



# Bridges Trade BioRes

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

Volume 9 · Number 18, 16 October 2009

## Climate Change

Denmark Issues Warning as Climate Talks Near 1	
Delhi Conference Sees Some Progress toward Tech Package in a Climate Deal.....	3
India, China Ink Deal to Cooperate on Climate Change.....	4

## Environmental Goods

GE Calls for Stand-Alone Deal on Environmental Goods and Services.....	6
--	---

## In Brief

Environmental Group Disputes Effectiveness of REDD Project.....	7
Brazil Moves to Restrict Foreigners' Land Purchases in the Amazon.....	8

## Events and Resources

Events.....	9
Resources.....	11

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/](http://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 issue of Bridges Trade BioRes was edited by interim editors Trineesh Biswas and Paige McClanahan.

Contributors to this issue were Ahmed Abdel Latif, Michelle Athanas, Trineesh Biswas, Thais Macedo and Paige McClanahan.

The Director is Ricardo Meléndez-Ortiz.

ISSN 1682-0843

## CLIMATE CHANGE

### Denmark Issues Warning as Climate Talks Near

Just six weeks before climate negotiators descend on Copenhagen to try to hammer out a global deal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, Denmark's prime minister gave a frank and surprisingly pessimistic assessment of the meeting's prospects.

"We do not think it will be possible to decide all the finer details for a legally binding regime" at the Copenhagen meeting, Danish Prime Minister Lars Loekke Rasmussen said ahead of a European climate summit on Thursday.

Later, speaking on the BBC show Newsnight, he urged heads of state, particularly the US president, to attend the conference.

"Without the presence of heads of state and governments we can't close a deal which can come into immediate effect and can be implemented immediately," Rasmussen said. "It is a direct call to President Obama, but not only to him."

UK Prime Minister Gordon Brown has already said he plans to attend the meeting, which will kick off on 6 December. President Obama will be in the region to accept the Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo on 7 December, but he is unlikely to attend the Copenhagen meeting, according to recent media reports.

The reality-check tone from the Danish head of state is telling, observers say. Denmark, the meeting's host, has been a stalwart cheerleader of the talks, but with time running out and negotiators still deeply divided, the Danish government appears to be increasingly concerned about managing expectations.

Some analysts say that if the two-week Copenhagen meeting fails to produce a new legally binding text, negotiators may reconvene six months later for a so-called 'COP-15 bis' - that is, a follow-up round to December's 15th Conference of the Parties of the UN climate convention. But even six months may not allow enough time for the US political landscape to shift sufficiently in favour of a strong emissions-cutting pact, some analysts say. More time could result in a stronger agreement; perhaps, some say, a bad climate deal would be worse than no deal at all.

### **Major Economies Forum tackles climate financing**

But as the Copenhagen clock ticks away, negotiators are continuing to push ahead. Some progress has been achieved recently, namely on the subject of climate financing.

High-level officials from 16 industrialised nations plus the European Union focused on climate change at a two-day meeting of the Major Economies Forum in London on 18 and 19 October.

"There are now fewer than 50 days to set the course for the next few decades, so as we convene here we carry great responsibilities, and the world is watching," British Prime Minister Gordon Brown told the officials. "I believe agreement at Copenhagen is possible, but we must frankly face the fact that our negotiations are not getting to agreement quickly enough."

But while the meeting brought no major breakthroughs, the officials did succeed in finding at least a small slice of common ground. A communiqué issued after the meeting said that there was "substantial agreement" that "significantly scaled up financing will be important" in any climate deal, media sources reported.

Financing from developed countries to support poorer nations' mitigation and adaptation efforts is a commitment under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Developing countries have repeatedly stressed that rich nations have so far failed to deliver on financing; they insist that their ability to contribute

to future mitigation is contingent on fulfilment of this commitment.

Officials at the London meeting further agreed that all countries except the poorest will provide regular inventories of their national emissions, with the qualifier that such "transparency mechanisms" would "respect the sovereignty of countries." The communiqué called on G20 finance ministers to "advance these discussions" further at their meeting in St. Andrews in Scotland, that is scheduled for 6 and 7 November.

"There was a universal view that we need to get an agreement in Copenhagen - not an agreement at any price, but that we've come a long way and we intend to translate that into an agreement by the end of the year," Ed Miliband, Britain's Energy and Climate Secretary, told journalists after the meeting closed on Monday.

The Major Economies Forum comprises Australia, Brazil, Britain, Canada, China, Denmark, the European Union, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Russia, South Africa, Sweden and the United States. The countries of the MEF account for roughly 80 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions.

### **More information**

A full transcript of Prime Minister Brown's speech is available here: <http://www.number10.gov.uk/Page21033>

ICTSD reporting; "Major Economies Forum narrows divergence on climate change negotiations," XINHUA, 19 October 2009; "East-West divide stalls EU climate funding talks," EURACTIV, 30 October 2009.

---

## Delhi Conference Sees Some Progress toward Tech Package in a Climate Deal

Climate change technology plays an essential role in reducing emissions of greenhouse gases and in addressing the effects of climate change. Increasing developing countries' access to that technology has been at the heart of global climate change negotiations. However discussions on technology transfer, as on other key issues such as mitigation commitments and finance, have witnessed wide disagreements, particularly between developed and developing countries.

In this context, the recent High-Level Conference 'Climate Change: Technology Development and Transfer', held in New Delhi on 22 and 23 October, achieved some progress in identifying elements of a possible technology transfer package to be part of a wider global climate deal. The officials' aim is to reach agreement on tech transfer in time for the major meeting of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) that will be held in Copenhagen in December. The Delhi gathering was attended by officials from 58 countries and nearly 30 ministers and vice-ministers of the environment.

The conference was preceded by controversy in India about possible changes in India's position in the negotiations. Media reports had disclosed a letter by the Indian Minister for Environment Jairam Ramesh to Prime Minister Manmohan Singh suggesting a deviation from the 1997 Kyoto Protocol on climate change, which puts the burden of cutting greenhouse gas emissions primarily on developed countries' shoulders. But the Indian minister later took a step back, saying that his letter had been misinterpreted and taken out of context.

At the outset of the meeting, Prime Minister Singh made a forceful statement reaffirming the well-known Indian position. "Developing countries cannot and will not compromise on development," Singh told the conference. However, as "responsible members of the global community we also do recognise that we, along with other members of the global community, must do our bit to keep our emissions footprint

within levels that are sustainable and equitable," he added.

He recalled that India's per capita consumption of primary energy was less than one-fourth of the world average and that its per capita emission of CO<sub>2</sub> was among the lowest in the world. "Equating GHG emissions across nations on a per capita basis is the only just and fair basis for a long-term global arrangement on climate change which is truly equitable," he said.

The Delhi conference was preceded by high-level consultations between India and China, during which the two countries signed a bilateral partnership agreement on combating climate change.

### Elements of convergence on a technology transfer package

Participants at the Delhi conference agreed on the need to move beyond an 'abstract' discussion and examine the "specifics and concrete aspects" of putting in place international cooperative mechanisms for climate change technology development and transfer.

In this regard, the Delhi statement on Global Cooperation on Climate Technology, which was adopted by the conference, reflected converging views on some key elements of a possible technology transfer package for Copenhagen: enhanced technological cooperation, including joint research and development of new technologies and products; the possibility of creating a new network of technology centres; the need for periodic assessment, evaluation and expert guidance on new and emerging technologies; the key role of technology financing, in particular public financing; and finally, the critical need to improve access to and deployment of technologies to enable countries to adapt to the effects of climate change.

### Parallel made with Green Revolution

At the opening session, Mohamed Nasheed, the president of the Maldives, drew a parallel between the Green Agricultural Revolution of the 1960s and 1970s - which significantly increased agricultural productivity through the diffusion of

new technology - and what he called the 'Green Power Revolution', which he said is needed today to address climate change. Nasheed urged India to show on climate change technology the same leadership it had demonstrated in leading the Green Revolution.

This parallel became a primary theme of the Delhi conference. Many speakers from both developed and developing countries pointed to the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research - a food-centred research network known as CGIAR - as a possible model for research collaboration in the area of climate change technologies.

A proposal from India would see the creation of an international network of Climate Innovation Centres (CICs) which would act as vehicles for enhancing technology innovation and capacity building in developing countries. Such a network of centres could draw on the CGIAR experience, India and other countries suggested.

The experience of the Montreal Protocol was also presented and discussed. In this regard, the conference's final statement invited officials to draw lessons from the successful examples of past partnerships - such as those that took place under the Montreal agreement - in discussions on future mechanisms for technology cooperation.

### Disagreements on IPRs persist

Intellectual property rights (IPRs) have been one of the most contentious issues in the talks on climate change and technology transfer. The Delhi conference was no exception in this regard. The meeting's final statement avoided any reference to IPRs, in view of the persistent disagreements on the matter.

At the outset of the meeting, the Indian Prime Minister referred to climate change technologies as "global public goods." He further stressed that "the IPR regime applied to those goods should balance rewards for innovators with the need to promote the common good of humankind." He made reference to the approach that had been adopted successfully in the case of pharmaceutical technologies for the benefit of HIV/AIDS victims in developing countries. The moral case for

adopting a similar approach to protect our planet is equally compelling, Singh said.

UNCTAD Secretary General Supachai Panitchpakdi mentioned that developing countries should also be encouraged to make full use of the flexibilities within existing IPR agreements. "There may even be a case to revisit those agreements in light of the scale of the climate challenge," he added.

Developed countries say that strong IPRs are a pre-requisite to innovation and investment in clean technologies, and they have fiercely resisted moves to water down IP regimes in a climate deal.

After the adoption of the statement, the Indian Minister of the environment emphasised that the absence of any mention of IPRs in the Delhi statement did not mean that the vigorous debate on the issue had come to an end.

Despite its informal nature, the Delhi conference - by bringing together critical players and identifying some key elements for convergence - appears to have boosted the odds that climate negotiators will be able to strike an agreement on technology transfer at the Copenhagen meeting.

ICTSD reporting.

---

## India, China Ink Deal to Cooperate on Climate Change

One month before a high-profile climate change conference in Copenhagen, as global leaders position themselves to be seen as problem solvers and not makers, China and India signed a bilateral agreement pledging partnership to tackle climate change.

The agreement promises continued coordination at international climate meetings and seeks to broaden joint research and development into emissions-reducing technologies, in areas such as wind, solar, forestry and even 'clean coal'.

The memorandum of understanding was signed in New Delhi on 21 October by India's environment minister, Jairam Ramesh, and Xie Zhenhua,

minister and vice-chairman of China's National Development and Reform Commission.

The signing coincided with a workshop on the two countries' climate change policies. The workshop also examined how China and India stood to be affected by global warming in similar ways, not least because of their population's reliance on increasingly fragile water sources that are heavily threatened by the impacts of climate change.

Common interests on climate change between the world's two most populous nations – from vulnerability to its adverse affects, to the need to restrain emissions while reducing poverty –were a repeated theme in New Delhi.

“Both India and China are collaborating to ensure a fair and equitable outcome at Copenhagen,” said Ramesh, according to a report by Bloomberg. “There is virtually no difference in Indian and Chinese negotiating positions.”

Xie, for his part, noted that “India and China are most vulnerable to climate change.” He noted that both countries were in the process of “rapid industrialisation and urbanisation” –which are linked to increased carbon emissions – and expressed confidence that both would “make a positive contribution to Copenhagen.”

Both ministers promised to cooperate in Copenhagen. Ramesh called the accord an important step in Sino-Indian relations, reports Xinhua.

The agreement, which is available on the Indian environment ministry's website (<http://moef.nic.in/index.php>), will be valid for five years. Apart from establishing diplomatic processes for exchanging views on international climate change negotiations and domestic policies, few of its provisions entailed specific action, calling simply for enhanced cooperation and information exchange on a range of issues, from supporting adaptation to the adverse impacts of climate change to developing green technologies and better forest management.

In a nod to the ongoing UN climate talks, the agreement stressed that “developed countries

should take the lead in... reducing their greenhouse gas emissions and providing financial resources, technology transfer and capacity building support to developing countries.” It stated that the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and its Kyoto Protocol remained “most appropriate framework for addressing climate change.”

The Kyoto Protocol, which was never ratified by the US Congress, includes binding emission targets for industrialised countries, but not for developing ones such as the rapidly growing economies of China and India.

The US and the EU, as well as other developed countries, are pushing for a departure from this approach in the successor agreement, with binding caps for emerging economies as well.

China and India have rejected these demands, arguing that such legal limits would unjustly inhibit their economic development. They have, however, announced national plans to decrease carbon emissions per unit economic output.

Although China recently surpassed the US as the world's leading carbon emitter, its per capita emissions levels remain substantially lower than those in the West. Indian per capita emissions levels are significantly lower than more-industrialised China's.

Xie and Ramesh reiterated calls for developed countries to step forward with bold emissions cuts and promises of financial and technology transfer, blaming their failure to do so for the diminishing hopes for a far-reaching deal in Copenhagen (see related story, this issue). By signing the bilateral cooperation pact, the ministers hoped to send two signals to developed countries: one, that they were indeed doing their part to combat climate change, and two, that they are a force to be reckoned with as governments around the world race to gain a foothold in the production of emissions-reducing technologies.

The Indian minister's repetition of longstanding views matched New Delhi's furious denial of media reports published days before recent meeting that Ramesh, in a confidential memo to the prime minister had recommended that India

accept binding emissions targets even in the absence of guarantees of money and technology. This would have represented a shocking shift in India's negotiating position.

Ramesh said that the reports distorted his message. In a 20 October statement, he said that while "some flexibility in India's stance" was possible, "India will never accept internationally legally binding emission reduction targets or commitments as part of any agreement or deal or outcome." He did say that New Delhi would consider international measurement, reporting and verification of its mitigation actions, but "only when such actions are enabled and supported by international finance and technology."

ICTSD reporting; "China, India sign agreement of co-op on climate change," XINHUA, 21 October 2009; "China, India Sign Climate Change Cooperation Accord," BLOOMBERG, 21 October 2009; "Jairam for major shift at climate talks," TIMES OF INDIA, 19 October 2009; "India-China Partnership on Combating Climate Change to strengthen bilateral dialogue poses toughest challenge to US and Europe," INDIA DAILY, 21 October 2009.

## ENVIRONMENTAL GOODS

### GE Calls for Stand-Alone Deal on Environmental Goods and Services

General Electric, the iconic US-based multinational technology and services conglomerate, is calling for governments to cut tariffs and other barriers to trade in environmental goods and services in order to help combat climate change.

WTO members should strike an 'environmental goods and services agreement' (EGSA) without waiting for a broader deal in the long-running Doha Round of trade negotiations, according to Thaddeus Burns, GE's senior counsel for intellectual property and trade.

In a paper prepared for a 22-23 October conference on trade, energy, and the environment,

Burns argued that tariffs and domestic purchasing requirements on products like wind turbines and solar panels increase the cost of clean energy investments, undermining governments' efforts to cut greenhouse gas emissions.

Liberalising trade in environmental goods and services is one of the many issues under consideration in the Doha negotiations. However, with a broad multilateral trade deal nowhere in sight after nearly eight years of negotiations, Burns said that "it is time for governments to make a firm commitment to reducing the costs they impose on EGS." He rejected suggestions that taking EGS liberalisation out of the struggling negotiations would undermine the Doha Round, saying "it makes little sense to delay action on climate-change related cost reduction." Other business interests, including the Washington-based National Foreign Trade Council, have made similar appeals.

It is not without precedent in the WTO for a group of countries to agree to cut tariffs on a particular class of goods outside the context of a trade round. For instance, in 1997 a group of major traders enacted the Information Technology Agreement, which cut tariffs on a wide range of IT products. In principle, there is no reason why a critical mass of WTO members could not do the same for environmental goods, a point that ICTSD and other analysts have made for several years.

GE has an interest in seeing major markets cut tariffs on wind turbines and other clean energy technology: it is the world's second largest manufacturer of wind turbines, behind Denmark's Vestas and ahead of Spain's Gamesa, Germany's Enercon, and India's Suzlon. Burns' paper noted that the majority of WTO members still levy tariffs on wind turbines, ranging from 14 percent in Brazil and Mexico, to 8 percent in China and Korea, and 2.7 and 1.3 percent respectively in the EU and the US. Significant tariffs also face solar panels and gas turbines: India levies duties of 15 percent on the former and 7.5 percent on the latter.

Burns' paper also pointed to non-tariff barriers that were "often even more destructive to greenhouse gas reduction goals and worldwide

economic recovery than traditional tariffs.” ‘Buy domestic’ requirements and other local content restrictions in China, the US, and two Canadian provinces were closing off opportunities to foreign suppliers. An EGSA that addresses these non-tariff barriers would make cleaner energy technologies cheaper, he said.

GE envisions a multi-step process for implementing an EGSA: first, a subset of WTO members accounting for the bulk of existing trade would eliminate tariffs on a list of products (all WTO members, not just participants, would receive the concessions). Next, more countries could join, and coverage could extend to more products, services, and non-tariff barriers.

The Doha Round talks on EGS liberalisation have long been blocked over disagreements among members on which goods should be covered. And within the framework of the round, large developing countries have jealously guarded their freedom to choose whether to sign on to initiatives slashing tariffs across entire industrial sectors.

Any separate agreement on environmental goods and services would be likely to face the same problems.

This became apparent at the conference, held at WTO headquarters, when a senior Brazilian diplomat noted that clean-burning ethanol would deserve to be part of an EGS deal. Ethanol, however, faces tariffs of over 40 percent in the EU and the US, where ethanol producers are heavily subsidized and politically influential. Oil, in contrast, enters duty free. “If people are serious about emissions, why tax clean, renewable fuels while dirty, non-renewable and price-volatile oil is admitted duty-free?”, asked Flavio Damico, Brazil’s deputy ambassador to the WTO, according to a report from Reuters. He observed that even measures intended to promote sustainable development could be discriminatory.

The US government has made proposals similar to GE’s call for an EGSA in the past. In late 2007, just before an important UN climate conference, Washington joined hands with the EU to urge all major economies to eliminate tariffs on a list of ‘climate-friendly’ goods - but not ethanol. At the

time, several developing countries complained that the list did not adequately reflect products in which they had an export interest (see Bridges Trade BioRes, 18 December 2007, <http://ictsd.net/i/news/biores/9151/>).

Nefeterius McPherson, a spokesperson for the US trade representative’s office, said the US “remain[ed] eager to move ahead with negotiations to eliminate tariff barriers on climate-friendly technologies and spur momentum on a larger WTO Doha package on environmental goods and services.” However, she declined to comment on whether an EGS agreement should also cut tariffs on ethanol, along with subsidies to biofuels and government support for fossil fuel production.

ICTSD reporting; “GE calls for trade deal in environmental goods,” REUTERS, 23 October 2009.

## IN BRIEF

### Environmental Group Disputes Effectiveness of REDD Project

A major private-sector project to reduce carbon emissions through forest management in Bolivia is a ‘scam’, environmental group Greenpeace said in a report released earlier this month. The NGO claims that the environmental and social benefits of the initiative have been grossly oversold, although the project sponsors - along with some other green groups - insist that the efforts have been worthwhile.

The report was released as climate negotiators prepare for a major meeting in Copenhagen in December. The notion of including a mechanism on reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation, or REDD, has gained wide support in the talks, but a deal has yet to be struck.

In the Bolivia project, three major US energy corporations - American Electric Power (AEP), BP Amoco (BP), and PacifiCorp - joined forces with the Bolivian government in the biggest-ever attempt to curb climate change by reducing deforestation. The initiative, called the Noel

Kempff Climate Action Project (NKCAP), sought to create carbon credits that the participating countries could sell on carbon markets to 'offset' their greenhouse gas emissions. Nevertheless, some environmental organisations, specifically Greenpeace, claim to have found numerous pitfalls in this approach.

The recent Greenpeace report, entitled "Carbon Scam," compares the project's pledges to its actual emissions reductions, as determined by the findings of an extensive investigation conducted by Greenpeace. Based on this report, Greenpeace concluded that NKCAP fell short of its overall goal to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, failed to effectively monitor leakage, and did not provide benefits to local communities. Moreover, the NGO argued, the project sponsors have not proven that the forests that were ostensibly protected by the NKCAP would have been demolished in the absence of the project. The report also alleges that NKCAP sponsors overestimated the project's emissions cuts by 90 percent, misrepresented recent deforestation trends in Bolivia, and left unanswered many vital questions.

But NKCAP officials, joined by numerous environmental organisations, have refuted many of Greenpeace's claims. The project should be seen as a first step toward fulfilling "the rigorous requirements that are now being used for tropical forest conservation," said Glenn Hurowitz, the Washington director of Avoided Deforestation Partners and a former Greenpeace employee.

Moreover, several forestry experts have said that NKCAP's overestimation of pollution cuts is the result of enhanced computer models and satellite technology that adjusted the baseline for what would have occurred if the project had not been conducted. Supporters of the project emphasise that it is an experiment that can help inform future national legislation and help improve other REDD programmes. Sarene Marshall, the deputy climate change director of Nature Conservancy, called the project a successful learning process that has unmistakably proven that such projects can work.

While both sides have gathered facts and figures, much of the debate comes down to how such data are interpreted. Greenpeace claims that REDD

offsets are among the least reliable, lowest-quality offsets available, using the NKCAP as an example. Conversely, other environmental groups and NKCAP supporters believe that this specific project has provided an ample amount of information for future REDD agreements. Moreover, the initiative has proven that REDD projects can attract the private capital needed to build developing nations' capacities to manage forest carbon programmes, they say.

### More information

The Greenpeace report is available here: <http://www.greenpeace.org/raw/content/usa/press-center/reports4/carbon-scam-noel-kempff-clima.pdf>

"CARBON SCAM: New Greenpeace report exposes how coal and oil companies are trying to use forest offset projects to cheat the climate," GREENPEACE, 15 October 2009; "Green Groups Clash Over Reliability of Forest-Based Carbon Offsets," THE NEW YORK TIMES, 15 October 2009; "Use of Forests as Carbon Offsets Fails to Impress In First Big Trial," THE WASHINGTON POST, 15 October 2009; "Greenpeace Questions Rain Forest Project," THE NEW YORK TIMES, 15 October 2009; "Carbon Scam: Noel Kempff Climate Action Project and the Push for Sub-national Forest Offsets," GREENPEACE, October 2009.

---

## Brazil Moves to Restrict Foreigners' Land Purchases in the Amazon

In an effort to combat 'biopiracy' and regulate the Amazon rainforest's occupation by foreigners, the Brazilian House of Representatives approved on 13 October a bill that restricts the purchase of land in the region by non-Brazilians.

The proposed legislation imposes two conditions for foreigners to acquire rural property in the Amazon region: the property must not exceed roughly 1500 hectares, and the potential purchaser must have lived in Brazil for at least ten years.

The legislation also includes a clause that requires purchased property to be productive so that it

might fulfil its 'social function'. Properties acquired before the law's enactment - even those that exceed the 1500-hectare limit - might be kept, as long as the proprietors can prove the land's productivity. For this, the government will conduct a survey of all foreign-owned properties in the region. If the latter measure is accomplished, it will mean a great step forward in the monitoring policy for the region.

In a strategic move, the bill also forbids the purchase of land in the Amazon region that borders other countries. The 150-kilometre area in question is critical for monitoring and controlling cross-border activities, especially the trafficking of genetic natural resources.

During a Parliamentary Investigation Commission on biopiracy, Parliamentarian José Genoíno showed his fellow lawmakers an advertisement from a Brazilian real estate agency that was aimed at foreigners. The ad offered large plots of land rich in mahogany, precious minerals, and animal fossils.

Brazil has long been concerned about the threat of bio-piracy - the illegal appropriation of indigenous knowledge about medicinal plants and other resources - but analysts say that previous efforts to regulate the issue have been insufficient. Many amendments and complementary bills have been put forward in the past ten years, but none has been turned into law.

The House-approved bill will now move to the Senate.

ICTSD reporting; translated and adapted from Pontes Quinzenal, Vol, 4, No 18

## EVENTS AND RESOURCES

### Events

For a more comprehensive list of events for the trade and environment community visit the BioRes online calendar, <http://ictsd.net/news/biores/events/>.

**Coming up in the next two weeks (30 October - 13 November):**

2-4 November, Lisbon, Portugal. OCEAN POWER: ACCELERATING INNOVATION IN OCEAN ENERGY DEVELOPMENTS. Ocean energy technologies are still in their infancy in comparison to other alternative energy sources, yet the rate of development is rapidly increasing. This conference aims to bring together leading international regulatory officials, industry experts, and project developers to discuss the key challenges in developing ocean energy projects, effective policies to encourage development, creating industry standards, improving collaboration between the public and private sectors, and the continued development of new and reliable technologies. For more information, contact Ben Leighton: tel: +971-4813-5211; fax: +44-207-900-1853; email: [ben.leighton@greenpowerconferences.com](mailto:ben.leighton@greenpowerconferences.com); internet: <http://www2.greenpowerconferences.co.uk/v8-12/Prospectus/Index.php?sEventCode=OP0911PT>

4-5 November, Paris, France. GLOBAL FORUM ON ECO-INNOVATION. This meeting, organised by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), will take stock of current knowledge on policies to support eco-innovation and four policy challenges: how to make environment and innovation policies mutually supportive; how to most effectively induce eco-innovation; how to support the diffusion of eco-innovation (in particular to developing countries); and the consequences of the economic crises and the stimulus packages on existing policies and instruments. For more information, contact the organisers: tel: +33-1-45-24-82-00; fax: +33-1-44-30-61-79; e-mail: [gfsd.eco-innovation@oecd.org](mailto:gfsd.eco-innovation@oecd.org); internet: <http://www.oecd.org/environment/innovation/globalforum>

10 November 2009. London, England. 2009 MINISTERS' SUMMIT: ROADMAP FOR RECOVERY - SUSTAINABLE TOURISM IN CHALLENGING TIMES. Jointly organised by the UN World Tourism Organisation and the World Travel Market, this summit will bring together ministers and leading tourism experts to determine the best course of action for the industry given the recent challenges of the

economic crisis. Discussions will be organised along the following themes: 1) Tourism: Tackling the Global Economic Crisis - focus on the impact of the current global crisis on tourism demand and innovative solutions; 2) Positioning Travel and Tourism in the Global Agenda - focus on the role tourism can play within the G20 initiative to stimulate the global economy, support poor countries facing the crisis and prepare for a Green Economic transformation; and, 3) The Way Forward: Future Challenges and the Transformation to a Green Economy - focus on the post-crisis industry, relevant structural changes and the need to pursue a green agenda. For more information, contact Geoffrey Lipman or Marcelo Risi: tel: +34-9156-78178; fax: +34-9156-78218; e-mail: [c...@unwto.org](mailto:c...@unwto.org); internet: [http://www.unwto.org/media/news/en/press\\_de\\_t.php?id=4452&idioma=E](http://www.unwto.org/media/news/en/press_de_t.php?id=4452&idioma=E)

10-11 November, Ismailia, Egypt. FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON "IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON NATURAL RESOURCES" Organised by the Suez Canal University and Egyptian Society for Environmental Sciences (ESES), this conference will offer outstanding international speakers on a wide range of key topics, including: impacts of climate change on natural resources; climate change and arid lands and desert margins; climate change and risk assessment; and climate change and sustainable development. The deadline for registration is September 1st. For more information, contact Hassan Mansour: email: [hmansour@uga.edu](mailto:hmansour@uga.edu); internet: [www.eses-catrina.com](http://www.eses-catrina.com)

10-12 November, Geneva, Switzerland. 5TH SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES OF THE CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION AND USE OF TRANSBOUNDARY WATERCOURSES AND INTERNATIONAL LAKES. This conference will review the progress achieved in the Water Convention's implementation and plan for the challenges that lie ahead. A wide variety of topics will be discussed ranging from ratification and implementation of the Convention, climate change adaptation in the transboundary context, and transboundary flood risk management to ecosystem services for water management. Furthermore, the meeting will feature a high-level

segment on the needs of Central Asian countries with regard to cooperation and sustainable management of transboundary water resources as well as the advantages of permanent cooperation. For more information, contact Olga Carlos: tel: +41-22-917-1926; email: [olga.carlos@unece.org](mailto:olga.carlos@unece.org); internet: <http://www.unece.org/env/water/mop5.htm>

### Other Upcoming Events:

30 November - 2 December, Jakarta, Indonesia. THIRD BUSINESS AND THE 2010 BIODIVERSITY CHALLENGE CONFERENCE. This conference, held in conjunction with the UNEP Business and Industry Global Dialogue, aims to strengthen business participation in CBD processes. The overall objective of this event is to effectively engage the private sector in addressing biodiversity by stressing the link between biodiversity and core business and by highlighting best case practices, including life cycle approaches and incentive mechanisms. Ways to scale-up business engagement on biodiversity issues and develop recommendations on collaborative actions that can be undertaken will also be explored. An additional goal is to identify opportunities for key partnerships or international initiatives between the business community and biodiversity organisations that would further support mainstreaming. For more information, contact the organisers: tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; email: [secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:secretariat@cbd.int); internet: <http://www.cbd.int/business3/>

1-2 February, London, UK. PROSPECTS FOR MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA ENERGY. This conference will explore the changing dynamics in North Africa and Middle East energy developments and discuss the impact of the recession on the regions. Participants at this event will have an opportunity to examine the current economic state of affairs in the leading oil and gas producing countries of North Africa and the Middle East, issues surrounding consumption and provision of energy for domestic development and energy for export, and prospects for domestic and foreign investment in the regions. Critical questions, such as these, will be addressed: Will Saudi energy consumption catch up with oil production, and what may be the role

of alternative energy sources to maintain oil exports? How is the increasing oil and gas consumption in the producing countries affecting global supplies? For more information, contact the organisers: tel: +44-020-7957-5753; fax: +44-020-7321-2045; email: [conferences@chathamhouse.org.uk](mailto:conferences@chathamhouse.org.uk); internet: [http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/mena\\_energy/](http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/mena_energy/)

15-17 February, San Francisco, California, USA. GEOPOWER AMERICA 2010. By bringing together governments, developers, and investors from North, Central, and South America, participants will have the chance to discover new business opportunities, learn the challenges faced by developers, and the prospects of the growing geothermal industry. This conference will explore the expansion of geothermal energy production in not only the US, but in other emerging markets of Canada, Central, and Southern America. For more information, contact the organisers: tel: +44-020-7099-0600; email: [info@greenpowerconferences.com](mailto:info@greenpowerconferences.com); internet: <http://www.geopowerseries.com/index.html>

---

## Resources

If you have a relevant resource (books, papers, bulletins, etc.) you would like to see announced in this section, please forward a copy for review by the Bridges staff to Andrew Aziz at [aaziz@ictsd.ch](mailto:aaziz@ictsd.ch).

HOW WOULD A TRADE DEAL ON SUGAR AFFECT EXPORTING AND IMPORTING COUNTRIES? By Amani Elobeid (Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute, Iowa State University). September 2009. This study examines how exporting and importing countries could be affected by a trade deal on sugar along the lines of that under discussion in the WTO's Doha Round, as well as in bilateral and regional negotiations. The author takes into consideration the preferential access arrangements that currently exist, recent historical trends in sugar trade in different countries and geographical regions, and the internal market reforms in importing regions such as the EU. With specific emphasis on market access, domestic support, and export competition, this study analyses the implication of the

December 2008 draft modalities proposal for specific sugar exporting and importing countries, as well as prospective bilateral and regional agreements. To access this study, visit: <http://ictsd.net/i/publications/57666/>

FOREST RESILIENCE, BIODIVERSITY, AND CLIMATE CHANGE. By Ian Thompson, Brendan Mackey, Steven McNulty, and Alex Mosseler. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. 2009. The secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) has launched a synthesis report on the concepts of ecosystem resilience, resistance, and stability in forests and their relationship to biodiversity, with particular reference to climate change. An explanation is given on major impacts of humans on forest ecosystems including loss of forest area, habitat fragmentation, soil degradation, depletion of biomass and associated carbon stocks, and species loss. The authors focus on forests' natural capacity to adapt to climate change because of their biodiversity while providing case studies on forestry in North America and Europe and the Amazon rain forest. This report strongly supports the conclusion that the capacity of forests to resist change, or recover following disturbance, is dependent on biodiversity at multiple scales. To access this report, visit: <http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-43-en.pdf>

INDIA, G77 PROPOSE TEXT AGAINST TRADE PROTECTION IN COPENHAGEN DRAFT. South Centre: South Bulletin (40), September 2009. By Martin Khor and Hira Jhamtani. This article discusses the issues brought forth during a preparatory meeting, for the Copenhagen conference under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), last August in Bonn. With trade protection in the name of climate change being a controversial issue during these talks, the Group of 77 (G77) and China have proposed that developed countries shall not to resort to any form of unilateral measures against goods and services imported from developing countries on grounds of protecting the climate as such measures violate the provisions of the UNFCCC and would transfer their mitigation burdens onto developing countries. The author goes on to explain how such measures would have a

distortive effect on international trade and how to avoid adverse economic consequences. To access this article, visit:  
[http://www.southcentre.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=1083&Itemid=279](http://www.southcentre.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1083&Itemid=279)