



Bridges Trade BioRes

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

Volume 9 · Number 1, 23 January 2008

ENVIRONMENT AT THE WTO

Trans-Atlantic Beef Hormone Dispute Heats Up
Once Again..... 1

New WTO Rules Text Outlines Fisheries
Roadmap..... 3

CLIMATE CHANGE

Carbon Prices Follow Global Economic
Downturn 4

IN BRIEF

Canadian Delegation in Brussels to Stop
Proposed Seal Ban..... 5

US Takes Aim at EU Poultry Ban 6

Indonesian Navy Cracks Down on Environment
Crime 7

Bolivian Restrictions on Polluting Car Imports
Upheld..... 8

EVENTS & RESOURCES

Events..... 9

Resources..... 10

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

To subscribe to Bridges Trade BioRes or access back issues, visit www.ictsd.net/news/biores/.

Excerpts from Bridges Trade BioRes may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Comments and suggestions are welcomed and should be directed to the Editor or the Director.

This edition of Bridges Trade BioRes was edited by Andrew Aziz, aaaziz@ictsd.ch.

Contributors to this issue were Daniela Alvarez, Andrew Aziz, Moustapha Kamal Gueye, Anja Halle, William Kraus, and Paige McClanahan.

The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz.

ISSN 1682-0843

ENVIRONMENT AT THE WTO

Trans-Atlantic Beef Hormone Dispute Heats Up Once Again

The trans-Atlantic trade dispute over hormone treated beef is heating up once again. A 15 January move by the outgoing Bush Administration to provide greater flexibility for retaliatory tariffs against the EU over its beef ban has raised the ire of Brussels, which has recently been attempting to engage the US at the WTO.

The EU had requested formal WTO consultations in December to discuss its refusal to allow imports of Canadian and American beef in the hopes of finding a final resolution to the debate, which has spanned nearly two decades.

At the centre of the controversy is whether the EU's ban on imported hormone-treated beef is in compliance with the WTO Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, known as the SPS Agreement. That Agreement governs the use of health and safety-related trade barriers, and allows such restrictions to be justified based on scientific evidence or other pertinent information.

Canada and the US maintain that the EU ban is unfounded and have established retaliatory sanctions on EU goods in response.

The EU authorised the current ban in 2003, citing research claiming to have found overwhelming evidence that the hormone oestradiol 17-beta caused cancer and harmed genes, and substantial evidence that five other hormones were also harmful to humans. The EU had hoped that this research would bring the bloc's import ban into compliance with a 1999 WTO ruling that found earlier restrictions unjustified.

Appellate Body Indecisive

On 16 October, the WTO Appellate Body handed down a mixed ruling on the dispute. In their decision, the EU was granted the authority to continue their ongoing restrictions, while Canada and the US were also allowed to continue imposing trade sanctions totalling over US\$ 125 million annually (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 31 October 2008, <http://ictsd.net/i/news/biores/32483/>).

The Appellate Body held that it was unable to determine whether the EU's assessment of human risk brought the European trading bloc into compliance with the SPS Agreement, faulting the lower WTO panel for numerous evidentiary and procedural errors. Concluding, the Appellate Body recommended that the parties re-initiate WTO dispute settlement proceedings.

Following the WTO Body's recommendation, on 22 December Brussels requested formal consultations with Canada and the US over the legality of both the EU's longstanding ban as well as Canadian and American sanctions.

By requesting formal consultations, the EU is inviting scrutiny of its own trade policies, an unusual move at the WTO. But Brussels says that it is confident that the import ban is legally justified.

"We are convinced that our legislation on hormones is fully in line with WTO law: the restrictions on hormone-treated beef are based on solid scientific evidence showing risks for human health," EU spokesperson Peter Power said. "We are thus very confident and hope that the US and Canada will engage constructively in these consultations and that we can find a solution to this long-lasting dispute."

Dispute Escalates

Having long taken a precautionary approach toward hormone-treated food, Brussels says it hopes this coming round of dispute settlement procedures will end the debate on the ban's legitimacy, and end Canadian and American duties on EU imports as well.

But recent moves by the outgoing Bush Administration have, in fact, escalated the dispute. On 15 January, Washington announced new changes to the list of EU food products subject to US\$116.8 million worth of retaliatory tariffs.

US Trade Representative Susan Schwab indicated continuing sanctions were justified following the 16 October Appellate Body ruling. "The Appellate Body's report confirms that WTO Members that are subject to additional duties for failing to bring themselves into compliance with the WTO's rulings and recommendations must do more than simply claim compliance in order to obtain relief from such duties. We very much welcome these conclusions by the Appellate Body" Schwab said.

Because the new changes – scheduled to take effect on 23 March – allow the US to revise the list of sanctioned goods every six months, it will make moves by the US harder to predict. The move was met with immediate criticism from the EU.

"This action is most regrettable in the view of many attempts by the EU to find a solution to the long standing dispute over hormone-treated beef," EU Trade Commissioner Catherine Ashton said in a statement. "A large number of EU exporters will be hit with these illegal sanctions. We look forward to working with the new administration to address this situation."

New Sanctions Aim to Force Resolution: Washington

Statements from Washington, however, indicate this latest action was designed to force the resolution of an issue that has been unresolved since the dispute began in the WTO back in 1996.

"The existing duties have been in place for over 9 years; the goal of these modifications is to reach a resolution of the dispute under which the EU would allow market access for US beef and the United States could end its trade action" US Trade Representative Susan Schwab said. "For over a decade, we have been trying to resolve this dispute with the EU but our efforts have gone nowhere."

The USTR added that "in this time of worldwide financial problems, it is important to emphasise

that the purpose of the action announced today is not to raise trade barriers, but to lower them.”

Initial reactions from Brussels, however, were markedly adversarial. “It is clear that this move by the US administration means that we will have no choice but to start preparations in order to take this to the WTO,” an EU press release warned. “As the WTO has not yet taken a view on our current hormone regime dating from 2003, the US sanctions are illegal.”

ICTSD Reporting; “US hits EU with revised sanctions in beef dispute,” REUTERS, 15 January 2009; “US, EU escalate dispute over ban on hormone beef,” ASSOCIATED PRESS, 15 January 2009; “EU Wants Sanctions Justified in WTO Beef Hormone Case,” Bloomberg, 22 December 2008; “Busy Bush gov't hauls EU to WTO over poultry ban,” ASSOCIATED PRESS, 17 January 2009.

New WTO Rules Text Outlines Fisheries Roadmap

The chair of the WTO rules group reeled in controversial language related to fisheries subsidies in the latest draft rules text released on 19 December. Unlike prior text – which contained hard language calling for a ban on specific subsidies – December’s text outlines only a ‘roadmap’ for future discussions.

The document had been expected to be released a few months earlier, but was ultimately put on hold so as not to distract from a strong end-of-year push to conclude critical negotiating areas of industrial and farm goods. When efforts on those fronts failed to produce results by mid-December, the chair of the rules group, Ambassador Guillermo Valles Galmés of Uruguay, released his draft text.

The rules group is charged with strengthening disciplines on subsidies in the fisheries sector. A particular challenge for the group on this front has been to balance the need to protect the world’s fish stocks from overfishing – a goal that the chair says all delegations appreciate – and the need to afford a just amount of ‘special and differential

treatment’ to the world’s poorer countries, many of which rely heavily on the sector.

Prior rules text too strict for some countries

The 2005 Hong Kong ministerial declaration called on the Negotiating Group on Rules to “strengthen disciplines on subsidies in the fisheries sector, including through the prohibition of certain forms of fisheries subsidies that contribute to overcapacity and over-fishing.”

The November 2007 rules text took this into account, providing a detailed legal text - Annex VIII of the SCM Agreement - for a new agreement on fisheries subsidies. The text would have prohibited government support for construction, operating and fuel costs of vessels, and port infrastructure development exclusively or predominantly linked to wild capture fishing – including storage and processing facilities.

Some subsidies would have been permissible for all countries, provided that they maintain an international standard fisheries management system. These included payments aimed at boosting fishing vessel safety without increasing fishing capacity, reducing the environmental impact of fishing, or re-training fisheries sector workers.

The 2007 text would have exempted least-developed countries (LDCs) from the disciplines altogether, and allowed non-LDC developing countries to provide otherwise-banned subsidies.

However, it soon became clear that many governments considered the proposed disciplines too strict. Canada, the EU, Japan and Norway said Members should be allowed to subsidise bait, fuel, insurance and port infrastructure in certain cases, as well as offer assistance to small-scale fishermen affected by high oil prices. And India objected to the conditions attached developing country subsidies to small-scale fishing, such as limiting boat length to 10 metres.

Roadmap lays out fundamental questions for moving forward

Given the controversy over several issues in the 2007 text, Valles took a step back this time by

replacing the legal language of the previous draft with a roadmap for future work on the matter. “We have no pre-existing agreement to which to revert, and the differences among delegations go to the very concepts and structure of the rules,” the chair explained.

Thus, rather than revising the prior text, Valles proposed a ‘roadmap for discussion’, which consists of fundamental questions that must be clarified for the negotiations to move forward. These questions include general considerations, such as why, in view of the Hong Kong mandate, a particular kind of subsidy should or should not be prohibited. Other questions ask how to ensure that any permitted subsidies would not in practice contribute to overcapacity or overfishing, how to objectively determine if a fishery is ‘overfished’, and identifying the extent of the group’s mandate to discipline subsidies in the sector.

Environmental group Oceana welcomed the chair’s new approach to the fisheries talks.

“Oceana strongly and actively supports the WTO mandate to limit fisheries subsidies that contribute to overcapacity and overfishing,” Courtney Sakai of Oceana said. “The new roadmap offers a productive way for negotiators to move forward in implementing an effective agreement that achieves these objectives.”

Members still divided on anti-dumping

The new draft text also includes new language on anti-dumping and non-fisheries related subsidies disciplines. In an introductory note to the document, the chair stressed that while some compromises had been struck, Members remained starkly divided on several issues, most notably a long-controversial anti-dumping tool known as zeroing.

Nevertheless, some incremental progress has been made in the 13 months since the previous text was released, and the chair has vowed to intensify the group’s work beginning in early February in an effort to narrow gaps in the rules talks, one of several negotiating areas that have prevented the seven-year-old Doha Round talks from reaching a successful conclusion.

Additional Resources

For a comprehensive analysis of the new rules text, see Bridges Monthly, Vol. 12 No. 6, <http://ictsd.net/i/news/bridges/38064/>

The 30 November 2007 draft text can be found here:

http://www.oceana.org/fileadmin/oceana/uploads/dirty_fishing/for_amanda/Draft.Rules.30.Nov.07_EDITED.pdf

The 19 December 2008 draft text can be found here:

http://ictsd.net/downloads/2009/01/rules_dec08_e.pdf

ICTSD reporting.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Carbon Prices Follow Global Economic Downturn

The global carbon market has not remained unshaken after the world financial crisis and gloomy economic outlook. Over the past two months, prices of emissions permits have fallen, with risks of a negative downward effect on investment in carbon reducing projects.

Driven by weak energy prices, increased selling of credits by cash-strapped firms and an anticipated drop in emissions from lower industrial production, the fall in carbon prices is hitting the UN mandatory market for Certified Emissions Reductions (CERs) harder than the voluntary offsets market for Verified Emission Reductions (VERs).

In the US, buyers anticipating a carbon cap-and-trade under the Obama administration contributed to the fall in price of VERs – tradable carbon offset credits for emission reductions – at levels still higher than mid-2008. The voluntary Carbon Index of market analyst New Carbon Finance for November-December 2008 has the average VER price at US\$7.50 - down 15 percent from US\$8.70 in the previous two months, but still up nearly 20 percent from July-August prices.

In contrast, the prices for CER – carbon credit generated under Kyoto Protocol's Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) for industrialized countries to reduce their emissions of greenhouse gases through a primary market of projects undertaken in developing countries – have continued to fall away, with falling prices of European carbon permits amid lower energy prices and looming recession. Benchmark CERs in December 2008 closed at €11.75 (US\$15.50) on the European Climate Exchange on January 15 - down 42 percent over the last three months.

Low Prices Could Limit CDM Effectiveness

There is now fear that the low prices for issued credits in secondary markets leads to downward pressure on the primary market and discourages project developers from generating new credits. This may significantly hamper prospects from the UN CDM's to contribute to emissions reduction and clean technology transfer in the developing world over the next year or two.

Carbon offsets traded under the Kyoto Protocol represented a \$32 billion market in 2008, of the US\$120 billion global carbon market. At the UN climate change conference in December 2008 in Poznan, Poland, delegates adopted decisions aimed at streamlining and speeding up the CDM (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 15 December 2008, <http://ictsd.net/i/news/biores/36372/>).

In China, the largest recipient of CDM projects, one project developer noted that the number of developers looking to secure forward credit sales in the primary market has halved from a year ago. The Chinese government imposed a primary market CERs price floor to above €8 in 2008. Some developers are hoping the government will consider the depressed market and bring minimum prices back down to €6, but others are skeptical that the government will act unless there is a sustained period of depression in prices.

Nonetheless, Reuters reports that many established project developers with projects underway have already locked in prices at levels above €10. According to equity analysts, the three largest publicly-traded developers, Camco, EcoSecurities and Trading Emissions, are well positioned to weather a prolonged downturn in

CER prices. So developers not pressed by debts or urgent cash flow are holding off selling their credits, and waiting for prices to return to truer values, knowing that CERs are expected to range from €18-21 in the period to 2012.

ICTSD reporting; “Depressed Carbon Prices To Have Ripple Effects,” REUTERS, 16 January 2009; “Global downturn hits carbon credits,” CARBONPOSITIVE, 16 January 2009.

IN BRIEF

Canadian Delegation in Brussels to Stop Proposed Seal Ban

Canadian officials are in Brussels this week in an attempt to persuade the European Union to abandon its proposed plan to ban imports of seal products. If passed, the proposal would ban seal products from countries whose hunting practices involve ‘unnecessary pain’.

Rumours of a vote on the EU proposal are not new. However, recent moves from Canada suggest that they feel a vote is imminent. Canadian officials say that the EU may attempt a vote before its annual seal hunt gets underway in March of this year. However, similarly timed sabre-rattling from Brussels took place in April 2008 but no vote ultimately took place (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 4 April 2008, <http://ictsd.net/i/news/biores/10505/>).

The Canadian delegation's arrival in Brussels is the country's second major move in recent weeks to convince the EU that hunting practices are not as cruel as lobbyists would have them believe. In December the Canadian government issued new rules governing the way in which hunters determined whether seals were, in fact, dead before skinning them.

The proposed EU ban is meant to “ensure that products derived from seals killed and skinned in ways that cause pain, distress and suffering are not found on the European market.” Canada's new rules, published in the Canada Gazette – the country's official government publication of laws

– on 27 December, are specifically designed to appease European concerns.

“The method of harvesting seals in the current Regulations...would fail to meet the derogation criteria presented in the proposed European ban on seal products,” the document reads. “As a result, Canada could face a potential ban of its seal products to Europe, which would represent a loss for an export industry worth \$13 [million] and a critical element of the livelihood of 6,000 sealers in rural communities across Atlantic Canada, Quebec and the North.”

The existing rules require hunters to perform a ‘blinking reflex test’, to determine whether a seal is unconscious before skinning. This test has been replaced by a ‘three-step process’ of stunning, checking, and bleeding seals for 60 seconds before processing.

Loyola Sullivan, Canada's ambassador for fisheries conservation insists that the changes take into account recommendations of the International Veterinarians' Working Group – a panel of nine veterinarians from Canada, France, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.

Sullivan says that Canada is already considering retaliatory trade options. “Canada strongly believes that what's proposed is in violation of WTO and GATT provisions,” Sullivan said recently. “There's a whole host of aspects we think violates their obligations.”

The EU already has a ban on fur imports from white-coated pups. Canada lodged a complaint at the WTO dispute mechanism over the EU bans in September 2007 (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 5 October 2007, <http://www.ictsd.org/biores/07-10-05/inbrief.htm>). However, no panel has been established and no settlement has been notified.

Belgium and the Netherlands have already independently banned imports of seal products. While Canada is in a position to challenge the bans at the WTO, officials say they hope to resolve both the existing and proposed bans through dialogue.

“Canada 'Tweaks' Seal Hunt Rules to Avert EU Trade Ban,” ENVIRONMENT NEWS

SERVICE, 30 December 2008; “New Seal Regs Aim to Stave off EU Ban,” THE HILL TIMES, 14 January 2009; “Canadian delegation asks EU to drop proposed seal product ban,” CBC NEWS, 21 January 2009.

US Takes Aim at EU Poultry Ban

The United States announced last week that it was filing a WTO complaint against a long-running European Union ban on imports of chemically treated poultry. For more than a decade, Brussels has barred the import of chicken treated with anti-bacterial chemicals such as chlorine dioxide, a practice that the US contends is safe and effective.

The latest request for consultations comes one day after the outgoing Bush Administration announced changes to retaliatory trade sanctions relating to the EU's ban on hormone-treated beef, further increasing pressure on Brussels to resolve the long-standing agricultural disputes (see related article, this issue).

“The poultry treatments at issue have been widely and safely used in the United States for many years” then-US Trade Representative Susan Schwab said in the announcement. “We have tried to address this issue through dialogue with the EU for more than eleven years, and neither the European Commission nor EU Member States have offered any legitimate, science-based reason for continuing to block our poultry.”

Brussels prohibits the import of poultry treated with any substance other than water unless that substance has been approved by the EU. But the US alleges that the EU has not published or otherwise made available the process it uses to approve a substance. Washington also alleges that Brussels has not approved the use of four pathogen-reducing chemicals in the nearly seven years since Washington's formal request for approval in 2002, to the frustration of US industry leaders.

“The EU's ban has no scientific basis,” said Shaun Donnelly, a Senior Director at the US trade group National Association of Manufacturers (NAM). “US poultry has been thoroughly tested and

judged to be safe for consumers and for the environment by both US and European food safety authorities.”

For its part, though, the EU expressed its assurance that the ban is justified. “We regret the US decision to resort to WTO dispute settlement on this issue,” said Peter Power, an EU spokesperson. Power denied that the ban specifically discriminates against US imports: “we apply our regulatory measures to both domestic and imported goods alike,” he said. “We will carefully study the US claims and will engage in consultations in good faith,” Power said.

Washington’s decision to file the complaint was hailed by the US poultry industry, which has been battered during the recent economic crisis as prices for both chicken and feed have fluctuated greatly. US poultry exports have greatly expanded since the EU ban took effect in 1997 and the industry is looking to continue its growth by accessing the EU market. Current exports stand at roughly 16 percent of production.

Under WTO rules, Washington and Brussels will have 60 days to hold formal consultations. If the parties fail to reach a resolution by the end of that period, the complainants may ask a WTO dispute settlement panel to consider the case.

ICTSD reporting; “US poultry industry cheers WTO flap with EU,” WALL STREET JOURNAL, 16 January 2009; “US challenges EU’s ban on poultry imports at WTO,” BLOOMBERG, 16 January 2009.

Indonesian Navy Cracks Down on Environment Crime

Indonesia is clamping down on foreign registered ships suspected of participating in illicit activity, such as illegal fishing and the transportation of illegally harvested timber. Since the beginning of the month, 32 ships – predominantly from Malaysia, the Philippines, China and Thailand – found in the southern Papuan region of the archipelago have been impounded.

Illegal fishing has been an ongoing problem for the Southeast Asian country for many years. The Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries estimates that illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing in Indonesian waters costs as much as US\$2 billion annually. And many believe that numbers are increasing.

The People’s Coalition for Equal Fisheries (KIARA) – a federation of environmental and social groups concerned with the state of the maritime and fishery sectors – says that 764 foreign trawlers suspected of illegal fishing were intercepted by authorities in 2008.

The recent crack-down in Papua is not limited to suspected illegal fishing. Longstanding environmental challenges such as vessels dumping toxic waste, transporting illegally harvested timber, and shipments of illegally mined sand and granite have also been targeted.

Indonesia banned all exports of sand mined in domestic waters in 2003 and sand mined on land in 2007. While a limited number of permits are issued to export Indonesian granite, Navy representative Iskandar Sitompul says that ships they often intercept ships that have not been issued permits.

Authorities seized 21 foreign-registered ships transporting illegally mined materials in 2007.

While many of the vessels intercepted by the Navy are registered in foreign countries, crews are often predominantly Indonesian.

According to the Navy, the seizure of 521 vessels over 2008 resulted in 100 successful prosecutions – and patrolling has been stepped up this year. Nevertheless, environmentalists complain that the government is not committed to tackling environmental problems – particularly those related to fisheries.

The Indonesian government recently announced that it would permit trawling in limited areas off the Bornean state of Kalimantan – a practice that has been banned for three decades. Officials say that controlled trawling will help to reduce illegal fishing by regulating the process.

However, environmentalists rebuff the argument, saying that policies such as these are unsustainable. Critics argue that trade liberalisation policies, such as last year's Indonesia–Japan Economic Partnership Agreement, which exempts 51 Indonesian fishery products from import duties in Japan, and has led to a large increase in exports of Indonesian fish to Japan, are leading to overfishing.

“The Ministry of Fishery and Maritime Affairs in July 2008 targeted an increase in national fish production from 10.42 million tons that year to 12.73 million tons in 2009 in an effort to boost the country's export profits from fishery products,” says KIARA Secretary-General Riza Damanik. “However, we have ignored the looming threat of a national and global fish crisis due to the depletion of fishery resources.”

Other green groups, charge that Indonesia is not fit to host the upcoming World Ocean Conference – an international gathering of policymakers and scientists – due to its inability to deal with illegal fishing and recent policy decisions to increase quotas in the face of overfishing concerns. The five day World Ocean Conference gets underway on 11 May in the town of Manado in North Sulawesi.

“Navy Impounds 32 Foreign Vessels in Papua Region,” JAKARTA GLOBE, 19 January 2009; “Indonesia to allow trawling despite overfishing fears,” AFP, 15 January 2009; “KIARA warns of national fish crisis,” THE JAKARTA POST, 15 January 2009.

Bolivian Restrictions on Polluting Car Imports Upheld

The Government of Chile's efforts to reverse a decree by Bolivian president Evo Morales to ban imports of used vehicles more than 5 years old have ended in failure. The Bolivian ban aims to stem the steady cross-border stream of mainly Japanese used cars arriving in the Chilean ports of Arica and Iquique.

Rigid emissions and safety standards in Japan often makes the cost of owning older cars

prohibitively high. As a result, Latin America has become a popular destination for cheap vehicles deemed unfit to drive in many other countries.

Prior to the 3 December decree, there were no restrictions on used vehicle imports. La Paz asserts that the surge of sub-standard used car imports in recent years has created a higher demand for fuel in the country and that the associated increases in greenhouse gas emissions pose health and safety risks to the population. The new restriction also extends to the vehicles that use diesel oil as fuel and whose engine capacity is less than or equal to 4,000 cubic centimetres and vehicles using liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) as fuel.

While the Chilean diplomatic mission failed to achieve its objective, Bolivia has agreed to expedite the customs procedures an undetermined number of cars that were in the process of being imported when the new rules were made effective.

Carlos Furché, Chile's Director of Foreign Trade, conceded that Bolivia has a right to protect its citizens, but hinted that the move was protectionist in nature. However, Bolivia's finance minister emphasised that the decision is rooted in need to keep ‘junk cars’ out of the country in order to improve urban traffic problems and reduce pollution and fuel use.

Bolivian used car importers, who will be directly affected by the new measure, have held demonstrations opposing the measure. Opposition has also been heard from related sectors, such as auto mechanics and many businesses that have been established to convert right-hand-drive Japanese vehicles to left-hand-drive. While some opponents are calling on the government to fully eliminate the ban, others say a gradual and flexible introduction would have allowed business sectors directly affected to better adapt.

Chilean officials estimate that ban will cost the country 15 thousand jobs and suggest that several small and medium sized businesses would be negatively affected.

Bolivian authorities say that they are already facing obstacles in enforcing the ban due to a flood of

falsified documents being used by used car importers.

ICTSD Reporting; CINPE Reporting; “Bolivia no atenderá el pedido de Chile sobre los vehículos usados,” RED ERBOL, 4 January 2009; “Chile retira observaciones sobre autos usados a Bolivia: medios,” REUTERS, 13 January 2009; “Decreto Supremo 29836,” DERECHOTECA, 3 December 2009; “Por zona Franca Denuncian ingreso de vehículos de importadores pakistaníes,” FM BOLIVIA, 19 January 2009; “Import ban aims to halt Bolivia's used car flood,” INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 18 December 2009.

EVENTS & RESOURCES

Events

Coming up in the next two weeks

26-27 January, Bonn, Germany. FOUNDING CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY AGENCY (IRENA). Prior to the Founding Conference, the statutes will be sent to all member countries of the United Nations, inviting them to participate and become founding members of the agency at the Founding Conference. For more information contact: e-mail: info@irena.org; Internet: <http://www.irena.org/index.htm>

5-7 February, New Delhi, India. DELHI SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT SUMMIT. This annual event will be organised around the theme “Towards Copenhagen: an equitable and ethical approach.” The DSDS is organised by TERI and seeks to provide long-term solutions for sustainable development. The 2009 Summit will aim to reinforce the climate change agenda of the previous year and will feature: an international climate change exhibition; screening of films on climate change; an Africa day; a young global leaders meeting; Sustainable Development Leadership Award; live performance: Tabla Maestro Ustad Zakir Hussain; and the CEO Forum 2009. For more information contact Satish Kumar, Programme Assistant, tel: +91 011

24682100 (Ext.2524); email: satish@teri.res.in; internet: <http://dsds.teriin.org/2009/>

Other upcoming events

12-13 February, Geneva, Switzerland. FUEL RULES – ENERGY, EMISSIONS AND THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION. This International Bar Association conference will offer an overview of the international legal regimes applicable to trade in energy products and services, with a particular focus on the WTO and the Energy Charter Treaty. Other topics include, the use of regional trade agreements to secure energy supplies and the ways in which international trade rules will need to be adapted in order to achieve global climate change goals. For more information please contact, the International Bar Association, tel: (+44) 20 7691 6868; fax: (+44) 20 7691 6544; e-mail: confs@int-bar.org; internet: <http://www.int-bar.org/conferences/conf266/>.

12-13 February, Geneva, Switzerland. MULTI-YEAR EXPERT MEETING ON TRANSPORT AND TRADE FACILITATION. This UN Conference on Trade and Development expert meeting aims to provide a platform for the exchange of views and experiences, both to improve understanding of the implications of climate change for maritime transport and to help contribute substantively to discussions on possible regulatory options under the auspices of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change process. For more information contact UNCTAD, tel: +41 22 917 2043; fax: +41 22 917 0050; e-mail: regina.asariotis@unctad.org or hassiba.benamara@unctad.org; internet: <http://www.unctad.org/Templates/meeting.asp?intItemID=1942&clang=1&m=15862>.

23-24 February, Barcelona, Spain. EVOLVING THE MARKET FOR LARGE SCALE SOLAR POWER. This two-day conference will bring together the leading players in concentrated solar thermal (CST) / solar thermal electricity generation (STEG), concentrator photovoltaic (CPV), and large scale photovoltaic technology to address the key issues in developing large scale solar projects. For further information contact

Green Power Conferences, tel: (+44) 20-7099-0600; fax: (+44) 20-7900-1853; internet: <http://www.greenpowerconferences.com/renewablesmarkets/solarpower09.html>.

4-15 May, New York, US. SEVENTEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. This policy session will focus on agriculture, rural development, land, drought, desertification and Africa. For more information, please refer to <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd>.

11-15 May, Manado, Indonesia. WORLD OCEAN CONFERENCE. This conference – organised by the Government of Indonesia, Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts and Islands, and other partners – will focus high-level attention on issues of ecosystem-based integrated oceans management in the context of climate change, focusing especially on the policy recommendations emanating from the 2008 Global Conference. For further information, contact the World Ocean Conference 2009 Secretariat, tel: +62 431 861 152, e-mail: info@woc2009.org; internet: <http://www.woc2009.org/home.php>.

Resources

WEATHER AND CLIMATE SERVICES IN EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA: A REGIONAL REVIEW. The World Bank, Washington, DC, 2008. This paper reviews the status of weather and climate services in Europe and Central Asia (ECA). Worldwide, the accuracy and value of weather and climate services are rising, bringing great economic benefits. However, many national hydrometeorological services (NMHSs) in Europe and Central Asia are in decline. As a result, these potential gains are often missed. Much more could be done to mitigate weather disasters, support the productivity of smallholding and commercial agriculture, conserve energy, and promote safe aviation and transport by road and rail. Although NMHS capacity deficiencies are serious, they could be significantly remedied by relatively modest—but sustained—investments. Economic assessments indicate substantial benefit-to-cost ratios for such initiatives.

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/ECAEXT/0,,contentMDK:22000203~pagePK:146736~piPK:146830~theSitePK:258599,00.html>.

CLIMATE CHANGE: FINANCING GLOBAL FORESTS. By Johan Eliasch, November 2008. Climate Change: Financing Global Forests is an independent report commissioned by the UK Prime Minister to address this vitally important issue. It assesses the impact of global forest loss on climate change and explores the future role of forests in the international climate change framework, with particular emphasis on the role of international finance. It also looks at the economic and policy drivers of deforestation and describes the incentives required to ensure more sustainable production of agriculture and timber in order to meet global demand while reducing carbon emissions. The report includes new modelling and analysis of the global economic impact of continued deforestation and provides a comprehensive assessment of the opportunity and capacity-building costs of addressing the problem. It shows that the benefits of halving deforestation could amount to \$3.7 trillion over the long term. However, if the international community does not act, the global economic cost of climate change caused by deforestation could amount to \$12 trillion. Johan Eliasch makes a clear and forceful case for forests to be included in international carbon trading mechanisms. He calls for the international community to support forest nations to halve deforestation by 2020 and to make the global forest sector carbon neutral by 2030. For more information and to order the book, please refer to <http://www.earthscan.co.uk/?TabId=57029&v=451863>.

THE GLOBAL WARMING REGIME AFTER 2012: TOWARDS A NEW FOCUS. By Philippe Cullet, Economic & Political Weekly, July 2008. Global warming has been at the centre of international environmental law and policy at least since the early 1990s. In recent years, it has quickly become one of the main environmental issues and today attracts widespread media attention. Cullet argues that any understanding of global warming must consider the relative contribution to the problem by the richer countries and the rich, over

the poorer countries and the poor who are the most affected due to the problem. He asserts that the legal regime adopted to solve the issue should place the poor and human rights in the centre stage of a new entitlement-based strategy to address the issue. This framework would then involve the development of technology reducing greenhouse emissions in the richer countries and the transfer of the same to the poorer ones. <http://www.ielrc.org/content/a0802.pdf>