Trade and Development Monitor

Monthly E-Newsletter of South Asia Watch on Trade, Economics & Environment (SAWTEE)

Volume 7, Issue 1, January 2010

CONTENTS

OPINION IN LEAD

Bilateral FTAs rule as SAFTA loses

South Asia is witnessing a proliferation of bilateral free trade agreements (FTAs) even as its regional trading arrangement—the Agreement on South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA)—fails to move intra-regional trade significantly. Both intra-regional and trans-regional FTAs are in vogue. The first type includes the Indo-Bhutan Trade Agreement; the Indo-Nepal Trade Treaty; the Indo-Sri Lanka FTA; and the Pakistan-Sri Lanka FTA. The second type includes the Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement between India and Singapore; the India-Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) FTA; the Pakistan-China FTA; and the Pakistan-Iran Preferential Trade Agreement. Moreover, several other such agreements are in the pipeline. The early harvest programme between Pakistan and Malaysia is to be converted into a full-fledged FTA soon. India is negotiating an FTA with the European Union (EU).

Pakistan has proposed an FTA with Nepal, while Bangladesh and Nepal are exploring the possibility of entering into an FTA.

If the trans-regional FTAs are driven particularly by South Asian countries desire to secure further market access opportunities outside the region as well as by the sluggish pace of World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiations, intra-regional ones—some of which are explained by historical ties and geographical reality—have received additional impetus by the sclerotic regional integration process, initiated in 1995 with the entry into force of the SAARC Preferential Trading Arrangement (SAPTA), which was replaced by SAFTA in mid-2006. Intra-regional trade in South Asia remains below 5 percent (4.8 percent in 2008, to be precise). Of course, this aggregate figure overlooks the high dependence of three small countries—namely, Afghanistan, Bhutan and Nepal—on the region for their trade. But then the seeming regional character of the foreign trade of these three countries owes to their overwhelming trade dependence on India and Pakistan.

Not all FTAs have had significant, positive impacts on bilateral trade. While trade between India and Sri Lanka has registered sharp and sustained growth since they signed an FTA in 1998, the growth in trade between Pakistan and Sri Lanka has slipped since their FTA came into effect in 2005. Two features are evident in South Asian intra-regional trade. On the one hand, excessive trade concentration with a single economy characterizes countries like Bhutan, Nepal and Afghanistan—all landlocked and least-developed countries—which do the bulk of their merchandise trade within South Asia (81.79 percent, 63.27 percent and 40.68 percent, respectively, as per IMF statistics), but are dependent on a single economy (India for Nepal and Bhutan; Pakistan for Afghanistan). On the other hand, in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, intra-regional trade makes up 2.41 percent, 6.18 percent, 11.52 percent and 17.33 percent of their total international merchandise trade, respectively. This points to the need for the former group of countries to diversity their trade relations within the region, and the latter to pursue more intense trade linkages within the region.

The spate of FTA formations within the region have several implications for regional trade.[*] The proliferation of bilateral FTAs in the region is likely to lead to the emergence of a “mini spaghetti bowl” with overlapping rules pertaining not just to the FTAs but also SAFTA, the WTO and various trans-regional FTAs. This complicates the trading arrangements within the region and makes it difficult to exploit the trade-investment nexus. There is a clear pattern of “hub and spoke” emerging within the region with India emerging as a hub and other countries such as Bhutan, Nepal and Sri Lanka emerging as spokes. This provides a hegemonic role to the hub, which can wield enormous leverage over its weaker trade partners in the region. The bargaining power of the weaker countries is very low when they individually negotiate with a powerful trading partner—they could get a better deal if an FTA were to be negotiated regionally. Scare negotiating capital will necessitate devotion of more resources to the agreement believed to be more beneficial to the country concerned. This is especially true of least-developed countries (LDCs). The resulting casualty is SAFTA negotiations, which are progressively becoming less attractive for countries that have an FTA with India. Just as multilateral trade liberalization is considered better than regional trade liberalization from the angle of trade creation vs. trade diversion, countries entering into FTAs instead of undertaking liberalization under a regional arrangement (SAFTA) can potentially result in trade diversion within the regional context.

SAFTA is in crisis, regardless of the direction of causality in relation to flourishing FTAs and the status of SAFTA—most likely, it is mutually reinforcing. In the three and a half years since it came into force, the regional FTA has remained largely ineffective in spurring intra-regional trade due mainly to long sensitive lists (accounting for almost 53 percent of the goods trade among member countries), various para-tariff and non-tariff barriers, onerous rules of origin that are difficult for LDCs to meet, and the scope of liberalization being limited to goods in spite of the potential gains from liberalization of services and investment. It is a measure of the inefficacy of SAFTA that Nepal has not exported any good to its South Asian neighbours utilizing SAFTA preferences. Apart from the limitations of SAFTA itself, intra-regional trade is also being impeded by poor regional transport connectivity and inhibitory transit arrangements. For example, Nepal’s trade with Bangladesh is not even 0.5 percent of its total foreign trade despite huge potential although only a 54-km strip of Indian territory separates the two nearest border points of the two countries. Likewise, a 20-foot container takes at least 30−45 days to move between New Delhi and Dhaka, at a cost of around US$2,500, whereas by rail, the time would be reduced to 4−5 days, and the cost would drop to around US$850.

Available data indicate that intra-regional trade in services is not significant in South Asia, and India accounts for the bulk of the existing services trade. South Asia is yet to exploit the advantage of the geographical proximity of its countries by building new partnerships in various sectors like energy, tourism, banking, information technology, telecommunications, transportation, education, health, and capital markets. Opening up services can lead to trade creation and, importantly, produce welfare gains for the weaker economies and help them bridge their trade deficit with India. FDI in South Asia is predominantly from outside the region, the exceptions being Bhutan and Nepal. In spite of India's huge internal market, investments from other South Asian countries have been quite insignificant, both in relative and absolute terms, accounting for less than 1 percent of total FDI in India.

In sum, pruning sensitive lists, relaxing rules of origin, opening up services, investment cooperation, and instituting a regional transit arrangement are crucial for injecting life into SAFTA and saving it from permanent obsolescence.

* See for details Adhikari, Ratnakar. 2009. *Intra-regional Free Trade Agreements: Implications for Regional Trade Integration in South Asia*. Briefing Paper, No. 9. Kathmandu: South Asia Watch on Trade, Economics & Environment (SAWTEE).

ANALYSIS

BASIC countries reiterate support for Copenhagen Accord, emphasize "two-track" process

At a time when the legal standing of the Copenhagen Accord (CA), the process through which it came into being and its implications for negotiations under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) are being debated, Brazil, South Africa, India and China—the so-called BASIC group—have underscored their support for the CA while at the same time emphasizing the centrality of the two-track negotiation process under the Bali Roadmap.

In a joint statement issued after their second meeting, held on 24 January 2010 in New Delhi—the first since the Copenhagen 15th Conference of the Parties (COP-15) to the UNFCCC—the environment ministers of the BASIC group recalled the "important and constructive contributions" of the group at COP-15 and in the finalization of the CA, and re-emphasized their commitment to working together with all other countries to ensure an agreed outcome at COP-16 in Mexico later this year.

While the statement described the CA as a political agreement representing a high-level political understanding among the participants on some of the contentious issues of climate change negotiations, the fact remains that the COP only took "note" of the CA, with several countries—including Bolivia, Cuba, Nicaragua, Sudan, Tuvalu and Venezuela—rejecting the three-page document, on both procedural and substantive grounds. It is not clear whether by "participants" the BASIC countries were referring to all the 193 parties to the UNFCCC or just themselves plus the United States (US) which spearheaded the birth of the CA after Denmark, the COP President, convened a controversial small meeting of 26 countries to thrash out an agreement. That the terms "take note of" and "notes" are neutral terms that constitute neither approval nor disapproval has been reiterated by the UN General Assembly on many occasions since it first made that interpretation in a decision on 7 September 2001.

The BASIC ministers underscored the centrality of the decision in the CA to carry forward negotiations under the two tracks of Ad hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA) under the UNFCCC and the Ad hoc Working Group on further emission reduction commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) in 2010 leading up to COP-16 at Mexico. The secretive process adopted in the drafting of the CA among a small group of countries notwithstanding, the ministers of the four emerging economies reiterated that all negotiations must be conducted in an inclusive and transparent manner. After the meeting, India's Environment Minister Jairam Ramesh said: "We support the Copenhagen Accord. But all of us were unanimously of the view that its value lies not as a standalone document but as an input into the two-track negotiation process under UNFCCC." The strong backing of the two-track negotiation process by the four emerging economies has raised hopes that the process would not be abandoned, as feared. They also called upon Denmark to convene meetings of the two negotiating groups—AWG-LCA and AWG-KP—in March 2010 and to ensure that the AWGs meet at least five times before COP-16 in Mexico. They emphasized that funding, logistics and other procedural issues should not be allowed to become a constraint in the convening of these meetings which are essential to make progress towards an agreed outcome at COP-16.

Procedural matters aside, the CA has also come in for sharp criticism for the absence of emissions reduction targets, even those already on offer in the run-up to COP-15. As per the CA, Annex I countries should submit their quantified economy-wide emissions reduction targets for 2020 to the UNFCCC secretariat by 31 January 2010, while non-Annex I countries, including the BASIC countries, should submit their voluntary mitigation actions to the secretariat by the same deadline. Amid uncertainty over whether the parties would meet the deadline, UNFCCC Executive Secretary Yvo de Boer on 21 January said the deadline was "soft". Nonetheless, in their Delhi meeting, the BASIC countries expressed their intention to communicate information on their voluntary mitigation actions to the UNFCCC by 31 January 2010. Brazil, China and India submitted their mitigation actions within the stipulated dateline, as did the US and the European Union (EU), among major economies.

Ahead of the Copenhagen talks, BASIC countries, which are among the fastest-growing emitters of greenhouse gases, had announced voluntary emissions control targets. China, the world's largest emitter of greenhouse gases accounting for 19 percent of global emissions, had declared that it would aim to reduce its "carbon intensity"—the amount of carbon dioxide emitted for each unit of gross domestic product—by 40-45 percent by 2020 compared with 2005 levels. India followed suit by announcing its plan to reduce its own by 20-25 percent compared with 2005 levels. Even earlier, Brazil had announced a "voluntary commitment" to reduce its growth of carbon emissions by 36-39 per cent up to 2020 from what they would otherwise be at that time. By far the boldest among the four countries, South Africa's offer was to take mitigation actions which would result in a deviation below the current emissions baseline of around 34 percent by 2020 and by around 42 percent by 2025. In the developed world, the US offered to cut emissions by about 17 percent by 2020 from 2005 levels while the EU said it would cut emissions by 20 percent by 2020 from 1990 levels unconditionally and by 30 percent if other nations deepen their reductions.

On the finance front, the BASIC environment ministers called on developed countries for an early flow of the pledged US$10 billion in 2010 with a focus on least-developed countries (LDCs), small island developing states and African countries, as proof of their commitment to urgently address the global challenge of climate change. The developed countries, in the CA, had committed to provide US$30 billion as new and additional funding for the period 2010-2012, with a balanced allocation between mitigation and adaptation. If the most vulnerable countries are to be the priority for the funding, the allocation ought to favour adaptation over mitigation, and the CA overlooks this aspect, as does the BASIC statement. Further, the BASIC statement does not clarify what the CA means by "international institutions" through which the funding is to be channeled, even though the "G77 and China" grouping has been pushing for a new financial mechanism devoid of the defects of the World Bank or the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). The BASIC statement missed an opportunity to call for the new finance to flow through existing funds under the UNFCCC such as the LDC Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund.

Despite the official support extended by BASIC countries to the CA, the process through which it emerged remains tainted. However, the support, accompanied by the unequivocal message that the two-track negotiation process remains sacrosanct, may encourage other countries to positively respond to the Danish Presidency's invitation to be associated with the CA, although its contents leave much to be desired.

OTHER NEWS

India’s trade talks with EU, Japan may spike proposal to ban e-waste

India’s free trade agreement (FTA) negotiations with EU and Japan are likely to prevent a proposal to ban trade in electronic waste (e-waste) from being incorporated in the draft rules to be notified by the environment ministry by March 2010.

Abhishek Pratap, senior campaigner, Greenpeace India, said the Union Ministry of Environment and Forests will notify the Electronic Waste Handling and Management Rule, under the Environment Protection Act by March 2010. He said stakeholders have proposed a clause in the rule to completely ban import and export of e-waste. However, experts say the FTAs being negotiated would facilitate trade of waste, including e-waste, oil contaminated products, and incinerator ash from developed economies into India, as there is apprehension that wastes would be included in the list of goods enjoying preferential tariffs. Krishna, convener, environmental body, Toxics Watch, said the FTAs will legitimize the already existing trade in waste.

E-waste includes used/discarded computers, mobile phones, air conditioners, refrigerators, and washing machines. About 50,000 tonne of e-waste is imported into India annually, according to an e-waste assessment study by Manufacturers Association of Information Technology and GTZ, an enterprise for sustainable development. E-waste in India is growing at 20 percent per annum (including both imports and self-generated), equivalent to the rate at which electronic equipments are being discarded globally.

According to Okechukwu Ibeanu, special rapporteur, United Nations Human Rights Council, e-waste is one of the most hazardous waste streams worldwide, as electronics contain over 50 chemicals or heavy metals that can affect health if not disposed of in an environmentally safe manner.

Source: DNA, India, 25.01.10, http://www.bilaterals.org/article.php3?id_article=16665.

Bangladesh government suggested to sign FTAs with three South Asian nations

An official body has recommended the Bangladeshi government to sign bilateral free trade agreements (FTAs) with India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka on goods in the first phase and similar deals on services and investment in the second phase.

Under the proposed FTAs, a Core Group (CG), formed by the government, strongly suggested the government to seek zero-duty facility for all Bangladeshi exports to the markets of the three countries and demand national treatment at the local level to avoid any additional duties and charges.

The CG, headed by Dr. Mohammad Ali Taslim, Chief Executive Officer, Bangladesh Foreign Trade Institute, has 12 members from public, private and research organizations. The Group recently submitted its report to the commerce ministry.

Presently, Bangladesh, India and Pakistan are the members of South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA), the Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation (BIMSTEC) and the Asia-Pacific Trade Agreement (APTA).

The report of the Group reads: “To begin with, bilateral FTAs should only cover trade in goods leaving the services and investments to be dealt with in the future or under separate bilateral agreements. In this regard Bangladesh should claim credit for signing unilateral agreements on investments in goods and services." The report recommends taking into cognizance negative and positive lists during the signing of the agreements.

A CG member said Dhaka could not reap benefit out of the duty-free market access facility offered by India under both SAFTA and bilateral approaches as extra levies like education tax, central value added tax, special central value added tax and additional countervailing duty are levied on products originating from Bangladesh. National treatment at local level means no additional duties and charges will be levied on Bangladeshi products which are not levied likewise on Indian, Pakistani or Sri Lankan products in their respective markets.

Presently, exports from Bangladesh to India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka constitute less than 3 percent of its total annual export earnings while its imports from these countries represent about 13 percent of its total imports.

Source: Financial Express, 08.12.09, http://www.bilaterals.org/article.php3?id_article=16458.

Trade facilitation draft text holds promise for developing countries

The World Trade Organization (WTO) secretariat, in December, announced that its Negotiating Group on Trade Facilitation—the committee charged with hammering out regulations to facilitate the movement of goods across national borders—had agreed upon a "draft consolidated text" to guide the group's negotiations in 2010.

The announcement marks an important step for the talks, which, if concluded, could bring significant gains to the economies of the developing world.

Broadly speaking, the trade facilitation committee has been tasked with slicing through the red tape that causes the movement of goods to slow at international borders. In WTO terms, the group has been mandated to "review and as appropriate, clarify and improve" relevant sections of three articles of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (1994): Article V (facilitating transit and trade), Article VII (limiting border fees and formalities), and Article X (making trade regulations transparent).

Updating and streamlining government regulations on these fronts could significantly boost exports from the developing world. But the issue has encountered its share of controversy since it was initially tabled at the WTO's first ministerial meeting, held in Singapore in 1996. From the outset, several developing countries fought the prospect of dedicated negotiations on trade facilitation. A new agreement on the matter could impose heavy administrative burdens on poorer countries, they argued, and additional legal obligations would make them more vulnerable to trade disputes. But those concerns were ultimately assuaged and official talks commenced during the summer of 2004. But developing countries managed to secure three major concessions: any new regulations would be accompanied by generous technical and financial support; the WTO would help them participate fully in the talks; and they would not have to take on any new commitments until they had been provided with the assistance they needed to help them do so.

The "draft consolidated text" (WTO document TN/TF/W/165) that was released in December reflects all of the proposals that delegations have put forward to date, but is heavily bracketed. Now, it only remains for negotiators to bring those elements into focus. The negotiations on Special and Differential Treatment for developing and least-developed countries will also need particular attention so to ensure that this area of the talks does not "lag behind."

Source: Bridges Weekly Trade News Digest, Vol. 14, No. 1, 13.01.10.

EU parliament group monitors EU trade pacts' impact medicine access

Trade agreements must not contain clauses on intellectual property rights that could imperil the poor's access to affordable medicines, a veteran member of the European Parliament

(MEP) has said. David Martin, a Scottish Labour Party MEP since 1984, expressed concern about the planned free trade agreement currently under negotiation between the European Union (EU) and India. Leaked drafts of the accord favoured by the European Commission, the EU's executive arm, include far-reaching provisions on intellectual property. These include a "data exclusivity" requirement, whereby major pharmaceutical companies would be able to block India's generic medicines industry from using the formulae with which new drugs are developed for a period of several years.

Because India is a leading exporter of low-priced generic medicines to other developing countries, such provisions could have repercussions far beyond the country, according to Martin. Martin is the chairman of the Parliament's working group on innovation, access to medicines and poverty-related diseases, which was launched in Brussels on 27 January. This cross-party alliance will monitor the extent of EU funding for the treatment of diseases that primarily affect the world's poor, as well as issues relating to the patenting of medicines.

One priority of the group will be to address seizures of generic medicines by customs authorities. During 2008 and last year there were several incidents in the Netherlands during which the transport of medicine was halted by customs officers, reportedly following requests by pharmaceutical companies suspecting that patents may have been infringed. Martin described the seizures as an attempt to disrupt the generic medicine trade and insisted that the consignments involved comprised "perfectly legitimate" drugs.

The humanitarian organization Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) will organize the new working group's activities. Tido von Schoen-Angerer, director of the MSF campaign on access to medicines, said the working group will seek to provide a counterbalance to the influence of the pharmaceutical industry over the Brussels institutions. This influence is particularly pronounced in the EU's trade talks with India, he added, voicing fears that the introduction of stricter patenting rules in India would make the generic medicines that MSF uses in its emergency relief programmes more expensive.

Initiated in 2007, the EU-India talks have so far yielded no concrete results. Yet both sides vowed to keep pursuing the talks when Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh met top-level EU representatives in November last year, with Singh signalling that a formal agreement may be concluded during 2010.

Jon Pender, a director of government affairs with the pharmaceutical firm GlaxoSmithKline, said that "we need to get the balance right" between protecting intellectual property and ensuring access to affordable medicines in developing countries. While he contended that patents "play an important role" in providing an incentive for the innovation of new treatments, he said that his company was "very open" to explore alternative approaches to regulating medical innovation. He also described the seizures of generic medicines as "very unfortunate" and denied that the pharmaceutical industry had persuaded customs authorities to clamp down on generics by equating them with counterfeit medicines.

Source: *www.ip-watch.org*, 28.01.10.

IMF proposes "Green Fund" for climate change financing

The world must adopt a low-carbon model for growth as it rebuilds from the global economic crisis, Dominique Strauss-Kahn, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), said at the World Economic Forum in Davos.

To help finance this shift in the global economy, the IMF is working on a set of proposals to create a multi-billion dollar "Green Fund" that would provide the huge sums—which could climb to US$100 billion a year in a few years—needed for countries to confront the challenges posed by climate change.

During a panel discussion on the future of the world economy, Strauss-Kahn said it was obvious that developing countries do not have the cash to finance the measures needed to tackle climate change while developed countries were saddled with enormous debts from combating the global economic crisis.

The IMF will start discussions with central banks and finance ministers on the feasibility of creating this Green Fund, possibly partly financed through the issuance of additional Special Drawing Rights (SDRs), a reserve asset created by the IMF.

Strauss-Kahn said that climate change financing was such a big issue that "it cannot be seen as a problem that cannot be solved." But because of the debt overhang from the global crisis it clearly needed alternative solutions. The IMF will release a paper in a few weeks setting out ideas on how the proposal can be financed.

Source: www.imf.org, 31.01.10.

Germany tops world logistics performance

The capacity of countries to efficiently move goods and connect manufacturers and consumers with international markets is improving around the world, but much more progress is needed to spur faster economic growth and help firms benefit from trade recovery, according to a new World Bank Group survey on trade logistics.

Germany is the top performer among the 155 economies ranked in the Logistics Performance Index (LPI), which is included in the report *Connecting to Compete 2010: Trade Logistics in the Global Economy*. The study is based on a world survey of international freight forwarders and express carriers who are asked to rate the performance of countries in six areas of the current logistics environment: efficiency of the customs clearance process; quality of trade and transport-related infrastructure; ease of arranging competitively priced shipments; competence and quality of logistics services; ability to track and trace consignments; frequency with which shipments reach the consignee within the scheduled or expected time. The score for each indicator and the overall index ranges from 1 to 5, with higher score indicating better performance.

According to the LPI, high-income economies dominate the top logistics rankings, with most of them occupying important places in global and regional supply chains. By contrast, the 10 lowest performing countries are almost all from the low-income and lower middle-income groups.

Although the study shows a substantial "logistics gap" between rich countries and most developing countries, it finds positive trends in some areas essential to logistics performance and trade. Some of them include the modernization of customs, use of information technology, and development of private logistics services. According to Bernard Hoekman, World Bank Trade Department Director, increasing logistics performance in low-income countries to the middle-income average could boost trade by around 15 percent and benefit all firms and consumers through lower prices and better quality services.

The report notes that among developing economies, logistics performance transcends the level of per capita income: Many countries perform better than what their income level would suggest. The 10 most significant over-performers include China (27), India (47), Uganda (66), Vietnam (53), Thailand (35), the Philippines (44), and South Africa (28). Likewise, the countries with significant improvement in performance between the two surveys (the 2007 and 2010 LPI) are often those which implemented comprehensive logistics and trade facilitation reforms earlier, such as Colombia, Brazil, and Tunisia.

In South Asia, the performance of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India and Nepal improved in terms of absolute score compared to 2007 LPI, while that of Pakistan and Sri Lanka worsened. India tops South Asian countries with a rank of 47, followed by Bangladesh (79), Pakistan (110), Bhutan (128), Sri Lanka (137), Afghanistan (143) and Nepal (147). The score of all South Asian countries except India is below three. The Maldives is not covered in the survey.

According to the study, logistics performance is heavily influenced by the quality of public sector institutions and the effective coordination of border clearance processes among all border management agencies. In this area, customs performs better than many other agencies, pointing to the need for border management reforms. In low performing countries, on average, half of the containers are physically inspected and one container out of seven at least twice. Other areas for improvement include better transport policies, increasing competition in trade-related services such as trucking, freight forwarding and railways, and better trade-related infrastructure. For many low-income countries the most binding constraints are often in logistics services and international transit systems. Given they perform better on many other indicators, improving trade infrastructure is often reported to be a priority for middle-income countries.

Adapted from www.worldbank.org.

ACTIVITIES

Post-Copenhagen discussion

SAWTEE, in collaboration with Oxfam, Novib, organized a regional policy dialogue on "Beyond Copenhagen: Agenda for South Asia" in Kathmandu on 28 December 2009. The objectives of the dialogue were to: analyse the Copenhagen Accord from the perspective of the South Asian region; discuss how some of the provisions of the Accord that are in favour of vulnerable developing and least-developed countries can be effectively implemented; and provide indicative suggestions on the position that South Asian countries should take in achieving a legally binding international climate agreement by 2010.

SAWTEE publications

Intra-regional Free Trade Agreements: Implications for Regional Trade Integration in South Asia, Briefing Paper, No.9, Author: Ratnakar Adhikari.

Intellectual Property Rights and Public Health: Lessons from Thailand, Policy Brief, No. 20, Author: Cecilia Oh.

The Conflict between Seed Bill and PPVFR Act of India: Lessons for Other South Asian Countries, Policy Brief, No. 19, Author: S. Bala Ravi.

International Regime on Access and Benefit Sharing: Negotiation Dynamics and South Asian Issues, Policy Brief, No. 17, Author: Prabhash Ranjan.

EDITOR

Paras Kharel

CONTACT

South Asia Watch on Trade, Economics & Environment (SAWTEE)
P.O. Box: 19366, 254 Lamtangeen Marg, Baluwatar, Kathmandu, Nepal
Tel: 977-1-4415824, 4444438 Fax: 977-1-4444570
Email: enewsletter@sawtee.org
Web: www.sawtee.org

In order to subscribe or unsubscribe, send us an email with subject: "subscribe" or "unsubscribe".