
Committee on Trade and Environment

**INFORMATION RELEVANT TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE MARKET
ACCESS EFFECTS OF ECO-LABELLING SCHEMES**

Note by the Secretariat

I. INTRODUCTION

This Note responds to a request made by the Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE) for an update of previous Secretariat Notes on the market access effects of eco-labelling requirements.¹ Since the drafting of the last Secretariat Note on the *Technical Barriers to the Market Access of Developing Countries* (WT/CTE/W/101) in January 1999, only little evidence has emerged on this subject. Therefore, this Note proposes to contribute to the knowledge of delegations on this matter through: (1) a presentation of this new, albeit limited, evidence, but also through providing (2) factual information on the principal environmental labels in existence (such as on their geographic distribution and number), and (3) a compilation of environmental labelling and marking notifications made under the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT). Through (2) and (3), this Note aims at providing the CTE with some of the tools it may need in order to draw conclusions on trends in eco-labelling, and its potential trade impact. The Secretariat will on its own continue to update this Note as new evidence emerges.

II. RECENT LITERATURE ON THE MARKET ACCESS IMPACT OF ECOLABELS²

A. SUPPORTING GREEN MARKETS: ENVIRONMENTAL LABELING, CERTIFICATION AND PROCUREMENT SCHEMES IN CANADA, MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES, BY THE COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION (CEC)³

This CEC report synthesises three separate studies prepared by consultancy firms in Canada, Mexico and the United States on labelling, certification and procurement. Its central argument is that while concern among the general public for environmental protection remains consistently high in these three North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) countries, environmental labelling appears to have settled into a "niche" or specialized market segment. At the same time, environmental certification and green procurement programs appear to be expanding. The report explains that considerable overlap exists between labelling and certification, which often use similar criteria and indices. However, these two instruments of environmental protection differ in the fact that labels

¹ Recent Secretariat Notes on this issue include: *Eco-labelling: Overview of Current Work in Various International Fora* (WT/CTE/W/45); *Restrictive Trade Effects of Standards, Technical Regulations and Conformity Assessment Procedures* (G/TBT/W/42); *Market Access Impact of Eco-labelling Requirements* (WT/CTE/W/79); and *Technical Barriers to the Market Access of Developing Countries* (WT/CTE/W/101).

² In preparing for this Note, a number of international organizations were contacted for their recent work on the market effects of eco-labelling schemes. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Global Ecolabelling Network (GEN), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the International Trade Center (ITC), all indicated that they have not conducted any work beyond that which the WTO Secretariat has already reported on to the CTE.

³ Published by the Communications Department of the CEC, Quebec, 1999.

apply to specific products (and to a lesser extent services), whereas certificates apply to environmental management systems and often have a different audience, such as large retail firms or purchasers. The report notes that the shift in many businesses from pollution control to pollution prevention helps to explain the growing emphasis on certification and institutional procurement.

On the different labelling requirements in place in the United States, Canada and Mexico and their success in capturing a market share, the report explains the following. At least 25 important environmental labelling schemes are in place in the United States, covering approximately 310 different products. The large number of schemes has created a bewildering array of choices for consumers, and led to the inability of one or two labels to carve out a dominant market niche. The report expects the continued fragmentation of eco-labelling initiatives to lead to disappointing results in the United States. By contrast, it explains that in Canada, the principal environmental labelling program is Environmental Choice. Owned by the federal government, it is operated by an independent agency, Terra Choice Inc. Approximately 2000 products and services have been awarded Environmental Choice Labels (from 200 firms). Thus, Environmental Choice (a single labelling scheme) has succeeded in establishing itself as the dominant ecolabel in Canada. In Mexico, work has begun on bringing environmental labels to the market, and examples of products covered by labels include recycled paper and electrical appliances.

The report argues that although the issue of climate change has not yet affected the public's purchasing habits, the Kyoto Protocol is likely to push energy efficiency and conservation to the forefront in the next five years. It is sparking the creation of a number of government-sponsored programs and initiatives that promote energy conservation, efficiency and greener building design. Environmental Choice reports a strong demand for certified green power, and expects that demand to rise, as companies increasingly look for the means to reduce their total greenhouse gas emissions and purchase credit offsets.

It is argued in the report that green procurement can contribute significantly to the increased sale of ecolabelled products. In the NAFTA countries, a common challenge for governments has been the decentralization of purchasing decisions to a larger number of managers, i.e., allowing different government departments to implement their own environmental purchasing policies. This is currently being addressed through various training programs for federal governments officials.

In addressing the extent to which ecolabels could act as an impediment to trade between the NAFTA countries, the report argues that the harmonisation of criteria used for the certification and verification of products that carry ecolabels is needed. Such harmonization could not only lead to an expansion of trade, but result in a greater positive impact on the environment than if each country were to pursue its own individual program standards. This would be the case as consumers would cease to be confronted with a bewildering number of different labels.

B. GREEN LABELS: CONSUMER INTERESTS AND TRANSATLANTIC TRADE TENSIONS IN ECO-LABELLING, BY CONSUMERS INTERNATIONAL⁴

The central argument of this study is that, although eco-labelling schemes aim to empower consumers to make environmentally sustainable consumption decisions, some have developed in light of particular national circumstances and environmental concerns that do not apply across national boundaries. Differences in these concerns have resulted in the emergence of a multitude of different approaches to eco-labelling, creating trade tensions. It is argued that a trade dispute over the use of

⁴ Published by Consumers International's Office for Developed and Transition Economies, London, 1999. Consumers International is a non-governmental organization (NGO) founded in 1960, whose membership includes more than 260 consumer groups from over 112 developed and developing countries.

ecolabels should be avoided because of the inexorable high cost this would have for consumers. The study does not call, however, for disciplining ecolabels through the rules of the WTO ("there is no need to discipline their use according to trade principles under the(GATT/WTO) multilateral trade framework"). It calls instead for work to be undertaken on enhancing the compatibility of national eco-labelling schemes through international harmonization or a strategy of partial harmonization.

Consumers International explains that most eco-labelling schemes that would be classified by the International Standardization Organization (ISO) as Type I,⁵ tend to be established at the national level, rather than at the regional or multilateral. There are two main reasons for this: (1) that while there is widespread international support for environmental sustainability, there is a significant divergence in specific environmental concerns. Different countries face different kinds of environmental problems and tend to tailor individual national solutions to them; and, (2) whereas many Type I ecolabelling schemes are run by the private sector, most are funded and administered by public agencies, which also tends to limit their focus to national concerns. The study explains that governmental involvement in eco-labelling schemes generally has as its objective striking a balance between consumers, industry and the environment, and bringing about greater public accountability and consistency in product selection, criteria development and compliance assessments. The non-homogeneity of environmental concerns and the public role in eco-labelling schemes, however, has tended to restrict ecolabels to the national level. And, it is the divergence between different schemes that is leading to trade tensions according to this study.

The study compares the eco-labelling schemes in North America to those in Europe and argues that those in Europe are better supported due to the following: (1) green public procurement policies in the European Union have provided incentives for producers to use ecolabels. In the United States, despite a Presidential Executive Order⁶ on public procurement policies, the market power of public institutional consumption has been relatively weak compared to that in Europe. Public procurement policies in the United States were weakened by the inadequate support given to the implementation of the Executive Order across different governmental departments and agencies with different mandates. In addition, the United States-based Coalition for Truth in Environmental Marketing, which is a coalition of industry associations established in reaction to the European Union's eco-labelling scheme, has fought hard to ensure that the Federal Government would not support Type I ecolabels through public procurement. The study states that "To date, several crucial deadlines for the Executive Order have been missed, and its future as a framework for a US public procurement policy is uncertain"; and (2) the credibility of third-party accreditation among European consumers has encouraged producers to pursue Type I labels.

The study echoes the CEC's conclusion that the proliferation of environmental claims in the marketplace confuses consumers and prevents them from distinguishing between Type I claims and other kinds of claims. It indicates that in the United States, many more eco-labelling schemes are in existence than in Europe and that this is reducing the ability of eco-labels to achieve their desired objectives.

In discussing how to reduce potential trade barriers, the study argues that ecolabels should not be seen as a trade issue. Nonetheless, it states that there is interest in harmonizing the criteria on which they are based as a trade dispute could imperil the use of ecolabels as a tool for environmental protection. However, it cautions that "from the consumer interest perspective, there are significant disadvantages to pursuing greater compatibility of national eco-labelling schemes within the

⁵ Type I eco-labelling schemes are voluntary programs, adjudicated by independent third parties, that rank products within a specific product category according to their comparative or relative environmental impact based on established criteria. For more information on the ISO classification of eco-labelling schemes, please refer to document WT/CTE/W/79.

⁶ Referenced by Consumers International as "EO 12873, amended 13101."

GATT/WTO framework....the WTO lacks credible environmental perspective." Full international harmonization, it argues, requires a credible international institution. This institution would then have to develop 'top-down' environmental objectives on behalf of its members. Currently, it states, there is no obvious candidate among the international institutions for this role. On the possibility of ISO becoming this institution, it argues that "its technical expertise is not in environmental issues and its administrative structure makes it difficult for environmental and consumer groups to participate throughout the entire course of standards development."

A strategy of only partial harmonization, therefore, is recommended in the report through bilateral mutual recognition agreements between national eco-labelling schemes. It is argued that this strategy should start by targeting commonly ecolabelled consumer goods, such as detergents and paper products, and only then move towards others that are more important for industrial production, such as chemicals (including fertilizers and pesticides).

C. PROFITING FROM GREEN CONSUMERISM IN GERMANY. OPPORTUNITIES FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES IN THREE SECTORS: LEATHER AND FOOTWEAR, TEXTILES AND CLOTHING AND FURNITURE, BY THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (UNCTAD)⁷

This study identifies trends in the "greening" of the market-place in Germany, focusing on the extent to which consumers purchase eco-labelled products. It addresses three different sectors: (1) leather and footwear; (2) textiles and clothing; and (3) timber and furniture. Its central argument is that the "cleaning" of products and production processes is not likely to be a temporary phenomenon in Germany, and that developing countries must think of proactive ways in which to adapt their exports to the environmental requirements of the German market.

Green consumerism in Germany, this study reports, is a growing phenomenon and eco-marketing strategies have increased over the years. Since the introduction of the Blue Angel eco-labelling scheme in 1978, ecolabels have played a prominent role in the marketing policy of green companies. They have been regarded as an additional tool for attracting the attention of consumers to products in a marketplace in which product differentiation has become increasingly sophisticated. With respect to textiles and clothing, the study explains that 80 to 90 per cent of clothes in Germany are imported, predominantly from developing countries. In 1993, ecolabelled textiles were estimated to have captured 0.2 per cent of the total market share. However, the study argues that "the green market 'niche' in the case of textiles and clothing may be estimated to account for 1 to 2 per cent of the entire textile industry today". Germany imports 80 per cent of all the footwear it uses. A total of 1 to 3 per cent of its overall consumption is said to be made of certified leather. With respect to timber, 80 per cent total consumption comes from German forests, with imports of tropical timber accounting only for a small proportion of this consumption. The main tropical timber exporters to Germany are Cameroon, Congo, Ghana and Malaysia. To date, only few eco-labelled timber products are available in Germany. However, the demand for certified tropical timber in future is expected to rise significantly.

The study argues that export-oriented sectors from developing countries should be enabled to anticipate trends in environmental regulation and identify growing as well as shrinking export markets as early as possible. It recommends improved information flow on environmental and fair-trade issues regarding export markets, and intensive networking among producers, retailers, industrial associations and government agencies. Sector-specific bilateral workshops between a developing and a developed country on environmental requirements for imports are identified as a useful vehicle for information exchange.

⁷ Published by UNCTAD Analytical Study on Trade, Environment and Development, Geneva, 1999.

III. OVERVIEW OF PRINCIPAL ENVIRONMENTAL LABELS

The most comprehensive information on the main environmental labels in existence today which the Secretariat was able to find, is a survey conducted by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in *Environmental Labelling Issues, Policies and Practices World-wide*.⁸ The report was prepared in December 1998 and covers labels which form part of environmental labelling and certification programmes.

The table below has been extracted from a larger table in the report, and contains information on all of the following: (1) the name of the countries that have an environmental label; (2) the name of their seal or environmental label; (3) the mandatory or voluntary nature of their label; (4) its governmental or non-governmental nature; (5) the year in which it was founded; (6) the number of the product categories it covers⁹; (7) the number of foreign-based licenses it awarded. This reflects the number of licenses to use the environmental label that were granted to product suppliers from other countries;¹⁰ (8) the stages in the development of the label in which stakeholders are involved. Some labels involve stakeholders at a very early stage (in product selection for instance), while others only involve them later or not at all; (9) its use in procurement by governments or large organizations; (10) its use for retail products. This shows if the environmental labels are used for products intended for sale to individual customers and are distributed through retail outlets; (11) its use within industries, prior to retail. Labels are sometimes used in pre-retail transactions between, for example, raw material suppliers, product manufacturers, formulators/packagers, and wholesalers; and (12) the extent to which trade issues are/were raised in relation to the label.

In connection to point (12), the survey explains, for example, that Germany requires companies which do not participate in its Green Dot program to take back their packaging, and bear the cost of the recycling or packaging themselves. There are no exceptions for foreign firms. The take-back burden is, therefore, greater for companies that ship their products long distances to Germany because they either have to pay the transportation costs of shipping the packaging back to the country of origin or arrange for in-country processing. It states that "Many manufacturers exporting to Germany from within the EU and beyond claim that the domestic demand for the Green Dot label places imported goods at a market disadvantage." Point (12) is designed to capture those kinds of issues when they have been raised. Other types of trade issues it is designed to reflect are situations where labels were developed to boost exports (i.e. respond to the environmental concerns of export markets). The survey explains that India recently added textile products as one of the product categories covered by the Indian Ecomark, in response to new regulations enacted by Germany and rest of the European Union that banned the use of certain dyes in textiles.

⁸ EPA 742-R-98-009, published in Washington D.C. in December 1998.

⁹ Such as paper products (including towels, toilet paper, office paper), detergents, office equipment, dishwashers, and so on.

¹⁰ The Secretariat wishes to caution, however, that this could underestimate the total number of foreign suppliers awarded environmental labels, as importers (who are often nationals of the importing country) are sometimes the ones to apply for the label.

Country	Seal	Mandatory/ Voluntary	Govt/ Non-Govt	Year founded	No. of product categories	Foreign - based licenses	Stage at which there is stakeholder involvement ¹¹	Used in Procurement	Used in retail products	Used within industry sector, i.e. pre- retail	Report of trade issues
Existing Programs											
Austria	Austrian Eco-Label	V	Govt	1991	35	10	criteria devlp	Yes, unspecified	Yes	Unknown	Yes
Canada	Canada's Environmental Choice	V	Quasi	1988	49	10	product selection, criteria devlp	Informal	Yes	No	No
China	-	V	Govt	1994	12	0	product selection, criteria devlp	Unknown	Yes	No	Yes
Croatia	Croatia's Environmental Label	V	Govt	Unknown	33	Unknown	criteria devlp	Informal	Yes	Unknown	Unknown
Czech Rep.	-	V	Govt	1994	17	0.41%	criteria devlp		Yes	No	
Denmark	Nordic Swan	V	Quasi	1989	42	20%	product catg sel, criteria devlp	Formal	Yes	No	No
European Union	European Union Ecolabel Award Scheme	V	Govt	1992	11	N/A	product catg sel, criteria devlp	Informal	Yes	No	Yes
Finland	Nordic Swan	V	Quasi	1989	42	20%	product catg sel, criteria devlp	Formal	Yes	No	No
France	NF-Environment	V	Govt	1992	6	0	criteria devlp	Informal	Yes	No	Yes
Germany	Blue Angel	V	Govt	1977	88	17%	product catg sel, finalizing draft criteria	Informal	Yes	No	No
Germany	Green Dot	V	Quasi	1990	7	Unknown	criteria devlp	Formal	Yes	No	Yes
Iceland	Nordic Swan	V	Quasi	1989	42	20%	product catg sel, criteria devlp	Formal	Yes	No	No
India	Eco-Mark	V	Govt	1991	16	0	none	No	Yes	No	Yes
Japan	Ecomark	V	Quasi	1989	69	Unknown	criteria devlp	Informal	Yes	No	No

¹¹ The word "development" is sometimes reduced to "devlp", "selection" to "sel", and "category" to "catg".

Country	Seal	Mandatory/ Voluntary	Govt/ Non-Govt	Year founded	No. of product categories	Foreign - based licenses	Stage at which there is stakeholder involvement ¹¹	Used in Procurement	Used in retail products	Used within industry sector, i.e. pre- retail	Report of trade issues
Korea	Ecomark	V	Govt	1992	36	Unknown	criteria devlp	Unknown	Yes	No	Unknown
Luxembourg	European Union Ecolabel Award Scheme	V	Govt	1992	11	N/A	product catg sel, criteria devlp	Informal	Yes	No	Yes
Malaysia	Product Certification Program	V	Govt	1996	1	0	product sel, criteria devlp	No	Yes	No	Yes
Netherlands	Stichting Milieukeur	V	Quasi	1992	32	-	product criteria	Informal	Yes	No	No
New Zealand	Environmental Choice	V	Quasi	1990	17	0	product criteria	No	Yes	No	No
Norway	Nordic Swan Label	V	Quasi	1989	42	20%	product catg sel, criteria devlp	Formal	Yes	No	No
Singapore	Green Label Singapore	V	Govt	1992	21	Unknown	product criteria	Yes, unspecified	Yes	No	No
Spain	AENOR Medio Ambiente	V	Non-Govt	1993	3	-	-	No	Yes	No	No
Sweden	SIS-Nordic Swan Label	V	Quasi	1989	42	20%	product catg sel, criteria devlp	Formal	Yes	No	No
Sweden	Good Environmental Choice	V	Non-Govt.	1990	17	Unknown	product catg sel, criteria devlp	Informal	Yes	No	No
Taiwan	Green Mark Taiwan	V	Non-Govt	1992	35	4	product catg sel, criteria devlp	Will be formal in future	Yes	Yes	No
Thailand	The Thai Green Label Scheme	V	Quasi	1993	6	No	product catg sel, criteria	-	Yes	No	-
United Kingdom	European Union Ecolabel Scheme	V	Govt	1992	11	N/A	product cat sel, criteria	Informal	Yes	No	Yes
United States	Battery Labeling	M	Govt	1996	3	N/A	manufacturers lobbied for law	No	Yes	No	No
United States	Chlorine Free Products Association	V	Non-Govt	1997	2	Unknown	membership (it's a trade association)	Unknown	Yes	Yes	No

Country	Seal	Mandatory/ Voluntary	Govt/ Non-Govt	Year founded	No. of product categories	Foreign - based licenses	Stage at which there is stakeholder involvement ¹¹	Used in Procurement	Used in retail products	Used within industry sector, i.e. pre- retail	Report of trade issues
United States	ECO-O.K.	V	Non-Govt	1987	5	-	Yes	Informal	Yes	Yes	No
United States	Ecotel	V	Non-Govt	1994	1	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
United States	Energy Guide	M	Govt	1975	19	N/A	No	No	Yes	No	No
United States	Energy Star	V	Govt	1992	26	0	Yes	Formal	Yes	Yes	No
United States	Fuel Economy Information Program	M	Govt	1975	1	N/A	No	No	Yes	No	N/A
United States	Green Seal	V	Private – non-profit	1989	88	5	throughout	Informal	Yes	No	No
United States	ODS – Ozone	M	Govt	1990	Undefined	N/A	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
United States	Office of Pesticide Program (FIFRA)	M	Govt	1947	-	No	-	-	Yes	-	-
United States	Proposition 65	M	Govt	1986	Undefined	N/A	prog formation	No	Yes	Yes	N/A
United States	SCS – Claim Certification	V	Non-Govt	1991	4	Yes	throughout	No	Yes	Yes	No
United States	SCS – Eco-Profile	V	Non-Govt	1989	All	Yes	throughout	Informal	Yes	Yes	No
United States	SCS – Forestry	V	Non-Govt	1991	2	Yes	throughout	No	Yes	Yes	No
United States	SCS – NutriClean	V	Non-Govt	1984	1	Yes	throughout	No	Yes	Yes	No
United States	Smart Wood Program	V			-		-	-	Yes	-	-
United States	TSCA	M	Govt	1976	-	No	-	-	Yes	-	-
United States	Vermont	M	Govt	1991	35	N/A	unknown	No	Yes	No	N/A
United States	WAVE	V	Govt	1992	1	No	No	No	Yes	No	N/A
United States	Greening the Government (buying guide)	N/A	Govt	1997	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A
United States	The Green Pages (buying guide)	N/A	Govt	1993	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A
United States	US EPA VOC Emission Standards for Architectural Coatings	M	Govt	1998	50	N/A	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	N/A

Country	Seal	Mandatory/ Voluntary	Govt/ Non-Govt	Year founded	No. of product categories	Foreign - based licenses	Stage at which there is stakeholder involvement ¹¹	Used in Procurement	Used in retail products	Used within industry sector, i.e. pre- retail	Report of trade issues
Program being Developed											
Brazil	ABNT – Environmental Quality	V	Quasi	1993	2	In Progress	Product catg sel, criteria devlp	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	No
United States	Consumer Labeling Initiative	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress
United States	Electric Utility Labeling	In Progress	Quasi	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	Yes	No	In Progress	No	N/A
United States	Small Spark Ignited Engines	V	Govt	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	Yes	In Progress	Yes	No	N/A
Finland	Type III	-	Govt	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-
Indonesia	BAPEDAL	V	Govt	1995- present?	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	Yes	In Progress	Yes
Indonesia	Ministry of Trade	V	Govt	Unknown	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	Yes	In Progress	Yes
Indonesia	Indonesian Ecolabeling Working Group	V	Non-Govt	1994	1	Unknown	In Progress	In Progress	Yes	In Progress	Yes
Germany	Type III			Not yet developed							
Hong Kong	Eco-label			Not yet developed							
Not Operational											
Australia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
United States	OAQPS labels/CA program	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Argentina	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chile	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Country	Seal	Mandatory/ Voluntary	Govt/ Non-Govt	Year founded	No. of product categories	Foreign - based licenses	Stage at which there is stakeholder involvement ¹¹	Used in Procurement	Used in retail products	Used within industry sector, i.e. pre- retail	Report of trade issues
No Information Provided											
Greece	-										
Italy	-										
New Zealand	Project 98 – food label										
United States	Flipper										
Sweden	Swedish Type III										
Germany	Blue Angel's Green Passport - private										

N.B. The United States EPA explained to the WTO Secretariat that where the term "N/A" (for "not available") is used, the EPA was told that the information it was seeking was not available. The term "unknown", a "?" or a "-" is employed for situations in which the EPA could not obtain a response to the question asked.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL LABELLING/MARKING NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE

A. AGREEMENT ON TECHNICAL BARRIERS TO TRADE (TBT)

The following is a table of all technical regulations concerning environmental labelling and marking requirements notified under the TBT Agreement¹² between 1995 and 1999. It is based on a search of the notifications made by Members and of the annual Environmental Databases (EDB) prepared by the WTO Secretariat.¹³ It will be updated in light of future EDBs.

**Environmental Labelling/Marking Notifications under the Agreement
on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT)**

Notification Symbol	Country	Product	Objective ¹⁴
G/TBT/Notif.95.51	Canada	Electrical or hydrocarbon fuelled-appliances	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.95.84	Singapore	Hazardous substances: Paints containing lead compounds	Providing information on lead content of paints
G/TBT/Notif.95.107	United States	Incandescent lamps	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.95.120	Hong Kong	Household refrigeration	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.95.142	Singapore	Asbestos brake and clutch linings	Reducing risks of exposure to asbestos
G/TBT/Notif.95.241	Thailand	Light duty diesel engine vehicles	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.95.242	Thailand	Gasoline engine vehicles	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.95.320	European Community	Household electric washer-dryers	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.96.37	Switzerland	Substances, preparations, and pesticides	Harmonizing with European Union toxic substances standards
G/TBT/Notif.96.57	Hong Kong	Room coolers	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.96.87	Sweden	Marine engines	Decreasing emissions and reducing noise
G/TBT/Notif.96.178	Thailand	Motorcycles	Environment-related

¹² Under the TBT Agreement, notifications are made "Whenever a relevant international standard does not exist or the technical content of a proposed technical regulation is not in accordance with the technical content of relevant international standards, and if the technical regulation may have a significant effect on trade of other Members" (Article 2.9). Whereas a technical regulation is a "Document which lays out product characteristics or their related processes and production methods.....with which compliance is mandatory" (Annex I), some *voluntary* labelling and marking requirements were notified as technical regulations and are contained in the table above.

¹³ The most recent Environmental Database is contained in document WT/CTE/W/143 (June 2000).

¹⁴ When the objective of the measure is characterised as "environment-related", that means that environmental protection appears under either the *Title* of the notified document (Point 5 of the TBT notification), its *Objective* (point 7) or its *Description* (point 6). When more specific environmental objectives are spelled out in the notification, such as "energy efficiency" or "waste management", they are stated in the table. It is important to keep in mind that many notifications have more than one objective.

Notification Symbol	Country	Product	Objective¹⁴
G/TBT/Notif.96.179	Thailand	Heavy duty diesel engine vehicles	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.96.181	Thailand	Light duty diesel engine vehicles	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.96.182	Thailand	Gasoline engine vehicles	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.96.197	Korea	Chemicals	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.96.235	European Community	Household lamps	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.96.239	European Community	Household dishwashers	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.96.289	Mexico	Air conditioners	Energy conservation
G/TBT/Notif.96.409	European Community	Dangerous preparations, certain non-dangerous preparations	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.96.424	United States	Electric motors	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.96.460	Netherlands	Inorganic copper-chromium-arsenic salts for preserving wood	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.62	Mexico	Refrigerators and freezers	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.97.89	Jamaica	Major household appliances	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.97.157	Colombia	Cyclohexanone chemical products	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.160	Colombia	Liquid detergents	Protecting human, animal and plant health
G/TBT/Notif.97.161	Colombia	Toilet soap	Protecting human, animal and plant health
G/TBT/Notif.97.163	Colombia	Powdered synthetic washing detergents	Protecting human, animal and plant health
G/TBT/Notif.97.164	Colombia	Abrasive cleaning powders for household use	Protecting human, animal and plant health
G/TBT/Notif.97.215	Mexico	Refrigerators	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.97.218	Switzerland	Chemical substances and preparations	Harmonizing with European Union toxic and hazardous substances standards
G/TBT/Notif.97.219	Slovak Republic	Footwear	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.243	Norway	Microbiological products for applications that may involve their release to the outdoor environment	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.277	Costa Rica	Fertilizers, Technical Materials and Related	Environment-related

Notification Symbol	Country	Product	Objective ¹⁴
		Substances	
G/TBT/Notif.97.280	Costa Rica	Biological and Biochemical Agricultural Pesticides	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.382	European Community	Products containing or consisting of genetically modified organisms	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.419	France	Amalgam separators	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.687	Hong Kong, China	Washing machines	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.97.704	Norway	All genetically modified organisms, except ones approved for placing on market	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.748	Spain	Instruments for measuring motor vehicle exhaust emissions	Reducing vehicle exhaust emissions
G/TBT/Notif.97.767	Thailand	Two-stroke gasoline engine lubricating oil	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.785	El Salvador	Urea used as fertilizer	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.786	El Salvador	Ammonium sulphate used as fertilizer	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.787	El Salvador	Ammonium nitrate used as fertilizer	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.788	El Salvador	Potassium chloride used as fertilizer	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.789	El Salvador	Potassium sulphate used as fertilizer	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.97.790	El Salvador	Double potassium and magnesium sulphate used as fertilizer	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.98.68	Thailand	Gasoline engine vehicles	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.98.69	Thailand	Light duty diesel engine vehicles	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.98.79	Czech Republic	Chemicals, chemical compounds and preparations	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.98.102	Belgium	Ecotaxes	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.98.141	Thailand	Heavy duty diesel engine vehicles	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.98.156	Belgium	Agricultural pesticides	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.98.329	Netherlands	Sludge traps, fat and oil separators	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.98.331	United States	Electric motors	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.98.382	Korea	Processed foods, beverages, liquors,	Environment-related

Notification Symbol	Country	Product	Objective ¹⁴
		confectionery, health and preferred foods, fruits and vegetables, cosmetics (including detergents), toys and dolls, stationery, personal accessories such as wallets and belts, quasi-drugs, dress shirts and underwear	
G/TBT/Notif.98.388	Thailand	Motorcycles	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.98.448	Netherlands	Timber	Reducing deforestation
G/TBT/Notif.98.452	Hong Kong, China	Compact fluorescent lamps	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.98.488	Poland	Waste	Waste management
G/TBT/Notif.98.545	Denmark	Windows, outer doors	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.98.546	Denmark	Insulated glass units	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.98.591	United States	Household appliances and other products	Energy conservation
G/TBT/Notif.99.83	Netherlands	Building and demolition waste	Environment and waste-related
G/TBT/Notif.99.90	Thailand	Motor cycles and mopeds	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.99.204	Korea	Agricultural and fishery products and their processed products	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.99.250	Switzerland	Medicines that contain genetically modified organisms or consist of such organisms or medicines that are manufactured by recombinant DNA technology	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.99.259	Jamaica	Products and equipment containing or manufactured using ozone depleting substances	Protecting the ozone layer
G/TBT/Notif.99.324	Thailand	Industrial products	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.99.326	Thailand	Industrial products	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.99.376	Hong Kong, China	Clothes dryers	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.99.400	Thailand	Internal combustion engines, transport exhaust emissions	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.99.401	Thailand	Internal combustion engines, transport	Environment-related

Notification Symbol	Country	Product	Objective ¹⁴
		exhaust emissions	
G/TBT/Notif.99.445	Philippines	Household appliances: Non-ducted air conditioners	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.99.446	Philippines	Household appliances	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.99.455	Australia	All passenger motor vehicles	Fuel efficiency to reduce green-house gas emissions
G/TBT/Notif.99.457	United States	Home Insulation	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.99.498	Argentina	Electrical equipment for household use	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.99.508	Switzerland	Fertilizers	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.99.532	France	Household packaging waste	Waste disposal and recovery
G/TBT/Notif.99.546	United States	Pesticide containers	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.99.568	Canada	Low-speed vehicles	Environment-related
G/TBT/Notif.99.619	Trinidad and Tobago	Products and equipment using ozone depleting substances	Providing consumer information on ozone depleting substances
G/TBT/Notif.99.653	United States	Commercial and industrial equipment	Energy efficiency
G/TBT/Notif.99.655	Mexico	Plant nutrients	Environment-related