

To subscribe to *BRIDGES Trade BioRes*, send a blank email to [subscribe\\_biores@ictsd.ch](mailto:subscribe_biores@ictsd.ch)

### CONTENT

<b>Marine Resources</b>	<b>1</b>
Pro- And Anti-Whaling Camps Clash At IWC Meet	
<b>Agriculture</b>	<b>2</b>
Controversial EU Sugar Reform Evokes Strong Reactions WTO: Agriculture Liberalisation Hotly Debated	
<b>In Brief</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Events &amp; Resources</b>	<b>8</b>

## Marine Resources

### PRO- AND ANTI-WHALING CAMPS CLASH AT IWC MEET

The 56th annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) in Sorrento, Italy, from 19-22 July, again witnessed heated exchanges between supporters and opponents of commercial whale hunting. In a move hailed by conservationists, IWC member states, in the closing hours of the meeting, decided against setting a 2005 deadline for agreeing on a new management scheme, which anti-whaling lobbyists had feared could pave the way for ending the existing ban on whale hunting. The IWC also adopted a resolution calling for more humane hunting methods. The Commission, however, rejected proposals for setting up two new whale sanctuaries as well as a Japanese request for new catch quotas.

#### Last-minute rejection of deadline for management plan

Divisions at the IWC meeting were particularly deep with regard to a proposal by IWC Chair Henrik Fischer for the adoption of a Revised Management Scheme at the next annual meeting in 2005. Some nations had expressed concern that the draft plan, which would include a quota calculation model and procedures for inspection and observation, would effectively spell the end to the 18-year old moratorium on whaling. Anti-whaling nations, such as Australia, the UK and New Zealand, also felt that the draft was too weak and would not protect whales. In the end, the language on the timeline in the resolution was toned down, calling for work towards drafting of text and technical details of the RMS "with the aim of having the results ready for consideration and possibly adoption at" the 2005 IWC meeting.

Environmental groups welcomed this decision. "We have derailed a runaway train toward the resumption of commercial whaling," said Sue Liebermann of WWF. "It does bring commercial whaling closer, but it is a small step, and not the big step that Japan wanted," she added. Japan, one of the most vocal defenders of

whaling, expressed "dissatisfaction" with the decision. The result has "heightened our concern about the future relevance of the IWC for Japan," Tokyo's IWC Commissioner Minoru Morimoto noted.

### **IWC responds to animal welfare concerns**

In a move hailed by conservation groups as a "real victory for whale welfare", the Commission adopted a non-binding resolution advocating less cruel hunting methods. "Current whaling methods do not guarantee death without pain, stress or distress," the resolution noted. Pro-whaling nations Japan, Norway and Iceland voted against the motion, arguing that whale hunting was not excessively cruel and that the IWC should focus its efforts on conservation rather than animal welfare. The pro-whaling lobby group High North Alliance described the resolution as a "posturing exercise" which in practice would "not have any effect at all". The alleged cruelty of modern whaling activities recently aroused public concern with the release of a report in March this year pointing to inadequate and out-dated killing methods (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 19 March 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/04-03-19/story3.htm>).

### **No support for sanctuaries or new quotas**

Fruitless debates on new sanctuaries and quotas also continued at this year's IWC meeting (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 30 June 2003; <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/03-06-30/story3.htm>). The Commission again rejected proposals by Australia / New Zealand and Argentina / Brazil to set up whale sanctuaries in the Pacific and South Atlantic respectively. The pro-sustainable use conservation group IWMC - World Conservation Trust welcomed this decision, arguing that "the protection of whales depends on the establishment of an overall management system, not political grandstanding". In contrast, WWF expressed their deep disappointment. "The wishes of the region have been ignored," said Chris Howe of WWF-New Zealand. "This sanctuary would have provided enormous benefits to both whales and people in the Pacific but once again it was blocked by countries taking orders from Tokyo."

The Commission also rejected a request by Japan for quotas in the Antarctic and the North Pacific, adding further to Japan's frustration with the IWC meeting. IWMC deplored the decision as "double standards," pointing to the fact that the IWC had allowed indigenous peoples in the US to catch endangered bowhead whales off Alaska.

The 2005 IWC meeting will be held in Ulsan, Korea while the 2006 annual meeting will be hosted by St Kitts and Nevis.

"Anti-whalers claim victory in annual joust with pro camp," AFP, 22 July 2004; "IWC talkshop finishes," HNA, 22 July 2004; "Whaling body retreats from rush to lift hunt ban," REUTERS, 23 July 2004; "Whaling body calls for more humane deaths," REUTERS, 22 July 2004; "IWMC condemns whale body's dereliction of duty," IWMC, 21 July 2004; "Rejection of sanctuaries will aid whale conservation," IWMC, 21 July 2004;

## **Agriculture**

---

### **CONTROVERSIAL EU SUGAR REFORM EVOKES STRONG REACTIONS**

On 14 July, the EC released an anticipated outline for reform of the heavily subsidised EU sugar regime. Though the details of the reform had been leaked at the end of June (see BRIDGES Weekly, 30 June 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-06-30/inbrief.htm#1>), the official release was met by strong reactions. Among other changes, the reform will reduce the EU's intervention price for sugar by 33 percent and the minimum price for sugar beet by 37 percent over three years. Other elements of the reform include reducing the European production quota for sugar by 2.8 million tons over four years and merging two national production quotas. The reforms will begin in January 2005, and will be implemented over four years.

The proposal will have far reaching impacts on the domestic producers. Non-competitive sugar-growing areas in Europe will likely see production disappear under a reformed sugar regime. The government will offer aid packages to lessen the impact of these changes, including new decoupled payments to sugar beet farmers to partially compensate for lost income and a EUR 250 per tonne conversion scheme for factories leaving the sector. This proposal, which has been in the works for months, is part of an overall reform of the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and comes a year after the original CAP reforms were announced (see BRIDGES Weekly, 10 March 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-03-10/story4.htm>). This set of reforms is the first major change to the sugar regime in Europe since it was launched in the 1960s.

### **Reform plans met with criticism**

The EC proposal faced heavy criticism from many fronts. Within Europe, farmers in uncompetitive EU regions, such as Ireland and the Nordic countries, questioned a reform they said would kill off their sugar production, provide no benefits to the poorest developing countries, while mainly opening the market to countries such as Brazil "where social and environmental conditions of sugar farming are to say the least, questionable".

African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) sugar supplying countries also expressed serious concern over the reform. These countries criticised the unilateral decision to reform the ACP-EU Sugar Protocol, which has provided certain developing country farmers with preferred access to European markets since 1975. Even though the EU will maintain preferential access for producers in ACP countries, the reform will eventually reduce the price these producers receive by more than one-third. By 2008, this will result in a loss of US\$ 90 million a year for these countries. Under the current proposal, EU sugar producers will be compensated for 60 percent of the price reduction, but ACP producers will not receive the same support.

Civil society groups also spoke out against the reform. Oxfam and WWF International released a joint statement describing the reform as a "half-hearted effort". They noted that the new system would "allow continued export dumping on developing countries, thereby undermining poor farmers' livelihoods".

### **Pressure for sugar reforms grows**

The changes come at a time when the EU is facing unprecedented pressure to reform its sugar regime, which is currently being challenged by Brazil, Thailand and Australia in a WTO panel. The complainants argue that EC subsidies have driven world prices below production costs. A provisional ruling in this case is expected in early September (see BRIDGES Weekly, 17 July 2003, <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-03-18/story1.htm>). Some experts also believe the recent WTO panel decision against US cotton subsidies has increased pressure on the EU to reform its sugar sector. Eduardo Carvalho, president of the Sao Paulo Sugarcane Agroindustry Union, said that the recent US cotton decision strengthened the case for reform because "it showed for the first time that internal supports spilled over into external trade and broke international trade rules".

In addition to the legal challenge, the EU faces continuing pressure from aid groups who argue that the high levels of subsidies are impeding the ability of developing countries to compete. Currently, European farmers are paid prices more than three times above the world market and Oxfam International has claimed that for every one euro worth of sugar exports the EU is spending EUR 3.30 in such subsidies. Brazil estimates its sugar industry loses US\$ 900 million annually due to Europe's sugar export subsidies. Brazil is the world's largest sugar producer and exporter, followed by the EC.

### **Environmental impacts of the current EU sugar regime**

The current levels of sugar beet production in the EU, made possible through the subsidies, are taking a toll on the environment. Herbicide application in sugar beet is among the highest compared to other crops, with an average of four to five herbicide applications per growing season. Until recently, a commonly used type of herbicide, glyphosate, was thought to break down in the soil, but residues have been found in

groundwater. The high levels of irrigation associated with sugar production in Europe are another environmental concern. The subsidised sugar regime has enticed farmers into growing sugar beet even in parts of Europe where the climate is not suitable for sugar production. Without irrigation, it would be impossible to grow sugar in countries such as Greece, Portugal, and southern Italy, Spain and France. Yet because of the high guaranteed minimum price for sugar, these are large sugar-producing countries. The irrigation puts a strain on rivers and wetlands, threatening the habitat of many species. Another negative impact of sugar beet production is soil loss, with up to twenty percent of the total weight of the harvested beet being soil.

### **Additional Resources**

For more information on the EU Sugar Reform, see [http://europa.eu.int/comm/agriculture/capreform/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/agriculture/capreform/index_en.htm)

The Oxfam Briefing Paper 61 "Dumping on the World: How EU Sugar Policies Hurt Poor Countries" is available at [http://www.oxfam.org.uk/what\\_we\\_do/issues/trade/downloads/bp61\\_sugar\\_dumping.pdf](http://www.oxfam.org.uk/what_we_do/issues/trade/downloads/bp61_sugar_dumping.pdf)

"European Commission's Sugar Plan will not end Destructive Regime," OXFAM AND WWF RELEASE, 14 July 2004; "Caribbean Bitter at EU Sugar Reform," TERRAVIVA, 18 July 2004; "EU Commission Proposes Sweeping Sugar Reform," REUTERS, 23 June 2004; "EU Sugar Plan to Help Trade Talks, Hit Industry," REUTERS, 24 June 2004; "Environmental Impacts of Sugar Beet Production," WWF, July 2004.

## **WTO: AGRICULTURE LIBERALISATION HOTLY DEBATED**

In Geneva, negotiators are working around the clock to agree, by the end of July, on a framework for negotiations to complete the Doha Round. The end-July deadline represents the WTO's attempt to put the Doha negotiations back on track following the collapse of talks at last September's Ministerial Conference. Agriculture lies at the heart of these efforts (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 8 July 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/04-07-08/story3.htm>). On 16 July, a first draft text was released. As expected, the seven-page agriculture Annex of the text -- which also covers areas such as industrial market access, services and trade facilitation -- did not provide much specificity, due to the wide gaps between countries' positions. Several sources questioned whether the vague language of the draft could really help move the negotiations forward.

### **Key features of the agriculture draft**

In the area of agriculture, delegates are focusing on three "pillars": market access, which encompasses cutting border tariffs; domestic support, with subsidies paid to farmers being cut; and export competition, with different measures to subsidise farm goods sold abroad being phased out.

On market access, the new draft proposes a 'tiered' formula for reducing tariffs in both developed and developing countries. Under this formula, tariffs would be divided into different bands depending on their current levels. Higher tariffs would then be cut more than lower ones. Certain products would be treated separately -- so-called 'sensitive' products would be spared from substantial tariff cuts. This would allow agricultural net-importers such as Switzerland and Japan to shield key products. The definition for 'sensitive' products in developing countries remains vague at this point, although the draft made it clear that developing countries would be able to designate a number of special products and have access to a new special safeguard mechanism.

On domestic support, WTO Member countries would be required to reduce their trade-distortive subsidies overall (including so called Amber Box trade-distortive support), also under a 'tiered' formula, with higher subsidies being cut more radically than lower ones. The Blue Box, which includes partially decoupled

payments, would accommodate certain new subsidies, but would be reduced overall under a cap to be agreed. The Green Box, containing decoupled support such as environmental subsidies, would be reviewed and made more transparent.

On export competition, all forms of export subsidies would be eliminated in parallel, including direct export support as well as trade-distorting elements of export credits and similar measures.

With respect to cotton, the text states that this issue would be addressed as an integral part of the agriculture negotiations, but in an ambitious and expeditious manner.

### **Reactions to the draft**

In their initial responses to the draft no country outright rejected the document, but many voiced their strong displeasure with it. Developing countries in particular criticised what they considered imbalances, with issues important to developed countries being spelled out more clearly than those crucial to developing countries.

The sections on 'sensitive' products under market access and the proposed modification of the Blue Box category of domestic support created the strongest reactions. On sensitive products, many developing countries, along with the US, complained that the text gave too much flexibility to developed countries to protect sensitive products. Many developing countries felt that it was unfair that similar protections for developing countries would be negotiated at a later date. Net-importing countries, on the other hand, said the draft text did not include enough flexibility for them to protect their sensitive products. On the Blue Box, the G-20 group of major developing countries criticised changes that would allow the US to shelter some domestic subsidies now covered by the Amber Box, and Brazil cautioned against "box shifting".

The Africa group preferred keeping cotton on a separate negotiating track, rather than submerging it into the agriculture negotiations. The G-33, a group supporting special products and the special safeguard mechanism, expressed disappointment with the treatment of these new concepts and wanted to see more attention focused on them.

The draft also received heavy criticism from various civil society organisations. Oxfam International said the draft was "disappointing and unlikely to deliver change that benefits poor countries". For its part, the US-based Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP) criticised the draft text for not addressing the declining terms of trade for primary commodities, of vital importance to many developing countries.

Members will now continue to work in various formats to find an acceptable compromise. A final meeting of the WTO General Council, set to accept the framework for negotiations, is scheduled for 27-29 July, but may run longer.

The next issue of BioRes will provide an update on the end-July outcome.

### **Additional Resources**

The first draft framework text is available at see [http://www.ictsd.org/ministerial/cancun/docs/JOB\(04\)-96.pdf](http://www.ictsd.org/ministerial/cancun/docs/JOB(04)-96.pdf).

For a more in-depth analysis of the draft framework and the agriculture text, see <http://www.ictsd.org/weekly/04-07-21/index.htm>.

ICTSD reporting; "India Denounces Draft Negotiations," FINANCIAL EXPRESS MUMBAI, 20 July 2004; "WTO Members Review Draft Framework On Agriculture; Some Provisions Panned," WTO REPORTER, 21 July 2004; "WTO Draft Declaration 'Disappointing'," OXFAM RELEASE, 16 July 2004.

---

**In Brief**

---

**EU PLANS TO TACKLE ILLEGAL LOGGING CRITICISED**

On 20 July, the European Commission adopted a set of measures to address the problem of illegal logging and the related trade in illegally harvested timber, which is estimated to cost developing countries US\$ 12.3 to 18.4 billion annually. Specifically, the Commission plans to set up voluntary partnerships with wood-producing countries affected by illegal logging to support and promote governance reform in their timber sectors. Also, the Commission will develop a regulation setting up a legally-binding licensing scheme with partner countries, to ensure that only legal timber from these countries is allowed into the EU. The measures fall under the Commission's Action Plan for Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT), adopted in May last year.

While the environmental group WWF welcomed the Commissions' continuing efforts to combat illegal logging, they believe that a voluntary scheme was not sufficient. In their opinion, the measures would not address the failure of EU member states to implement necessary measures at the domestic level. According to a WWF survey released in April, 12 out of the 15 old EU member countries had failed to take adequate action against illegal logging (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 16 May 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/04-04-16/inbrief.htm>). Greenpeace also criticised the new measure for not setting up binding principles to ensure that timber licences are consistent and effective.

For further information on FLEGT, see [http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/theme/forest/initiative/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/development/body/theme/forest/initiative/index_en.htm).

"Environment-EU: New Measures in Fight Against Illegal Logging," TERRAVIVA, 22 July 2004.

**IUCN CALLS FOR SUSTAINABLE RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN EASTERN EUROPE**

While WTO Members are trying to hash out a new global agriculture deal (see related story, this issue), IUCN - The World Conservation Union on 22 July released a report highlighting the threats posed to the rural and agricultural environment in the new EU member states in Eastern Europe. The report, entitled "Gaps and Limitation within the Rural Development Plans of CEE New Member States", stresses that environmental quality and biodiversity are under pressure due to inappropriate development strategies in rural areas, and urges the European Commission to establish a common policy to ensure the environmental sustainability of rural development. This new policy should be designed to complement the EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). Currently, according to the report, ecologically sound farming practices and the management of protected areas is not attractive to farmers, who can get more funding for intensive farming under the CAP. At the global level, negotiators are discussing how, and how much, Members should be able to subsidise their agricultural and rural sectors, including for environmental purposes and landscape management.

To access the report, visit [http://www.iucn-ce.org.pl/documents/iucn\\_rdp.pdf](http://www.iucn-ce.org.pl/documents/iucn_rdp.pdf)

"EU Enlargement Highlights Urgent Need For Common Rural Development Policy To Protect Environment," IUCN RELEASE, 22 July 2004.

**NEW US TARIFFS ON SHRIMP IMPORTS FROM CHINA AND VIETNAM**

On 6 July, the US Commerce Department proposed new tariffs on shrimp imports from China and Vietnam. The announcement followed a decision by the US International Trade Commission (ITC) that exporters in these countries had been dumping shrimp into the US at artificially low prices. The proposed tariffs, which will go into effect shortly, range from 8 to 113 percent on Chinese exporters, and 12 to 93 percent on

Vietnamese exports. However, the Commerce Department will not set final dumping penalties until after the ITC makes its final ruling in January 2005 on whether the US shrimp industry is being harmed by these imports. The tariffs will only apply to frozen and canned warm-water shrimp and prawns, and do not affect breaded, fresh, dried and coldwater shrimp and prawns, and shrimp found in prepared meals.

This decision is part of a preliminary ruling in an antidumping case launched by US shrimpers and processors last year (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 3 October 2003, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/03-10-03/inbrief.htm>). The shrimpers filed the case to combat low domestic shrimp prices. They claim the value of the US shrimp harvest was more than halved between 2000 and 2002, decreasing from US\$1.25 billion to US\$560 million, because of the dumping of cheap imports. The case is against six countries in total, but decisions against Thailand, Brazil, Ecuador and India are not expected until later this month. Shrimp from these six countries account for 75 percent of total US imports of frozen and canned warm-water shrimp. Not everyone in the US is happy about this decision. US seafood distributors and retailers are opposed to the duties, claiming they will drive up shrimp prices by as much as 44 percent and reduce consumption.

"Update 2: US proposes Tariffs on China Shrimp," FORBES, 6 July 2004; "US Proposes Tariffs on Shrimp Imports," BOSTON GLOBE, 6 July 2004.

### **EU APPROVES ANOTHER GM IMPORT AS WTO DISPUTE DRAGS ON**

On 19 July the European Commission authorised Monsanto's NK603 corn, genetically modified (GM) to tolerate the herbicide Roundup Ready. This EC move followed the failure of European environment ministers to reach a decision on the corn at their last meeting (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 8 July 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/04-07-08/inbrief.htm#5>). The approval only applies for the use of corn as feed -- not for cultivation -- and imports will only be allowed once the maize also has been approved for food use. Agriculture ministers, meeting on 19 July on this issue, also failed to reach a decision on food use and it will again be up to the Commission to decide on the authorisation by late September. While the GM maize already was the second variety authorised by the Commission since approvals were put on hold in 1998, the US administration stressed that they would continue to pursue the WTO case against the EU's (now no longer existent) de facto moratorium on GM approvals (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 11 June 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/04-06-11/story1.htm>). "Our bottom line is Europe needs to have a predictable, timely, transparent and science-based regulatory system for biotech products," said Richard Mills, spokesperson for the US Trade Representative. The proceedings, however, have been delayed to allow parties additional time to prepare their rebuttals (see BRIDGES Trade BioRes, 8 July 2004, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/04-07-08/inbrief.htm#3>). No new timeline has been set for when the Panel will issue its report.

For further information on the dispute, see <http://www.trade-environment.org/page/theme/tewto/biotechcase.htm>.

"GMOs: Commission authorises import of GM-maize for use in animal feed," IP/04/957, 19 July 2004; "Europe approves genetically modified corn as animal feed," NYT, 20 July 2004.

### **AFRICANS TO SEEK CITES PROTECTION FOR DIET CACTUS**

South Africa, Botswana and Namibia have proposed the inclusion of the Hoodia cactus in Annex II of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES) at its next Conference of the Parties in November in Bangkok. If included, only limited trade would be allowed under strict controls. The cactus has long been used by African's San Bushmen for its appetite-suppressing qualities. In 1996, the South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) patented the chemical entity extracted from hoodia and licensed the British pharmaceutical company Phytopharm to develop the plant's commercial potential. Phytopharm in turn sold the development and marketing rights to the Pfizer Corporation. Phytopharm welcomed the move to restrict trade in the species. "This strengthens our

position substantially by making the unauthorised exportation of hoodia illegal, rather than merely naughty," said Chief Executive Richard Dixey. The San peoples have high hopes for a share of the profits should a drug be successfully marketed. Following lengthy negotiations, the CSIR concluded a memorandum of understanding with the San tribes in April 2002, which will serve as a basis for benefit-sharing, specifying that the San peoples will receive six percent of the royalties incurred.

"African states seek protection for rare diet plant," REUTERS, 19 July 2004; "Case study: Hoodia Cactus (South Africa)," Case Western Reserve University.

---

## Events & Resources

---

### EVENTS

For a more comprehensive list of events in trade and sustainable development, please refer to ICTSD's web calendar, <http://www.ictsd.org/cal/2004calendar.htm>. 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.

#### Coming up in the next two weeks

24 July, Lima, Peru: CONFERENCIA PERIODISTAS Y COMUNICADORES SOCIALES: BIOTECNOLOGIA Y BIOSEGURIDAD. Organised by the Centro de Investigación de Recursos Genéticos, Biotecnología y Bioseguridad (CIRGEBB). For further information, contact CIRGEBB, tel: (+51 1) 34 95 657 Anexo 272; fax: 47 92 866; <http://www.lamolina.edu.pe/cirgebb/nuevo/programaperiodistas2.doc>

25-30 July, Utrecht, Netherlands: 7th INTECOL INTERNATIONAL WETLANDS CONFERENCE. Organised by the International Association of Ecology. The Conference aims to highlight the newest developments in Wetland Science with all its major disciplines and to review this knowledge in the perspective of integrated water resources management world-wide. For further information, contact: Inge van Gaal, tel: (+31 30) 253 2728; fax: 253 5851; email: [intecol@fbu.uu.nl](mailto:intecol@fbu.uu.nl); Internet: <http://www.bio.uu.nl/intecol/index2.php>.

25-30 July, Trondheim, Norway: XI WORLD CONGRESS OF RURAL SOCIOLOGY. This event will address a diverse range of food security interests under the theme of "Globalisation, risks and resistance". For further information contact Mark Shucksmith, ESRS, tel: +44-1224-273-901; fax: +44-1224-273-902; e-mail: [IRSA@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:IRSA@abdn.ac.uk); Internet: <http://www.irsa-world.org/XI/>

26-30 July, Geneva, Switzerland: NEGOTIATIONS OF A SUCCESSOR AGREEMENT TO ITTA, 1994. The United Nations Conference (first part) for the negotiation of a Successor Agreement to the ITTA (International Tropical Timber Association), 1994, will follow ITTC-36. For further information, contact: ITTO Secretariat; tel: (+81-45) 223-1110; fax: 223-1111; email: [ittc@itto.or.jp](mailto:ittc@itto.or.jp); Internet: <http://www.itto.or.jp/live/PageDisplayHandler?pageId=189>

26-29 July 2004, Paris, France, INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE (IPCC): SCIENTIFIC WORKSHOP ON "CLIMATE SENSITIVITY". The workshop will consider the topic of climate sensitivity broadly including the results emerging from the various climate modeling projects and perspectives based on information from relevant observational and paleoclimatic studies. For further information contact: IPCC-WG1; tel: (+1 303) 497 7072; fax: 497 5628 1/2; email: [IPCC-wg1@al.noaa.gov](mailto:IPCC-wg1@al.noaa.gov); Internet: <http://www.climate-science.gov/Library/ipcc/workshop26-29july2004.htm>.

27-29 July, Geneva, Switzerland: WTO GENERAL COUNCIL. For further information contact the WTO Information and Media Relations Division, Geneva; tel: (41-22) 739- 5007; fax: (41-22) 739-5458; email: [enquiries@wto.org](mailto:enquiries@wto.org)



28-30 July, Almaty, Kazakhstan: WORKSHOP ON ACCESS AND BENEFIT SHARING LEGISLATION IN CENTRAL ASIA FOR LEGAL EXPERTS OF GOVERNMENTS AND NGOS. Organised by the UN University / Institute for Advanced Studies For further information, contact Kirsten Newmann, tel: (+ 81 4) 55 221 2330; fax: 5221 2302; email: [neumann@ias.unu.edu](mailto:neumann@ias.unu.edu); Internet: <http://www.ias.unu.edu/events/workshops.cfm>.

1-10 August, Arusha, Tanzania: SECOND WORLDWIDE SYMPOSIUM ON GENDER AND FORESTRY. Organised by the Hedmark University College. The meeting will focus on women and forestry, gender, poverty and sustainable development, forest resource utilization and income generating activities for local people, ideology, religion and environmental responsibility. For further information, contact Merete Furuberg, tel: +47 90 163092; fax: +47 62 945753; email: [merete.furuberg@hedmark-f.kommune.no](mailto:merete.furuberg@hedmark-f.kommune.no).

5-8 August, Lima, Peru: SEGUNDO SIMPOSIUM INTERNACIONAL DE PLANTAS MEDICINALES Y FITOTERAPIA - FITO. Organised by Medicina Verde. For further information, contact Medicina Verde, tel: (+51 511) 564-7554; fax: 51 1 564 7554; email: [infaperu@hotmail.com](mailto:infaperu@hotmail.com); Internet: <http://www.medicinaverde.org/>.

### Other upcoming events

20-24 September, Ennis, County Clare, Ireland: 13TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES. This annual conference series is widely considered the most comprehensive international forum for the review of accumulated scientific knowledge on the impacts of aquatic invasive species, presentation of the latest field research and related data, introduction of new technologies and advancements in control and mitigation, and discussion of policy and approaches to effective public education and outreach initiatives to prevent new introductions. For more information contact: tel: (+1 613) 732 7068; fax: 732 3386; email: [profedge@renc.igs.net](mailto:profedge@renc.igs.net); Internet: <http://www.aquatic-invasive-species-conference.org/conference-home.htm>

26-30 September, Montpellier, France: EIGHTH INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON THE BIOSAFETY OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS. Organised by the International Society for Biosafety Research, this symposium will be held under the theme "How Scientific Research Informs Biosafety Decisions." A special workshop will discuss North-South issues related to biosafety of GMOs. For further information contact: International Society for Biosafety Research; tel: (+33 1) 30 83 37-30; fax: 83 37 28; email: [isbgmo@versailles.inra.fr](mailto:isbgmo@versailles.inra.fr); Internet: <http://www.inra.fr/gmobiosafety/aboutsymposium.php>

19-20 August, Nairobi, Kenya: TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC RENEWAL: DESIGNING NEW POLICY TOOLS FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. Organised by the Millennium Project's Task Force on Science, Technology and Innovation and Kenya National Academy of Sciences. The conference will focus on addressing the recommendations of the Task Force interim report "Science, Technology and Innovation: Challenges and Opportunities for Implementing the Millennium Development Goals". For more information about the conference, contact: Brian Torpy, tel: (+1 617-496-5574); email: [brian\\_torpy@harvard.edu](mailto:brian_torpy@harvard.edu); Internet: <http://bcsia.ksg.harvard.edu/events.cfm?program=STPP&ln=upcoming&gma=25>.

### RESOURCES

If you have a relevant resource (books, papers, bulletins, etc.) you would like to see announced in this section, please forward a copy or review by the BRIDGES staff to Heike Baumüller, [hbaumuller@ictsd.ch](mailto:hbaumuller@ictsd.ch).

LESSONS LEARNED ON TRADE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. By Aaron Cosby, 2004. The report distils six years of research carried out as part of the IISD-ICTSD Trade Knowledge Network. It draws on in-country research, thematic research and workshop papers to identify the key issues, and explores in depth what the TKN research has to say about them. The result is a comprehensive primer on the issues faced by the South in the area of trade and sustainable development. The book includes a companion CD

covering all of the surveyed TKN research (more than 40 papers in all, including several in Spanish). Available at <http://www.tradeknowledgenetwork.net/publication.aspx?id=631>.

**GLOBALIZATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT: LESSONS FROM THE AMERICAS.** Published by the Heinrich Böll Foundation, July 2004. This report the product of a series of studies presented by Working Group members at its first meeting in Brasilia March 29-30, 2004, hosted by Brazil's Environment Ministry. The report calls into question the prevailing economic argument that trade-led growth will automatically lead to environmental improvements. Available at <http://ase.tufts.edu/gdae/Pubs/rp/WorkingGroupReportJuly04.pdf>.

**DRAFT INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT.** IUCN Environmental Law Programme, Draft International Covenant on Environment and Development, 2004. From water governance to pollution issues and from forest conservation to sustainable use, the publication develops existing legal principles related to environment and development. First published in 1995, the third edition takes stock of the results of the Johannesburg WSSD, especially on the matter of implementation of international agreements. Available at [http://www.iucn.org/themes/law/pdfdocuments/EPLP31EN\\_rev2.pdf](http://www.iucn.org/themes/law/pdfdocuments/EPLP31EN_rev2.pdf).

**THE PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE AND WTO LAW: DIVERGENT VIEWS TOWARD THE ROLE OF SCIENCE IN ASSESSING AND MANAGING RISK.** By Lawrence Kogan in the Seton Hall Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations, Vol. 5 No. 1, Winter/Spring 2004. The article compares and contrasts the competing EU (precaution-based) and US (risk based) approaches. It discusses the evolution of the formal PP in international law and the legal consequences of adopting a precaution-based model of risk regulation. Furthermore, it discusses the EU's intentions to establish the PP as an absolute international legal framework standard to govern the use of science and technology by ALL countries. Finally, it explains the current relationship between the PP and WTO law.

**WE THE PEOPLES: CIVIL SOCIETY, THE UNITED NATIONS AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE.** Report of the Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations-Civil Society Relations, June 2004. The report proposes a number of concrete measures to increase the participation of civil society representatives from developing countries. The report also offers innovative ideas aimed at strengthening partnership with civil society in humanitarian and development. Available at [http://www.ecologic.de/download/dinner\\_dialogue/2003/final\\_report\\_juan\\_mayr.pdf](http://www.ecologic.de/download/dinner_dialogue/2003/final_report_juan_mayr.pdf)

**HOW IS YOUR MPA DOING? A GUIDEBOOK OF NATURAL AND SOCIAL INDICATORS FOR EVALUATING MARINE PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS.** Produced jointly by IUCN, WWF and NOAA, 2004. This publication is a field-tested comprehensive guidebook on the topic tailored to the needs of MPA managers. The guidebook lists 42 MPA-specific indicators that managers can use in evaluating their site. Available at <http://effectivempa.noaa.gov/guidebook/guidebook.html>.

**LABELLING OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOODS/ INGREDIENTS/ADDITIVES.** By Research and Markets, December 2003. The document provides an overview of the manner in which legislation relating to genetically modified foods is developing in Central and Eastern European countries, as well as in certain Latin American countries. Discussion is included on GM-free labelling requirements for those countries that have special provisions. For further information, see <http://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/c2870/>.

*BRIDGES Trade BioRes*© is published by the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD), <http://www.ictsd.org>, in collaboration with IUCN - World Conservation Union, <http://www.iucn.org>, and IUCN's Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy, CEESP, <http://www.iucn.org/themes/ceesp/index.html>. This edition of BRIDGES Trade BioRes was edited by Heike Baumüller. Contributors to this issue were Sarah Rogers and Malena Sell. The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz, [rmelendez@ictsd.ch](mailto:rmelendez@ictsd.ch). ICTSD is an independent, not-for-profit organisation based at: 13, ch. des Anémones, 1219 Geneva, Switzerland, tel: (41-22) 917-8492; fax: 917-8093. Excerpts from BRIDGES Trade BioRes may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and should be directed to the Editors or the Director. BRIDGES Trade BioRes is made possible in 2004 through the generous support of the Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape (BUWAL). It also benefits from ICTSD's core funders: the Governments of Finland, Denmark, the Netherlands and Sweden; Christian Aid (UK), the Rockefeller Foundation, MISEREOR, NOVIB (NL), Oxfam (UK) and the Swiss Coalition of Development Organisations (Switzerland). ISSN 1682-0843

To subscribe to *BRIDGES Trade BioRes*, please send a blank email to [subscribe\\_biores@ictsd.ch](mailto:subscribe_biores@ictsd.ch).

To become a member of the CEESP Working Group on Environment, Trade and Investment, please send an email to: [jvonbraun@ictsd.ch](mailto:jvonbraun@ictsd.ch)