outcome is reached there will likely affect the overall negotiations.

A group made up of the Canadian Pork Council and various US, Australian, Chilean, and Mexican pork producers recently warned that “a broad exemption for Japan will encourage other TPP countries to withhold market access concessions,” among other dangers, potentially unravelling the Pacific Rim trade deal.

“It would set a dangerous precedent,” they added, according to a letter quoted in *The Globe and Mail*, a Canadian newspaper.

Upcoming meetings?

Dates for the next meetings, along with what level these would be at, had not been publicly announced as Bridges went to press on Wednesday evening. However, some expect that a TPP leaders' meeting could be held on the sidelines of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders' week, being hosted in November by China. All 12 TPP members are part of the 21-country APEC regional grouping. China is not involved in the Trans-Pacific Partnership talks.

Should a TPP leaders' meeting be held, a ministerial-level meeting could potentially precede it, as done in years past. (See Bridges Weekly, [10 October 2013](#)) The most recent meeting of TPP ministers was this past May in Singapore, where the countries' top trade officials pledged to intensify the talks, while not setting out publicly a timeframe for their completion. (See Bridges Weekly, [22 May 2014](#))

US midterms

Some officials – including New Zealand Prime Minister John Key – have suggested in recent months that any progress on wrapping up a TPP deal might not happen until after the US holds its congressional midterm elections, set for early November.

“I'm of the view Obama won't go anywhere near this thing prior to the mid-terms,” Key said at a conference in Wellington earlier this month, noting that US President Barack Obama has stressed to him the importance of reaching a strong deal.

Obama had previously said, during a meeting in June with the New Zealand premier, that he hoped TPP members might also have something ready in November, without clarifying at the time whether this would be a draft deal or a finalised agreement. (See Bridges Weekly, [26 June 2014](#))

No other TPP members have publicly backed that date, however, and some – such as Australia – have openly said that 2015 is far more likely, given the fraught political climate in Washington.

ICTSD reporting; “Japan, U.S. see little progress in talks for TPP farm tariffs,” KYODO NEWS, 10 September 2014; “Canadian pork producers balk at Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal,” THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 9 September 2014; “Obama urged to boot Canada from trade talks or gain concessions,” THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 3 August 2014; “Top U.S. Trade Negotiator Sees 'Important Progress' in TPP Talks,” BLOOMBERG, 10 September 2014; “PM Key sees more TPP traction after US mid-terms,” SCOOP NZ, 8 September 2014.

AFRICA

FAO: Ebola Outbreak Putting West African Trade, Food Security in Jeopardy

Disruptions in cross-border trade and marketing in the three West African countries most affected by the Ebola outbreak – Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea – have sent food prices soaring, threatening food security in the region, according to an alert issued last week by the UN's Food and Agriculture Organization.

The Ebola virus disease is a severe, often fatal illness, with a death rate of up to 90 percent. The current outbreak has seen a case fatality rate of 51 percent, according to the latest World Health Organization (WHO) [report](#) released on 29 August. A total of 3052 cases have been recorded in West Africa, causing 1546 deaths. There is no known cure for the illness.

Cereal harvest at risk due to labour shortage

In an effort to combat the deadly virus, the governments of Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone have established quarantine zones and imposed restrictions on the movement of people. Although required to stem the spread of disease, these restrictions have had the unwanted side effect of exacerbating food security concerns, according to [the special alert](#) released by the FAO.

The main harvest season for key crops – maize, cassava and rice – is due in a “few weeks” time, the UN agency notes, and labour shortages on farmhouses due to movement limitations and migration to other areas will “seriously” impact cereal production.

Harvest across most of West Africa had initially been forecast at above-average levels, due to adequate rainfall during this past year. Food production is now expected to drop drastically, especially since the areas affected by the outbreak in Sierra Leone and Liberia are known to be the most productive.

“With the main harvest now at risk and trade and movements of goods severely restricted, food insecurity is poised to intensify in the weeks and months to come. The situation will have long-lasting impacts on farmers' livelihoods and rural economies,” said Bukar Tijani, the FAO's regional representative for Africa.

In addition, cash crops such as oil, cocoa, and rubber are also expected to suffer, which could in turn impact household incomes, “thus reducing purchasing power and inhibiting food access,” the report predicts.

The origin of the virus is still unknown, but some experts argue that human consumption of bush meat has been linked to the transmission of the disease to people.

According to the WHO, fruit bats are considered the likely host of the Ebola virus, based on available evidence. As part of the preventive measures aimed at combating the virus, a ban on bush meat was also introduced which, the FAO says, could deprive some households of a substantial source of nutrition and income.

Food price surge

"Closure of some border crossings, isolation of border areas where these three countries intersect and reduced trade from seaports are resulting in tighter supplies and a sharp rise in food prices," the FAO has said.

For example, in Liberia cassava prices increased by up to 150 percent within the first two weeks of August, according to a recent market assessment.

All three countries cited in the report are net cereal importers; therefore, the recent depreciation of their currencies is likely to apply inflationary pressure on domestic food prices, particularly for Sierra Leone and Liberia where exchange rates are more volatile and where food consumption is heavily reliant on imported cereal.

The UN agency has thus called for measures to improve internal trade, calling these "essential" in preventing additional price increases and resolving supply-side constraints.

Falling GDP

The suspension of operations by several multinationals and airlines operating in the region have also caused commercial and transport disruptions which, according to some observers, might hamper the overall region's economic growth.

Bloomberg has reported that Sime Darby, the world's leading palm oil producer, has cut back its output in Liberia, while steel manufacturing giant Arcelor Mittal has slowed down its efforts to expand its plant in the same country.

Air travel has also taken a hit, with British Airways among those to halt flights to Liberia and Sierra Leone over public health concerns. Several international shipping lines are also considering whether to avoid West African ports temporarily until the health crisis shows signs of abating.

Some experts say it is premature to evaluate how much Ebola and its consequences will affect sub-Saharan Africa's economic growth – estimated by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to hit 5.5 percent this year – while noting that some damage seems certain.

However, given the low connectivity of these economies, some experts argue that the crisis is unlikely to threaten the rest of Africa or the global economy as a whole.

Hinting at the narrative about Africa's strong growth and resilience, a subject of recent attention from the international community, some observers have suggested that this situation could again reinforce the negative stereotypes about the continent, and may in turn deter short-term foreign investment.

ICTSD reporting; "Ebola Virus Puts West Africa's Shipping Trade Under Threat," THIS DAY LIVE, 24 August 2014; "Ebola Threatens West Africa GDP as Companies Slow Production," BLOOMBERG, 14 August 2014; "Ebola outbreak puts harvests at risk, sends food prices shooting up," FAO, 2 September 2014, "Ebola threatens W. Africa food supply amid movement controls," BLOOMBERG, 2 September 2014.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

India Decides Against Solar Import Duties, Continues Renewables Push

The Indian Ministry of Finance confirmed in late August that it would not be imposing anti-dumping duties – meant to counter instances where goods are sold abroad at prices below their normal value – on imports of solar energy products from the US, China, Taiwan, and Malaysia.

The highly-awaited decision was welcomed by many Indian solar power developers, who had expressed concern that levying such duties would increase the cost of importing cells and other key products needed to make solar panels, while also raising consumer costs of solar energy.

The eleventh-hour announcement came despite a recommendation earlier this year from the Ministry of Commerce under the previous administration to move ahead with the duties after claiming to have found evidence of such dumping. (See Bridges Weekly, [22 May 2014](#))

The duties were reportedly set to range from 11 to 81 cents per watt on solar cells, modules, panels, and thin films; however, calculations over how much this would have impacted solar energy prices have varied substantially. Indian solar cell makers, which had favoured the duties, said that these would have had little effect on solar energy prices, while domestic power developers countered that energy prices could actually increase two-fold.

Clean energy investment boom?

Increasing India's share of renewables in the country's energy mix is one of the key goals of the recently-elected Modi government. The new Prime Minister pledged in May to scale-up the country's solar capacity to the point where every household across the country would be able to run at least one light bulb from the renewable energy source.

The Indian leader has also been credited with much of the success in setting up a solar scheme in Gujarat in 2009 during his time as the western state's chief minister.

Solar energy currently makes up just one percent of India's total power generation. In a bid to boost the renewable energy source, India set up the Jawaharlal Nehru National Solar Mission (NSM) in 2010, with the goal of deploying 20 gigawatts' (GW) worth of solar generating capacity by 2022, which would in turn be connected to the country's energy grid. More recently, the Modi government has reportedly asked for this target to be increased to as much as 100GW by 2027.

To that end, the current government has been implementing various policies aimed at ramping up solar energy production. For instance, New Delhi recently announced that it will be providing cheap grants and loans to establish solar power "parks" nationwide, which would together create up to 20 GW of energy. The scheme still requires approval by the Indian cabinet, expected later this month.

The reasons cited by officials and experts alike for increasing India's renewable energy capacity are manifold.

For one, India relies on coal – much of it imported – for 60 percent of its energy generation, which analysts have blamed for contributing to the country's trade deficit. Meanwhile, the sub-continent's power demand continues to increase, with approximately one-third of its 1.2 billion population still lacking access to electricity.

To date, the South Asian economy has solar projects that can produce approximately 2.5 GW of power, with another 2.2 GW expected through state and central government initiatives currently underway, according to the [Associated Chambers of Commerce and Industry of India](#), which had been critical of the proposed duties.

Analysts now predict that the country's solar potential may be substantially higher than the 20 GW goal set for 2022. A recent joint [report](#) by Tata Power Solar and Bridge to India has predicted that this potential could reach up to 110-144 GW in the next decade depending on the types of projects involved.

Such prospects have drawn in various new developers into the Indian solar market, keen to get involved in the rapidly growing field. For example, the US-based company First Solar, one of the world's top producers of solar modules, made headlines last month when it confirmed that it would be building a 4.5 GW project in the state of Telangana. Built across two sites, the project would be in operation by May 2015, expected to power on average over 92,000 homes in the region.

The process of adding new solar projects has not been without its own share of hurdles, however.

Plans for a 4 GW solar power plant in the state of Rajasthan stalled last month, according to the Wall Street Journal, after the newly-elected local government said the land involved should be used exclusively for salt production while other officials contended the plans would threaten the ecology of the area. Should the project move forward, however, the plant would be the world's largest such station.

Meanwhile, the National Solar Mission continues to face international scrutiny, four years after its launch. Specifically, the NSM's local content provision has come under challenge by the US at the WTO, with Washington claiming that the requirement for new Indian solar projects to source at least half of their inputs from domestic producers is in breach of international trade rules.

The trade dispute is now set to be reviewed by an expert panel, and is likely to spark renewed questions around how best to design sustainable energy expansion policies that will not run afoul of WTO rules. (See Bridges Weekly, [28 May 2014](#))

ICTSD reporting; "India Drops Plan to Impose Antidumping Tariffs on Solar Cells," WALL STREET JOURNAL, 25 August 2014; "India Dumping Duties Risk Choking Modi's Solar Revolution," BLOOMBERG, 11 June 2014; "India's Solar Power Plans Stalled," THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, 21 August 2014; "First Solar to develop 45 MW of solar farms in Telangana," THE HINDU BUSINESSLINE, 5 August 2014; "India Plans Solar Parks to Host Up to 20 Gigawatts," BLOOMBERG, 4 August 2014; "How a Solar Crisis was Averted by Three Ministers," NDTV, 24 August 2014.

DISPUTES

Argentina Pledges to Appeal WTO Ruling on Import Restrictions

Argentina has indicated that it plans to appeal a recent report by a WTO dispute panel that found several of the South American country's controversial import restrictions – part of its "managed trade" policy – to be inconsistent with international trade rules.

The panel report, released on 22 August, was overwhelmingly in favour of the EU, US, and Japan, which had each filed individual challenges to these Argentine measures in 2012. (See Bridges Weekly, [30 May 2012](#) and [12 September 2012](#), respectively)

Those parties, for their part, welcomed the ruling, and urged Argentina to bring the measures into compliance promptly in order to avoid affecting more exports.

"Argentina's protectionist measures impact a broad segment of US exports, potentially affecting billions of dollars in US exports each year that support high-quality, middle class American jobs," said US Trade Representative Michael Froman [in response](#) to the news.

EU Trade Commissioner Karel De Gucht [concurred](#), adding that the case gave "an important signal that protectionism is not acceptable."

Combination of restrictions

Argentina, the complainants had said, has been requiring "economic operators" to take a series of steps aimed at slashing the country's trade balance deficits, namely by incentivising these operators to replace imports with their domestically-produced equivalent and thus help limit the flow of dollars out of the country.

Such actions are part of the government's policy of "managed trade," or *comercio administrado* as it is known in Spanish.

These steps include, for instance, requirements for these operators to export at least the same amount, in terms of value, as what they are importing. Other such requirements include that imports be limited either in their volume or price, or that domestically-produced goods include a certain amount of locally-sourced content.

Economic operators, in some cases, were also required to either undertake some sort of investment in Argentina – such as by investing in production facilities – and/or to avoid transferring revenue abroad.

The panel found evidence of all five of these above-mentioned requirements, and noted that these measures have been used in some form since at least 2009. Furthermore, the Argentine government tended to inform economic operators of these requirements individually, depending on their particular circumstances, as opposed to outlining these in any domestic legislation or regulation.

These requirements, the complainants said, have been used – either individually or in some sort of combination – as part of a broad, overarching policy aimed at restricting imports. The measures are referred to jointly in the panel report as "Restrictive Trade-Related Requirements," or TRRs.

Argentina had denied that there was a single, overarching policy in play “that has general and prospective application,” arguing that these were – at most – a series of isolated incidents, a claim that the panel disagreed with in its findings.

Overall, the panel found that the TRRs measure “constitutes a restriction on the importation of goods,” thus violating a provision of the WTO’s General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) dealing with quantitative restrictions. The local content requirement, for its part, violated a separate GATT provision relating to national treatment by giving domestic products more favourable treatment than their foreign equivalents.

Unwritten measure

Notable in the case is that the complaints dealt with a series of measures that are not actually written explicitly in Argentine domestic law.

Whether a dispute panel would – or even should – make a ruling on an unwritten policy was thus one of the key questions underpinning the case.

The panel said, however, that even though these TRRs were unwritten, statements by Argentine government officials at the highest levels – including, for instance, the president, minister of industry, and minister of trade – in public speeches and on government websites did confirm that such a policy is in effect.

Import licensing requirement

While some of the measures had allegedly been in place for years, the adoption of an import licensing requirement in January 2012 – which meant that importers had to file online affidavits and wait for government approval before importing – was widely seen as the impetus for the EU, US, and Japan to formally complain at the WTO.

The requirement, known as the *Declaración Jurada Anticipada de Importación* (DJAI) in Spanish, entered into force in February of that year. While import licenses are allowed under global trade rules, they must be approved automatically. Any non-automatic import licenses must comply with specific WTO requirements and must be issued within 60 days.

The DJAI was challenged both under the GATT and under the WTO’s Import Licensing Agreement. The panel found that the DJAI in itself acted as an import restriction, thus violating the former. With regards to the latter, however, the panel refrained from ruling on whether the DJAI violated the terms of that agreement, saying that the GATT finding on the same grounds was sufficient for addressing the dispute.

Next steps

If Argentina does proceed with an appeal, it will have sixty days from the circulation of the panel report to do so. The complainants, for their part, can also file appeals of their own if they are interested in clarifying facts of law or legal interpretation in the ruling.

Should an appeal be filed, a report would then be issued by the Appellate Body – the WTO’s highest court – within 90 days from the close of the appeal period.

ICTSD reporting.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Australia Scraps Mining Tax

Australian Prime Minister Tony Abbott successfully repealed the nation's tax on mining company profits last week, a levy introduced by the previous Labor government in 2012.

After an apparent political stalemate around the repeal legislation since July, Abbott's Liberal-National coalition government struck a bargain with various independent lawmakers in the Senate, including with the maverick Palmer United Party representatives.

The bill was then sent to the House of Representatives where, as expected by pundits, it was duly [passed](#).

The tax, known formally as the "Mineral Resources Rent Tax," was initially sold by Canberra as a bid to spread wealth from the country's resources boom by financing infrastructure developments, retirement funds, and other welfare measures.

The levy targeted two of Australia's largest exports – iron ore and coal – at a rate of 30 percent. A number of Australian mining companies at the time of the tax's introduction viewed it as "discriminatory" and "cumbersome," according to Colin Barnett, Premier of Western Australia – an expansive, mineral-rich part of the country.

Critics of the tax also said that it harmed Australia's domestic mining sector by sending jobs and industry to competitors overseas.

Australia is the world's leading producer of minerals, exporting on a commercial basis primarily to its Asia-Pacific neighbours, including China, Japan, South Korea, and India. In recent years government officials have estimated the mining industry's contribution to gross domestic product at close to ten percent.

The annulment of the levy comes hot on the heels of the government's final scrapping of the carbon tax in July. (See Bridges Weekly, [17 July 2014](#))

The two repeals, both flagship pledges of Abbott's election campaign, follow several years of divisive debate. After winning office last year, the new Australian leader said his planned tax annulments would signal to investors that the country was "open for business."

Adversaries of the former carbon tax similarly claimed it crippled the mining and coal export industries while proponents alleged it would help Australia – the world's largest greenhouse gas emitter per capita – move to cleaner energy sources.

Budget challenge

Federal Treasurer Joe Hockey also lambasted the levy in the country's parliament last week, claiming that the tax succeeded in raising only one percent of what the former administration had forecast. A total of A\$11 billion (US\$10.1 billion at current exchange rates) had been raised by the levy over a three-year period.

Other experts have suggested that the levy failed to generate higher income due to a drop in commodity prices following declining demand from China, a major buyer of Australia's iron ore and coal.

The repeal of the mining tax has, however, thrown up a series of fiscal questions for the current coalition government.

Independent lawmakers in the Senate agreed to Abbott's proposition after changes were made to keep some spending mechanisms financed by the levy until the next election.

According to government officials, certain welfare and pension measures previously financed by the levy will be maintained until after the next election, in line with the deal struck with the Palmer United Party.

"By giving away some of its spending cuts in a tight budget climate it's a bit of a Pyrrhic victory," said John Warhurst, a political analyst at the Australian National University in Canberra in reaction to the news.

Great Barrier Reef reprieve

Last Tuesday, on the same day that the final repeal legislation was approved in full, [Reuters](#) reported that Australia may be reconsidering plans to dump three million cubic metres of dredged mud near an area of the Great Barrier Reef, a world heritage listed site.

The mud dumping, approved by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) last February, would be part of a project to construct the world's largest coal port by extending Abbot Point – a 30-year old deep-water port – in order to facilitate US\$16 billion worth of coal projects in the region. (See Bridges Weekly, [6 February 2014](#))

The decision followed approval by Australian Environment Minister Greg Hunt last December, although the politician conditioned his endorsement on the identification of alternate disposal sites for the mud within a set investigation zone.

According to Reuters, North Queensland Bulk Ports – the port authority charged with governing the area in question – will re-submit proposals outlining alternative dumping sites. A spokesman for Hunt's office, however, declined to confirm the media reports.

The move could augur well for the 600,000 year-old reef. Opponents of the coal expansion project had lobbied hard against the planned mud dumping, arguing that the move would cause sediment to drift into vulnerable marine areas, harming a fragile ecosystem supported by the reef.

In June, UN experts also expressed concern for the reef, citing the planned coastal industrial developments as a potential threat. However, the decision to label the coral reef "in danger" was deferred, and Canberra was instead asked to report on the state of the reef by February of next year. (See BioRes, [26 June 2014](#))

Last week's parallel developments have highlighted a long-running tension at the heart of Australia's economic development, namely, its resource-based economy that served to tide the country through the worst of the global financial crisis set against a need to ensure sufficient conservation safeguards in a nation home to vast biodiversity.

ICTSD reporting; "Australia Repeals Mining Tax," THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, 2 September 2014; "Australia's mining tax repealed," BBC, 2 September 2014; "Abbot Delays Budget Savings to Scrap Australia Mining Tax," BLOOMBERG, 2 September 2014, "Mining companies approve mining tax repeal," THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD, 2 September 2014, "Australia's proposed mining tax divides opinions," BBC, 19 March 2012; "Australia to scrap plan for dumping near Great Barrier Reef," REUTERS AFRICA, 2 September 2014.

WTO Appellate Body Confirms China Rare Earths Export Restrictions Illegal

The WTO Appellate Body confirmed last month that China's export restrictions on various rare earths, as well as tungsten and molybdenum, are largely inconsistent with international trade rules. The decision, which was formally adopted by the Dispute Settlement Body a few weeks ago, upheld the main findings of a previous [dispute panel ruling](#) that was released in March.

China is the leading producer of rare earths, which are primarily used for manufacturing high-tech products, such as wind turbines, energy-efficient lighting, hybrid and conventional vehicles, and medical equipment. However, despite accounting for over 90 percent of production of these minerals, it holds less than 25 percent of the estimated global supply.

In recent years, the Asian economy has imposed various measures to limit the exports of such rare earths. These decisions prompted the US, EU, and Japan to file nearly identical complaints at the WTO in 2012, questioning whether the measures were unfairly propping up global prices of these minerals and giving Chinese producers an unfair competitive advantage.

China, in turn, argued that the measures were geared toward protecting these natural resources, along with limiting the severe environmental damage that comes as a result of their extraction.

The case has drawn particular notice in the trade and environment community, as it brought to the fore the question of how to design natural resource conservation measures while adhering to global trade rules.

How the Appellate Body would rule on the relationship between China's accession protocol and the WTO Agreements also piqued the interest of trade law observers, particularly given the country's loss in a separate case involving restrictions on raw materials exports.

"By upholding rules on fair access to raw materials, this decision is a win not only for the United States, but also for every nation that respects the principles of openness and fairness," [said](#) US Trade Representative Michael Froman.

Accession protocol

One of the key questions ahead of the Appellate Body had been how it would interpret the relationship between China's accession protocol – in other words, the terms under which the country joined the global trade body in 2001 – and the WTO's founding Marrakesh Agreement.

Under China's accession protocol, the country was required to eliminate all export duties, and the dispute panel had ruled in March that there was "no basis" in the protocol for justifying the use of such duties under Article XX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

That particular article establishes a set of justifications under which WTO members may enact measures that would otherwise be illegal under international trade rules so long as

these are used to fulfil greater public policy objectives. This includes, for instance, the conservation of exhaustible natural resources.

In its appeal, China argued that Article XII:1 of the Marrakesh Agreement and paragraph 1.2 of the China's accession protocol, when read together, indicate that specific protocol provisions are to be treated as integral parts of either the Marrakesh Agreement or one of the Multilateral Trade Agreements, depending on the subject matter to which they "intrinsically relate."

China had argued that the panel did not "give effective meaning" to the second sentence of Article XII:1 of the Marrakesh Agreement, which governs the WTO accession process. This article stipulates that new members to the global trade body must accept its legal framework as a "single undertaking" rather than cherry-picking select agreements. According to China, therefore, specific terms of accession must "intrinsically relate" to either the Marrakesh Agreement or one of the annexed Multilateral Trade Agreements.

The Appellate Body rejected China's argument, indicating that Article XII:1 only provides the general rule for WTO accessions. They explained that Article XII:1 does not define the nature of the substantive relationship between the "terms" of accession, on the one hand, and the Marrakesh Agreement and the annexed Multilateral Trade Agreements on the other.

Beijing also claimed that the term "WTO Agreement" of paragraph 1.2 of its accession protocol should also cover agreements other than the Marrakesh Agreement. Therefore, the requirement under paragraph 1.2 that the accession documents "shall be an integral part of the WTO Agreement" means that the protocol's individual provisions are also "integral parts" of the global trade body's other specific agreements. The panel, China said, had erred in saying that these latter Multilateral Trade Agreements were excluded. (See Bridges Weekly, [1 May 2014](#))

The Appellate Body considered it of limited value to determine the scope of the term "WTO Agreement" under paragraph 1.2 in deciding the specific relationship between individual provisions of China's accession protocol and the individual provisions of the Marrakesh Agreement and other Multilateral Trade Agreements.

Overall, the Appellate Body rejected the view that an inquiry into this relationship must start from the premise that such a provision is "intrinsically related" to some of the others. For the Appellate Body, the specific relationship between the two must be ascertained through a thorough analysis of the relevant provisions, on the basis of customary rules of treaty interpretation and the circumstances of each dispute.

Export quotas, domestic conservation

China had also challenged the panel's finding that the rare earths export quotas were not actually measures that relate to conservation, given that these were not "made effective in conjunction with restrictions on domestic production or consumption."

Under GATT Article XX(g), any trade measures that a country would like to exempt from WTO rules, on the grounds of their importance for natural resource conservation, must also be paired with domestic production or consumption constraints.

Beijing had argued that the panel had incorrectly limited itself by looking only at the structure and design of the export quotas, without also considering what actual effect these had on the marketplace. The complainants, however, had posited that the panel did indeed review the evidence that China provided on market effects, and "still found that China had failed to show how its export quotas, in their design and structure, relate to conservation."

The Appellate Body ultimately agreed with the panel, and the complainants, on this particular point.

Even-handedness?

In April, Beijing appealed and alleged that the panel had mistakenly found that Article XX(g) imposed an additional requirement of “even-handedness” – splitting the burden of resource conservation evenly between foreign and domestic consumers and producers.

The Appellate Body clarified that Article XX(g) does not impose this as a separate requirement in addition to the conditions expressly set out in this provision. According to their ruling, for GATT-inconsistent measures to be justified under Article XX(g), effective restrictions must be imposed on the domestic side. Ultimately, however, it also found that since the dispute panel did not use this “even-handedness” evaluation in reaching its findings the overall panel ruling that the export quotas were unjustified would remain unchanged.

In a statement, the Chinese Ministry of Commerce noted that this finding regarding how to interpret Article XX(g) “contributed to clarify, to the benefit of the WTO membership as a whole, the requirements for a WTO member to invoke an exception for conservation purposes.”

US conditional appeal

The Appellate Body did not rule on whether the panel’s decision to exclude certain evidence from its consideration – namely, a series of ten exhibits submitted by the three complainants – was inconsistent with the WTO’s Dispute Settlement Understanding, which outlines the terms that govern dispute proceedings at the global trade body.

The US had argued in its appeal that the panel was incorrect in deeming that these exhibits had been submitted too late, and would have therefore created “due process” concerns for China, given that the latter country would not have had enough time to respond adequately. The panel also found that the exhibits “did not supplement” other evidence that had already been accepted.

However, the US had made its appeal conditional, saying that it would not push the Appellate Body to rule on its concerns if China did not file its own appeal, or if the Appellate Body did not modify the panel’s legal findings or conclusions. (See Bridges Weekly, [17 April 2014](#))

Since the Appellate Body did not reverse or modify any of the panel’s findings or conclusions, it confirmed that it did not need to rule on the US appeal.

Next steps?

Under WTO dispute settlement practices, if China cannot immediately bring the cited measures into compliance, the parties can seek a mutual agreement on the reasonable period of time. The latter should occur within 45 days following the 29 August adoption of the Appellate Body report by the WTO’s Dispute Settlement Body.

Should there be no mutual agreement, the parties can resort to arbitration under Article 21.3 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

ICTSD reporting.

TRADE REMEDIES

US, India Appeal WTO Panel Findings in Steel Dispute

The US and India have taken their two-year dispute (DS436) over steel duties to the next stage at the WTO, with both sides filing appeals on the subject in the past month.

In the dispute, India had challenged a series of provisions of the US' Tariff Act of 1930, along with how these were applied in countervailing duty investigations of hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from India. The balance of the panel ruling had ultimately been mixed, with the panel upholding some of India's claims while favouring the US on others. (See Bridges Weekly, [18 April 2012](#) and [17 July 2014](#), respectively)

The case, while highlighting the ongoing tensions between India and the US on trade, has also raised a series of questions over how to interpret key aspects of the global trade body's rules on subsidies, such as what qualifies as a "public body," or how to determine whether a subsidy is indeed conferring a benefit.

These issues, among others, have also been raised in other recent WTO disputes, including a separate row between the US and China that is also under appeal. (See related story, this edition.)

Real benefits?

Under the WTO's Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM), a government's provision of goods shall not be considered as conferring a benefit unless these goods are provided in exchange for less – or more – than "adequate remuneration." What constitutes the appropriate level of remuneration, the SCM Agreement says, will depend on the prevailing market conditions for such a good in that same country.

According to India, the US made a series of mistakes in this area when it was conducting its countervailing duty investigations, and the panel erred in not deeming the US' actions as WTO-inconsistent.

For instance, India said, American investigating authorities should have considered whether the government – as a provider of these goods – was actually receiving the appropriate level of remuneration, before determining whether a benefit was being provided to certain enterprises.

New Delhi has also argued that the US investigating authorities should have considered Indian government transactions when assessing the "prevailing market condition" in the Asian country, before making a decision on whether to use alternative, non-Indian market conditions as benchmarks in their calculations of adequate remuneration.

In order to use such "out-of-country" benchmarks, India added, investigating authorities must first evaluate a government's influence on the market, and then exhaust all possible sources of in-country benchmarks.

How to address lack of cooperation

India has also appealed the panel's interpretation and application of a SCM Agreement provision that allows investigative authorities to carry out trade remedy probes even when

the parties being investigated have chosen not to cooperate. In this case, investigators can make up for the lack of information by using the facts that are available.

Specifically, India says that the panel was wrong in finding that the SCM Agreement does not require an investigating authority to evaluate all the available evidence to select the most appropriate information, among other errors.

India, US question "public body" definition

The question over what actually constitutes a public body was raised in both the Indian and US appeals.

In the case of the former, India argues that the panel was incorrect to deem that the National Mineral Development Corporation (NMDC) is a public body within the meaning of the SCM Agreement, as the US had claimed.

The NMDC is India's state-operated and industry-leading producer of iron ore, which is used in the production of the steel products in question.

To qualify as a subsidy under the SCM Agreement, the financial contribution should come from a country's government or public body, and then be provided to its enterprises. India argues that the shareholding and appointment of directors solely by a government does not necessarily mean that the latter holds "meaningful control" of that entity – and even if it did, this would not be enough to determine that this entity is indeed a "public body."

In its own submission, the US raised a different question over the panel's interpretation of what constitutes a "public body." The panel had said that, in order to qualify as a public body, an entity "must be shown to have been vested with governmental authority, or to have actually exercised such authority through the performance of governmental function."

However, Washington says that an entity may also qualify if government control allows for the government to use the entity's resources as its own.

Next steps

Under WTO rules, the Appellate Body can review certain aspects of law and legal interpretation in the original panel ruling, but will generally not interfere with any factual findings. The court will likely issue its report within three months following the close of the appeal period.

ICTSD reporting.

China, US Trade Remedy Dispute Advances to WTO Appeals Stage

The WTO Appellate Body is set to hear appeals from both the US and China over a July panel ruling regarding Washington's trade remedy practices, after both sides filed submissions on the subject during the past few weeks.

This particular case ([DS437](#)) focuses on 17 countervailing duty (CVD) investigations that the US Commerce Department conducted from 2007 through 2012, on products ranging from solar panels and wind turbines to kitchen shelving and steel sinks. These types of duties are meant to counter instances of unfair subsidies, should they be found to exist.

Beijing had charged that these particular investigations violated global trade rules, and the panel had largely ruled in its favour. However, the panel rejected the Asian economy's claim regarding whether the US Commerce Department – which conducts trade remedy probes for the US – was correct in deeming that the alleged subsidies were specific to certain enterprises. (See Bridges Weekly, [17 July 2014](#))

Trade remedies have long been a major sticking point between the US and China, with the two economic giants having resorted to the WTO's dispute settlement mechanism several times in the past to clarify what does and does not qualify as legal practice in this area.

For instance, of the 12 disputes that the Asian country has brought to the WTO since joining in 2001, approximately half have involved US trade remedy practices. The US has also lodged its own share of complaints on China's procedures in this area.

Market price distortions

In its appeal, China has asked that the Appellate Body reverse the panel's finding that upheld the US Commerce Department's decision to use "out-of-country" prices as potential benchmarks in the CVD cases under scrutiny.

The US agency had chosen to use prices where these products were sold to other countries, rather than their private sector Chinese equivalent, on the grounds that the latter prices were distorted due to government intervention.

In its appeal, China claims that the panel should have used the legal standard for "financial contribution" outlined under a different section in the WTO's Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM) when considering whether the relevant state-owned enterprises (SOEs) are public bodies. This would have been considered prior to determining any market price distortions, China said, and thus whether the use of out-of-country benchmarks was appropriate.

Enterprise-specific?

China has also asked the Appellate Body to review the panel's interpretation and application of Article 2.1 of the SCM Agreement, which outlines how to determine if a subsidy is specific to certain enterprises of the country under investigation.

These principles include those scenarios where a subsidy appears to be specific, along with the factors required to conclude that a subsidy is in fact specific, such as the use of a "subsidy programme" by a limited number of certain enterprises.

Under the SCM Agreement, the provision of goods or services by a government shall not be considered as conferring a benefit, unless the provision is done in exchange for remuneration that is less – or greater – than adequate. What the level of “adequate remuneration” may be, the SCM Agreement says, depends on the prevailing market conditions for the relevant good or service in the country of provision or purchase.

In the appeal, China claims that the panel erred in deeming that “the consistent provision by the SOEs in question of inputs for less than adequate remuneration” provided an objective basis for the US Commerce Department to sufficiently identify “subsidy programmes” within the meaning of the relevant SCM article.

Facts available

China has also asked the Appellate Body to reverse the panel's finding that the US did not violate Article 12.7 of the SCM Agreement in reaching its “adverse facts available” determination.

Article 12.7 permits investigative authorities to carry out trade remedy probes even in cases where the parties under review do not cooperate. In this case, investigators are allowed to replace missing information with whichever facts are at their disposal – known in trade shorthand as “facts available.”

China claims that the panel failed to apply the proper standard of review, namely by not examining in the case of each challenged “adverse available facts” determination whether there was a reasoned and adequate explanation – separate from the published determination itself – that provided the factual basis for the US Commerce Department's conclusion.

US raises procedural questions

Five days after China's appeal notice, the US submitted its own appeal, challenging the panel's finding regarding a procedural aspect of Beijing's panel request. In particular, the United States argues that the panel erred in finding that China's request provided enough of a summary of the complaint's legal basis in order to present the problem clearly.

The US has asked the Appellate Body to reverse the panel's findings and as a consequence, to declare moot certain substantive aspects, given that China's claims – such as the use of facts available – were outside the panel's terms of reference.

Next steps

Under WTO rules, the Appellate Body can review certain aspects of law and legal interpretation in the original panel ruling, but will generally not interfere with any factual findings. The judges are expected to issue a report within three months following the close of the appeal period.

ICTSD reporting.

EVENTS & RESOURCES

Events

Coming Soon

15-17 September, Kigali, Rwanda. WORLD EXPORT DEVELOPMENT FORUM 2014. During this year's World Export Development Forum, business leaders and policy makers will meet to discuss the most recent trends and best practices when it comes to making small- and medium-sized enterprises more competitive and thus drive increased growth, development, and employment. The event, whose theme this year is "SMEs: Creating jobs through trade," will also serve as an opportunity for business officials to meet various potential partners, such as representatives from East African companies. The three-day meeting is being hosted by the Government of Rwanda, through the Rwanda Development Board. More information is available [here](#).

18 September, Geneva, Switzerland. THE WIPO DEVELOPMENT AGENDA+10 AND BEYOND. This event, organised by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), will be the first in a series of dialogues aiming to examine the rapid changes underway in the global innovation and intellectual property landscape. Participants will review the implementation of the 2007 World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Development Agenda Recommendations, and discuss future challenges for establishing a balanced and development-oriented intellectual property system. To learn more, or to register, visit [the ICTSD website](#).

22 September – 16 November, online. CLIMATE CHANGE DIPLOMACY: NEGOTIATING EFFECTIVELY UNDER THE UNFCCC. This online course, hosted by the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), aims to help participants develop a deeper understanding of the climate change policy framework, namely by addressing the science behind the subject, as well as the history of the policymaking process and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Participants will also learn about the more recent developments in the global climate talks, and analyse what will be the likely hot topics for negotiators as they vie to complete a new international climate deal by end-2015. To learn more, or to sign up, [visit the UNITAR website](#).

WTO Events

An updated list of forthcoming WTO meetings is posted [here](#). Please bear in mind that dates and times of WTO meetings are often changed, and that the WTO does not always announce the important informal meetings of the different bodies. Unless otherwise indicated, all WTO meetings are held at the WTO, Centre William Rappard, rue de Lausanne 154, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland, and are open to WTO members and accredited observers only.

16 + 18 September: Trade Policy Review Body - Chinese Taipei

17 September: Council for Trade in Services

17 September: Committee on Budget, Finance and Administration

17 September: Working Party on Domestic Regulation

18 September: Committee on Specific Commitments

18 September: Committee on Trade in Financial Services

18 September: Working Party on GATS Rules

Other Upcoming Events

25 September 2014, New York, US. ENSURING A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE POLICY TO CLIMATE ACTION TOWARDS COP 21. This event, hosted jointly by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD) and the Guarani Center of NYU Law, will focus on green trade, and is being held on the sidelines of the UN Secretary-General's climate summit. The ICTSD-NYU event aims to raise awareness of trade's role in climate change and sustainable energy, particularly for a non-trade audience. Participants will include government representatives, business leaders, and key experts, who will discuss how to advance the climate action and green growth agendas effectively through trade in clean energy technologies. To learn more, visit [the ICTSD website](#).

1-3 October, Geneva, Switzerland. ICTSD AT THE WTO PUBLIC FORUM. As in previous years, the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD) will be hosting several sessions during the WTO's annual outreach event, the Public Forum. ICTSD's events will focus on topics such as innovation, intellectual property, and informal sectors in Africa's development; why services trade is important for Africa; the role of trade in a universal post-2015 development agenda; and the growing role of smaller players in global trade. More information on ICTSD's activities is [available here](#).

13-16 October, Geneva, Switzerland. WORLD INVESTMENT FORUM 2014: INVESTING IN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. This biennial high-level event, hosted by the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), will bring together nearly 4000 participants from over 140 countries in order to discuss investment-related challenges that have emerged in recent years. The conference aims to provide a platform for stakeholders to discuss "investment for development," with the goal of promoting investment flows that contribute to sustainable and inclusive development. More information on the meetings are available at the [UNCTAD website](#). A [multidisciplinary academic conference](#), focusing on "Shaping a Future Research Agenda for Investment for Development," will also be held on the occasion of the Forum.

Resources

THE GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS REPORT 2014-2015. Published by the World Economic Forum (September 2014). This new report finds that there has not been enough progress so far in undertaking the necessary structural reforms for achieving long-term economic growth. Furthermore, the authors say, innovation, talent development, and institutional strength are key in determining an economy's competitiveness. The WEF report also features a Global Competitiveness Index, with Switzerland continuing to hold the top spot in this year's rankings. The US and Japan have risen in the index for the second year running. The full report, which reviews 144 economies, is available [here](#).

GREAT DATA, NICE TALE, BUT WHAT'S THE MESSAGE? THE OHIM/EPO STUDY ON THE ECONOMIC RELEVANCE OF IP-INTENSIVE INDUSTRIES IN THE EU. By Annette Kur and Dietmarr Harhoff for the Max Planck Institute for Innovation and Competition (July 2014). In this paper, the authors discuss the joint report by the European Patent Office (EPO) and the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (OHIM), which evaluated the economic performance of intellectual property (IP) intensive industries in the EU. The authors warn that many of those who use the EPO-OHIM report in order to prove the economic importance of IP ignore that the report did not provide evidence of a causal relationship between IP and economic data. More information, along with the discussion paper itself, is [available here](#).

AGRICULTURAL POLICY MONITORING AND EVALUATION 2014. Published by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (September 2014). This publication provides a series of updated estimates of agricultural support in OECD member economies, together with country profiles on recent agricultural policy developments. To learn more, or to read the publication in full, visit the OECD [website](#).

EXPLORE THE TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
WORLD FURTHER WITH ICTSD'S BRIDGES NETWORK

BIORES

Analysis and news on trade and environment for a global audience
<http://www.ictsd.org/bridges-news/biores>
English language

BRIDGES AFRICA

Trade and sustainable development news and analysis on Africa
<http://www.ictsd.org/bridges-news/bridges-africa>
English language

PUENTES

Latin America-focussed analysis and news on trade and sustainable development
<http://www.ictsd.org/bridges-news/puentes>
Spanish language

МОСТЫ

CIS-focussed analysis and news on trade and sustainable development
<http://www.ictsd.org/bridges-news/МОСТЫ>
Russian language

PONTES

Analysis and news on trade and sustainable development for the Portuguese-speaking world
<http://www.ictsd.org/bridges-news/pontes>
Portuguese language

桥

Analysis and news on trade and sustainable development for the Chinese-speaking world
<http://www.ictsd.org/bridges-news/桥>
Chinese language

PASSERELLES

Africa-focussed analysis and news on trade and sustainable development
<http://ictsd.org/news/passerelles>
French language

PUBLISHED BY



International Centre for Trade
and Sustainable Development
Chemin de Balexert 7-9
1219 Geneva, Switzerland
+41-22-917-8492
www.ictsd.org

Bridges Weekly Trade News is made possible
through generous contributions of donors and
partners including

DFID - UK Department for
International Development

SIDA - Swedish International
Development Agency

DGIS - Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Netherlands

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway

Copyright ICTSD, 2014. 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 BRIDGES and the BRIDGES series
of publications is most welcome; if interested,
please contact Andrew Crosby, Managing
Director at +41-22-917-8335.

Contributors to this issue are Sofia Alicia Baliño,
Yaxuan Chen, Taylor Clayton, Kiranne Guddoy,
and Jonathan Hepburn. This edition of Bridges
Weekly Trade News Digest is edited by Sofia
Alicia Baliño.

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 [director](#).

Price: €10.00

ISSN 1563-0

