

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

RESTRICTED

WT/CTE/W/79

9 March 1998

(98-0962)

Committee on Trade and Environment

MARKET ACCESS IMPACT OF ECO-LABELLING REQUIREMENTS

Note by the Secretariat

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Note responds to the request by the Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE) for information on the market access impact of eco-labelling requirements. Previous Notes by the Secretariat on this subject include: (1) *Packaging and Labelling Requirements*, dated 14 June 1993 (TRE/W/12); and (2) *The Effects of Environmental Measures on Market Access, Especially in Relation to Developing Countries, In Particular to the Least Developed Among Them*, dated 26 March 1996 (WT/CTE/W/26).

2. The conclusions of recent studies conducted by international organizations on eco-labelling and its market access effects are presented in this Note. These organizations include:

- (i) the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP);
- (ii) the International Trade Centre (ITC);
- (iii) the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD);
- (iv) the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD); and
- (v) the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).

3. An update of the Secretariat Note entitled *Eco-Labelling: Overview of Current Work in Various International Fora*, dated 15 April 1997 (WT/CTE/W/45), is contained in an Annex to this Note.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL LABELS: AN OVERVIEW

4. Environmental labelling has been defined as "the use of labels in order to inform consumers that a labelled product is more environmentally friendly relative to other products in the same category."¹ The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) has classified environmental labels into three categories:²

- (i) *Type I* environmental labels are voluntary, multiple criteria-based third-party practitioner programmes that award labels claiming overall environmental preference of a product within a particular product category based on life cycle considerations.

¹UNEP (1997), *Criteria in Environmental Labelling: A Comparative Analysis of Environmental Criteria in Selected Labelling Schemes*, Environment and Trade (No. 13).

²ISO (1997), *Business Plan of ISO/ Technical Committee 207/ Sub-Committee 3, Environmental Labelling*.

- (ii) *Type II* environmental labels consist of informative environmental self-declaration claims. Such claims are made without third-party certification by manufacturers, importers, distributors, retailers or anyone else likely to benefit from them.
- (iii) *Type III* environmental labels are quantified product information labels based upon independent verification using preset indices.³

5. The term "eco-labels" generally refers to Type I environmental labels. Eco-labels are usually designed to achieve four policy goals: (a) improve the sale or image of a labelled product; (b) raise the environmental awareness of consumers; (c) provide accurate and timely information for consumers to make informed judgements; and (d) direct manufacturers to account for the environmental impact of their products.

6. Increasingly, they are being based on an environmental policy making tool known as *life-cycle assessment* (LCA). According to ISO, LCA is defined as:⁴

A systematic tool of assessing the environmental impacts associated with a product or service system to: build an inventory of inputs or outputs; make a qualitative evaluation of those inputs and outputs; and identify the most significant aspects of the system relative to the objective of the study. LCA considers the environmental impact along the continuum of a product's life (i.e. cradle-to-grave) from raw materials acquisition to production, use and disposal. The general categories of environmental impacts to consider include resource depletion, human health, and ecological consequences.

7. The United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) notes that to date, most eco-labelling schemes have not used comprehensive LCA. Rather, labels have been awarded on the basis of a limited number of environmental criteria considered by national authorities to be the most important with regards to

³In the *Summary Report of the Workshop on Life-Cycle Management and Trade*, organized by the OECD from 20-21 July 1993, environmental labels were also defined:

Multi-Issue Voluntary Labels provide environmental information on the overall environmental quality or characteristics of a product. They are generally administered by government-supported bodies, but are voluntary (examples of them include Germany's Blue Angel, the Nordic White Swan, Canada's Environmental Choice, etc.). They correspond to ISO's Type I labels.

Single-Issue Voluntary Labels provide environmental information on one aspect of a product and are usually placed on the product by the manufacturer or retailer. They include labels such as: "organically-grown", "energy-efficient", "ozone-friendly", and "recycled-content". They correspond to ISO's Type II labels.

Single-Issue Mandatory Labels provide environmental information on one aspect of a product and are required by governments. These labels frequently take the form of negative warnings, such as "flammable" and "eco-toxic", or indicate positive environmental characteristic, such as "biodegradable". They correspond to ISO's Type III labels.

According to the OECD, it is the first category of environmental labels that is referred to as 'eco-labels'.

⁴ISO / Technical Committee 207 / Sub-Committee 5 (1995), *Environmental Management - Life Cycle Assessment -Principles and Guidelines*.

the environmental effects of particular products. However, the overall trend in eco-labelling is to apply the cradle-to-grave approach.⁵

8. The design of eco-labelling schemes involves three different stages. The first stage is that of product selection. Such selection is usually undertaken by a committee composed of representatives from governments, scientific, environmental and religious communities, consumer groups, trade unions and industry. During the product selection stage, an assessment is made of the environmental impact of the product. The second stage is that of criteria determination. A technical committee establishes the criteria that products have to meet to obtain the label. The third and final stage, involves the inspection and licensing of applicants, as well as supervision of the overall implementation of the labelling scheme.

9. The overriding aim of eco-labelling schemes is to distinguish certain brands or makes of products having significantly less adverse environmental impact than others in their product category. Eco-labelling can only be effective if accepted and used as a marketing tool to increase sales or improve product or company image. This in turn relies on consumer awareness that some products are better or worse for the environment than others. While the intention of eco-labelling schemes is not to discriminate between products *per se*, they necessarily differentiate between products because only in this way can they identify the environmentally preferred products in a product category.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF RECENT STUDIES

A. The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

10. In a report on the *Trade Effects of Eco-Labelling*, ESCAP published the proceeding of a seminar on eco-labelling held in Bangkok, Thailand, from 17-18 February 1997. In addition to discussing the market access implications of eco-labelling for the exports of the ESCAP region, the report contains country case studies on the eco-labelling schemes of India, Indonesia and Singapore. On market access, the report states that:

Market access effects of eco-labels on the main importing partners of Asia varied significantly from country to country and from product to product. Although documented evidence that developing countries had been adversely affected by eco-labelling was not available, labour-intensive exports of South Asia, and timber-based exports of South-East Asia had been particularly sensitive to eco-labelling. It was also evident that the multifarious eco-labelling schemes were a source of uncertainty and confusion to exporters with implicit increased cost effects. As only a few exporters had obtained eco-labels, it was difficult to obtain empirical estimates on the costs of adjusting production processes to eco-labels. Nevertheless, there was increasing evidence that small and medium-scale exporters were more severely affected by environmental requirements than larger exporters.

11. Other findings of the report may be summarized as follows. Based on evidence from various country case studies, ESCAP states that the additional costs which producers incur to meet eco-labelling requirements vary. Following the ban of certain types of dyes, known as AZO dyes, in Germany in 1996, textiles companies in Thailand switched to AZO-free substitutes with additional costs of 5 to 20 per cent of total cost. It states that this was of limited concern to large companies, but of some impact on small ones. In contrast, the leather and textiles sectors in India were severely affected by

⁵UNEP (1997), *Criteria in Environmental Labelling: A Comparative Analysis of Environmental Criteria in Selected Labelling Schemes*, Environment and Trade (No. 13).

the bans on pentachlorophenol and AZO dyes. Access to eco-friendly substitutes was a problem as domestically available alternatives were either incompatible with existing processes of production or inappropriate in their existing form. Large companies reported adjustment costs of 8 to 10 per cent, while small companies reported costs of between 15 to 20 per cent.

12. The study notes that approximately 15 per cent of exports from the ESCAP region to OECD markets are environmentally sensitive.⁶ For South Asian countries the share is 30 per cent, which is the largest in the ESCAP region. This it states, suggests that South Asian countries may require particular assistance in complying with environmental measures in export markets (including eco-labels).

13. ESCAP states that transparency is needed to ensure that the interests of developing countries are taken into account in the eco-labelling schemes of developed countries. It also states that mutual recognition should be pursued between developed and developing countries, so that developing countries benefit from their own certification infrastructure and reduce the costs of obtaining eco-labels.⁷ However, further study of the concept is required.

14. The study also argues that eco-labels may create new export opportunities for environmentally friendly products. A number of initiatives have already been undertaken in the ESCAP region to develop environmentally preferable "green" products. An example is given of China's comprehensive plan for the development of organic foods.

15. The study also notes that a number of eco-labelling schemes have been established in the ESCAP region. However, according to the study, these may be viewed as a response to the proliferation of similar schemes in developed countries, and the pressure from environmental and consumer groups. Schemes exist in, for instance, India, the Republic of Korea, and Singapore. China, Indonesia and Thailand are also actively establishing their own eco-labelling schemes.

⁶No specific definition is provided of the term "environmentally sensitive" in the study, but it can generally be taken to mean products which either are or can be expected to become the subject of environmental regulations (including eco-labelling schemes).

⁷The concepts of equivalency and mutual recognition have been defined by UNEP as follows:

Equivalency denotes the idea that "when comparable environmental objectives can be achieved in different ways, taking into account the specific environmental conditions of each country, different criteria can be accepted as a basis for awarding eco-labels." The concept of equivalency can be applied in two circumstances. First, when no eco-labelling programme exists in the exporting country, the importing country could accept compliance with certain environmental requirements in the exporting country as "equivalent" to compliance with criteria established under the importing country's own eco-labelling programme. Secondly, if both countries have an eco-labelling scheme in operation, the concept of "equivalent" standards could serve as a basis for mutual recognition of eco-labelling schemes (See UNEP, 1997).

The Global Eco-Labelling Network (GEN), a non-profit association of eco-labelling organizations with a membership of 14 eco-labelling organizations from Europe, Asia, and North and South America, explores, amongst other things, the potential for equivalency and mutual recognition agreements.

ISO's sub-committee 3 is developing standards for environmental labels, establishing the principles to be adhered to in their design. Sub-committee 5 is developing standards for how LCA is to be conducted. Their work could contribute to more easily determining the equivalency of environmental objectives, and lead to increased mutual recognition agreements.

B. The International Trade Centre

16. The ITC organized a Workshop on Eco-labelling and Other Environmental Quality Requirements for the Trade of Developing Countries in Textiles and Clothing from 20-23 June 1995 in Geneva. In a report entitled *Eco-Labelling and Other Environmental Quality Requirements in Textiles and Clothing; Implications for Developing Countries*, the outcome of the workshop is summarized and some of the papers presented at the workshop included (these do not necessarily represent the views of ITC).⁸

17. The summary begins with the following general statement:

It was highlighted that quality improvement and quality assurance efforts undertaken by developing country exporters should include environmental protection improvements related to products and their packaging and associated production methods, since the total quality management approach encompasses the imperative to satisfy both consumer needs and expectations on the one hand and environmental protection needs on the other.

18. The Workshop noted that in many developing countries for whom textiles and clothing constitute a significant portion of their exports, both government and industry representatives are concerned about the fast changing environmental regulations that affect international trade in textiles and clothing. The following concerns are noted in the report:

Problems regarding eco-labels themselves included the fact that there was a multiplicity of schemes, that the criteria did not have a common range, that eco-labelling schemes did not take into account the type of particular environmental and labour conditions of individual developing countries, that some schemes lacked credibility and that the setting of standards was being rushed.

Problems for developing countries included the lack of local infrastructure for testing, auditing and verification procedures and the costliness of such procedure; the lack of technical know-how in developing countries which will take time to develop; the difficulty of controlling the various stages of the life-cycle of a product, especially in decentralized processes; the fact that small and medium industries were more affected by the high additional costs of using so called environmentally friendly inputs imported from developed countries. Furthermore, quality may be affected by environmentally friendly substitutes which have a bearing on environmental performance. Indeed, competitiveness may be affected by higher costs incurred in compliance with requirements.

19. At the workshop, it was stated that eco-labels could be more of a commercial and marketing tool rather than an environmental one. There are instances where consumer health is not directly affected by inputs which eco-labels attempt to regulate. It was also stated that little attention has thus far been given to the environmental problems involved in the processes of consumption and disposal.

20. Finally, the following concern was also raised:

Other areas of concern were that in certain cases, there is an extra-territorial application of environmental priorities of developed importing countries on developing supplier countries, and that there are other mechanisms, rather than eco-labels that may be more appropriate for securing environmental performance.

⁸ITC (UNCTAD/WTO) (1996), *Eco-Labelling and Other Environmental Quality Requirements in Textiles and Clothing. Implications for Developing Countries*, Trade and Development Services.

21. A number of recommendations emerged from the workshop, including, for instance promoting dialogue between developing and developed countries, having developing countries participate in the setting of criteria and standards, providing developing countries with technical assistance to improve their environmental performance, increasing harmonization and the mutual recognition of eco-labelling schemes, etc.

C. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

22. The two most recent UNCTAD reports on eco-labelling include: (1) *International Cooperation on Eco-Labelling and Eco-Certification Programmes and Market Opportunities for Environmentally Friendly Products*, and (2) *Trade, Environment and Development: Aspects of Establishing and Operating Eco-Labelling Programmes*.⁹ In the report on market opportunities, the following conclusion is reached:

With respect to eco-labelling, the report shows that, despite being directed primarily at environmental objectives, there is nevertheless concern that eco-labelling programmes may at times discriminate against foreign producers because of the ways in which they operate and may in effect act as a non-tariff barrier to trade. The coexistence of different eco-labelling schemes may compound problems for foreign producers, in particular exporters in developing countries, who have to obtain information to adjust to the requirements of different markets if they want to qualify for an eco-label.

The costs of adjustment for developing country firms that wish to comply with eco-labelling criteria may be significant. For developing country producers, the costs involved in the use of specific chemicals and other raw materials, capital investment, as well as testing and verification tend to be particularly relevant. Designing and producing a product that complies with eco-criteria may be particularly costly for small-scale producers. In addition, process-related criteria, which tend to be based on environmental and technological conditions in the importing country, may imply high costs for foreign producers and may be environmentally inappropriate in the context of their local conditions.

23. The report notes that the transparency of eco-labelling schemes is key for developing countries, and that equivalency and mutual recognition are also in their interest. UNCTAD distinguishes between product-related and process-related eco-labelling criteria. It argues that because product-related criteria address the impacts of a product on the environment of the importing country (consumption and disposal phases), the scope for establishing equivalent product-related criteria will be limited. On the other hand, because process-related criteria may address environmental problems experienced in the exporting country alone, greater scope exists for accepting as equivalent environmental criteria that reflect the environmental condition and priorities of the exporting country. Equivalency and mutual recognition would make compliance with eco-labelling requirements easier for developing countries.

24. UNCTAD also states that mutual recognition tends to be easier between countries which have comparable levels of development and which are already involved in trade agreements. In countries with different levels of economic development, eco-labels may be based on substantially different criteria, rendering mutual recognition more difficult. In such cases, UNCTAD argues that the initial harmonization of certain technical regulations, such as testing and inspection methods, would be necessary to achieve mutual recognition.

⁹UNCTAD (1994), *International Cooperation on Eco-Labelling and Eco-Certification Programmes and Market Opportunities for Environmentally Friendly Products*, Trade and Development Board, 6 October; and, UNCTAD (1995), *Trade, Environment and Development: Aspects of Establishing and Operating Eco-Labelling Programmes*, Trade and Development Board, 28 March.

25. On export opportunities for environmentally-friendly products, the report notes "that there may be trading opportunities for environmentally-friendly products from developing countries. Their environmental claims must, however, be credible." The strategies which developing countries may use to substantiate their environmental claims are identified and include: giving the right signals to their importers regarding their commitment to environmental issues at the firm, and using third party certification schemes to promote their exports.

26. In the second report on eco-labelling, similar conclusions are reached. However, the report addresses the problems faced by SMEs in greater detail. It states that they may encounter particular difficulties in complying with environmental standards, and meeting the requirements of eco-labels for the following reasons:

- (a) SMEs may lack access to the information, technology and capital needed to comply with eco-labels;
- (b) Limited economies of scale in SMEs may render certain investments unprofitable;
- (c) Small industrial sites can be constrained by the lack of physical space needed to instal environmental facilities (e.g. facilities for wastewater treatment);
- (d) SMEs may be unable to ensure that the raw materials they use are produced in accordance with the criteria set by the eco-labels;
- (e) SMEs may be unable to purchase the raw materials needed to comply with the labels at competitive prices; and
- (f) Testing and verification requirements associated with eco-labels may involve costs too high for SMEs to assume.

27. The report examines three sectors of export interest to developing countries: paper, textiles, and clothing and footwear. It states that "most sectoral studies point out that meeting the eco-criteria for certain products would have significant effects on competitiveness, particularly for small firms."

D. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization

28. In a survey on the *Implications of International Standards for Quality and Environmental Management Systems*, conducted by UNIDO (in cooperation with ISO and the ITC), the effects of environmental labels on trade are addressed.¹⁰ The survey is based on the response of 351 respondents from 63 developing countries and countries with economies in transition to standard questionnaires. Respondents are from (a) government departments, national standardizing bodies, certification and accreditation bodies; and, from (b) industry associations, chambers of commerce, and commercial enterprises.

29. The survey reaches the following conclusion:

Since respondents hardly have any experience with foreign labels, one third of them is unable to assess the effects of different national eco-labels on export opportunities. One in five (20 per cent) respondents from companies and business associations considers national eco-labels to impair exports, whereas half of them deny that. Small and medium sized companies are reported to be less affected than larger enterprises are. In comparison to that, a far greater number of institutional respondents (53 per cent) are of the opinion that different national labels hinder trade opportunities, those from South and East Asia being particularly pessimistic on this issue. Differences in the perceived threat to trade also may reflect the broader perspective

¹⁰UNIDO, ISO and ITC (1997), *Implications of International Standards for Quality and Environmental Management Systems*, Survey Results, October.

that respondents from government departments, standards bodies, certification and accreditation bodies have.

E. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development

30. In the Case Study on Eco-Labeling Schemes, the OECD examines the market, trade and environmental effects of a selection of eco-labelling programmes operating in OECD countries.¹¹ These include: the European Union (EU) Eco-label Award Scheme, the Nordic Swan, the Swedish Environmental Choice Programme, the Canadian Environmental Choice Programme, the German Blue Angel, the Green Seal of the United States (US), the Japanese Eco-Mark, and the French Norme Francaise (NF) Environment.

31. On the level of transparency and consultation involved in the design of eco-labelling schemes, the study states that all of the schemes which it reviewed contain mechanisms for transparency and consultation. However, it reaches the following conclusion in their regard:

Once product groups have been selected by the decision-making body, representatives of various interest groups generally participate in the expert group responsible for the development of eco-label criteria. The draft criteria are then available for public review before the final criteria are adopted by the decision-making body. The decision on the final eco-label criteria is generally not open to outside participation and the lack of consideration given to comments provided on the draft criteria has been the source of criticism. While no examples of overt discrimination have been found in the course of this study, for practical reasons, access to information and participation in criteria development will be more difficult for foreign producers which are not represented domestically.

32. The study notes that the more significant the market impact of eco-labelling schemes, the greater their trade effect. With respect to market impact it states that:

In practice, data concerning the market impact of eco-labelled products is difficult to obtain. It is often confidential information in the hands of industry. Some scattered anecdotal evidence shows that sales have increased when an eco-label has been obtained, but there is no statistical data in general to show the market power an eco-label may confer on a product. Producers however continue to apply for and pay for eco-labels, indicating that they have some market value. Also, it is difficult to separate out the impact on the market of the eco-label in isolation from other factors which may also influence the market share of products.

33. The study argues that eco-labelling schemes have been more successful in countries or regions which benefit from a high level of consumer environmental awareness. Environmental non-governmental organizations, consumer groups and the media have contributed to increasing consumer awareness of environmentally preferable products; and, "in certain cases, eco-labels have had a significant impact on the market for specific product categories (e.g. detergents in Sweden)." Also, as eco-labels continue to be awarded to a growing portion of the market in particular product categories (e.g. 30 per cent), eco-labelled products could become the norm, and influence the market access of non-eco-labelled products.

34. The OECD states that overall, eco-labelling has only been moderately successful with the individual consumer. However, eco-labels may have important market impact when retailers specify

¹¹OECD (1997), *Case Study on Eco-Labeling Schemes*, Joint Session of Trade and Environmental Experts, Paris, 12-13 February.

that they want to purchase eco-labelled products, or when they become a tool for identifying environmentally preferable products for government procurement (as in Canada's Environmental Choice and Japan's Eco-Mark) and institutional purchasing (as with Green Seal Environmental Partners).

35. Producers have been motivated to obtain eco-labels due to the fear of losing market share to eco-labelled competing products, and the desire to maintain competitive advantage. However, eco-labels have also been considered by manufacturers to be a valuable tool to communicate the environmental qualities of their products and companies, to improve their image.

36. With respect to trade effects, the OECD states that "this study has not revealed hard evidence of trade effects arising from eco-labelling." However, it also notes that:

Eco-labelling schemes raise particular trade concerns when they include production-related criteria. Such criteria can discriminate against imports when they reflect exclusively the environmental conditions and preferences of the importing country, particularly for developing countries and countries depending heavily on exports.

37. However, in examining which of the schemes reviewed include production-related criteria, it concludes that only a limited number of eco-labels include requirements exclusively related to the environmental effects which occur during the production phase. It adds that few eco-labels in the schemes reviewed, have been developed for products of specific export interest to developing countries.

38. To minimize the potential trade effect of eco-labels, the study states that equivalency and mutual recognition play an important role. Attempts at equivalency and mutual recognition have already been made between Canada's Environmental Choice Programme and Green Seal of the US, and through bilateral cooperation between Terra Choice Environmental Services (the private consultancy firm running Canada's Environmental Choice Programme) and the Green Mark Programme implementation body in Taiwan

ANNEX

Update of "Eco-Labeling: Overview of Current Work in Various International Fora" (WT/CTE/W/45)

A. The Codex Alimentarius Commission

The Codex Alimentarius Commission, which had prepared *Draft Guidelines for the Production, Processing, Labelling and Marketing of Organically Produced Foods*, expects the Guidelines to be discussed in the next meeting of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling in May 1998.

B. The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) has produced a 1997 report entitled the *Trade Effects of Eco-Labeling*, which contains the proceedings of a seminar held in Bangkok, Thailand, from 17-18 February 1997. The objective of the seminar was the exchange of experiences and sharing of information among ESCAP countries that have operational eco-labelling schemes in place or which are in the process of establishing them. The conclusions of the report are presented in section III (A) of this Note.

C. The International Organization for Standardization

The International Organization for Standardization's (ISO) Technical Committee 207 is continuing its work on environmental management. Sub-committee 3 (SC 3) of the Technical Committee has been examining the issue of environmental labelling, and sub-committee 5 (SC 5) the issue of life cycle assessment.

ISO standards pass through a number of stages prior to publication. These include the Working Draft (WD), Committee Draft (CD), Draft International Standard (DIS), Final Draft International Standard (FDIS), and approval and publication stages. At the DIS stage, standards are submitted to ISO Members for a vote. At the FDIS stage, the standards that are submitted for a vote, are also made public.

Two of the standards that SC 3 had been working on, ISO 14022 (Environmental Labels and Declarations - Self-Declaration Environmental Claims - Environmental Labelling Symbols) and 14023 (Environmental Labels and Declarations - Self-Declaration Environmental Claims - Testing and Verification Methodologies) have now been incorporated into ISO 14021 (Environmental Labels and Declarations - Self-Declaration Claims - Terms and Definitions). The following is a list of SC 3 standards currently being developed, and of the stages of preparation that they are at.

- | | | |
|-------|-----------|---|
| (i) | ISO 14020 | Environmental Labels and Declarations - Basic Principles (changed from CD to FDIS stage); |
| (ii) | ISO 14021 | Environmental Labels and Declarations - Self-Declaration Claims - Terms and Definitions (remains at DIS stage); and |
| (iii) | ISO 14024 | Environmental Labels and Declarations - Environmental Labelling Type I - Guiding Principles and Procedures (changed from CD to DIS stage) |

The following is a list of SC 5 standards and of the stages of preparation that they are at:

- (i) ISO 14040 Environmental Management - Life Cycle Assessment - Principles and Guidelines (remains at FDIS stage);
- (ii) ISO 14041 Environmental Management - Life Cycle Assessment - Inventory Analysis (changed from CD to FDIS stage);
- (iii) ISO 14042 Environmental Management - Life Cycle Assessment- Life Cycle Impact Assessment (remains at CD stage); and
- (iv) ISO 14043 Environmental Management - Life Cycle Assessment- Life Cycle Improvement Assessment (remains at CD stage)

D. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization

The United Nations Industrial Development Organization, which had prepared a *Survey of the Trade Implications of International Standards for Quality and Environmental Management Systems (ISO 9000/14000 Series)*, will organize three conferences in 1998 in Latin America, Africa and Asia (tentatively scheduled for June, September, and October) to discuss the results of the survey, and identify the needs for assistance.
