

# GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

RESTRICTED

TAR/W/56

15 November 1985

Limited Distribution

## COMMITTEE ON TARIFF CONCESSIONS

### Draft Minutes of the Meeting held in the Centre William Rappard on 28 October 1985

Chairman: Mr. A. Satuli (Finland)

	<u>Page</u>
1. Adoption of the Agenda	1
2. Submission of Loose-Leaf Schedules	1
3. Sixth Certification of Changes to Schedules	2
4. Harmonized System and GATT Concessions	3
5. Report to the Council	21
6. Date of Next Meeting	21

1. Adoption of the Agenda (GATT/AIR/2214)

1.1 The Chairman welcomed the participants to the seventeenth meeting of the Committee and called their attention to document GATT/AIR/2214 which contained the agenda and the list of documents for the meeting. The agenda was adopted without any addition.

2. Submission of Loose-Leaf Schedules (TAR/W23/Rev.13)

2.1 The Chairman referred to document TAR/W/23/Rev.13 and reported that some progress had been achieved since the last meeting: two additional loose-leaf schedules had been circulated, Australia and Czechoslovakia. Out of a total of sixty-two schedules, thirty-seven were now available in a loose-leaf

format. The schedules of Egypt and Korea had been approved, which brought the number of schedules ready for certification to eight. Several written comments or requests for clarification on schedules under examination had also been exchanged between countries concerned. He recalled that because of the limited resources in capitals, efforts should be concentrated on the transposition of schedules into the Harmonized System and on the preparation of the documentation for the Article XXVIII negotiations, it would nevertheless be useful, precisely in view of the forthcoming negotiations, to have as many loose-leaf schedules as possible, even in a draft form. Moreover, the Chairman urged delegations, mainly from developing countries, to give the authorization to the secretariat to circulate their schedules which had been prepared by the secretariat in draft form.

2.2 The representative of the United Kingdom speaking on behalf of Hong Kong said that he understood the Japanese authorities to be ready to lift their request for extension of the time-limit concerning the schedule submitted by Hong Kong.

2.3 The representative of Japan confirmed that his delegation was in a position to withdraw its reservation with regard to the certification of Schedule XIX - United Kingdom (Hong Kong).

### 3. Sixth Certification of Changes to Schedules

3.1 The Chairman referred to GATT/AIR/2096 dated 21 January 1985 whereby contracting parties had been invited to submit, for certification, any rectifications or modifications to their schedules. He reported that, since then, the secretariat had received notifications only from Portugal, Sweden

and Austria. He also recalled that apart from results of Article XXVIII negotiations, modifications pursuant to the enlargement of the Annex to the Aircraft Agreement should also be notified for certification. It was now clear that it would not be possible to prepare, as foreseen at the beginning of the year, a Sixth Certification before the end of the year, because of the limited number of notifications so far received from contracting parties and the time constraint for their verification. He urged delegations once more to submit their notifications without delay.

4. The Harmonized System and GATT Concessions

4.1 The Chairman suggested following the list of items contained in an informal note distributed to all participants.

I. Status of work on national conversions

4.2 The Chairman referred to a note of 28 October 1985 prepared by the secretariat which gave the situation regarding the submission of transposition lists.

4.3 The representative of Brazil informed the Committee that his delegation would be submitting, in the near future, chapters 1 to 24 of the Brazilian schedule adapted to the nomenclature of the Harmonized System.

4.4 The representative of Argentina informed the Committee that work had started in the capital on the conversion between the nomenclature of imports and exports and the Harmonized System and that by the middle of 1986, his authorities would be in a position to submit the conversion tables.

4.5 The representative of the United States expressed concern over the fact that some countries had not been using the complete format and numbering scheme of the Harmonized System in their documentation. While appreciating the desire for simplification, he felt that one of the most important purposes of the Harmonized System - comparability and transparency of trade concessions - would be lost if countries deviated from the Harmonized System nomenclature and numbering scheme. He pointed out that document L/5470/Rev.1 required submission of proposed consolidated schedules of concessions in conformity with the nomenclature of the Harmonized System.

4.6 The representative of the European Communities underlined that in order to be able to study the proposals made by their partners, it was necessary to have the documentation in the form of Annexes III and IV to document TAR/W/25/Rev.2, i.e. concordance tables giving trade breakdowns, and above all a description of the goods concerned, either in full or in a comprehensible abridged form.

## II. Common Data Base

4.7 Mr. Raynal (secretariat) reported that the expert group on the common data base had met on 16 October 1985 to review the work done in capitals and in the secretariat. The latter had received test files from the five delegations which, at present, participated in the data base. The secretariat had noted some differences in the content of these submissions. These related to the concordance tables, where some delegations had recorded trade allocations at the global level for each tariff item, while other delegations had recorded trade allocations in the detail of the countries of origin of imports. Differences were also found in the import statistics; some delegations had submitted import figures from all origins, others only

from countries entitled to m.f.n. treatment or from GATT members. With regard to tariff data, one delegation had difficulty in supplying applicable rates for unbound tariff lines. Finally, with regard to product descriptions, some delegations had recorded only the legal descriptions while others had recorded legal and abbreviated descriptions. One delegation would provide product descriptions in printed form only. In the past, a number of delegations had proposed some changes in the format of the data; these changes had now been introduced in the data base. With regard to the definition of participating countries having access to the data base information, the expert group had agreed that a country would be deemed to be a participating country if it had submitted the so-called "sensitive" files, such as a complete tariff in the Harmonized System nomenclature and a complete concordance table with trade allocations allowing the conversion of present import statistics into the Harmonized System nomenclature. The group had also discussed the programmes which would be necessary for the use of the data base. The secretariat was asked to prepare a note on this subject and a draft of this note had been communicated to the five participating delegations. The secretariat would prepare explanatory comments on this note so that this subject could be discussed in depth at the next meeting of the expert group, which might take place in connection with the next meeting of the Committee.

4.8 The representative of the European Communities stated that he wished to give his delegation's reaction on three points. First, he wished to recall the interest his delegation attached to the rapid setting-up of the data base which would be an indispensable instrument for the examination of their partners' submissions. The data base would also accelerate the conclusion of

the present phase of technical consultations. Secondly, he hoped that the setting-up of the data base would not be impeded by certain considerations on the type of information which would be recorded in the data base. He expressed his surprise to see that delegations still raised questions concerning the basis on which Article XXVIII negotiations would take place and consequently which statistics should be recorded in the data base. In his view, the negotiations were taking place in GATT and the negotiations concerned only GATT member countries. Therefore, the statistics to be considered should relate exclusively to GATT members. He hoped that a final decision on this question could be taken during this meeting since, in his view, the subject was not questionable and should not justify any further delay in the establishment of the data base. The third point he wished to raise related to the definition of participating countries. He could agree with the definition referred to by the GATT secretariat, concerning the submission by participants of complete "sensitive" files. However, he thought that it should be specified that when reference was made to complete files, the word "complete" should not be taken as meaning that the submission should cover, at least at the early stage of the data base operation, all HS chapters. In other words, he considered that delegations having submitted all "sensitive" files for the HS chapters available at the time of the submission should be considered as participating countries if, ultimately, their submissions covered all chapters of the Harmonized System nomenclature. Such a definition of participating countries would, in his view, accelerate the setting-up of the data base and leave it open for other delegations which, on this basis, might be able to join in the exercise.

4.9 The representative of the United States said that he agreed with the representative of the European Communities insofar as his first point was

concerned. His delegation also attached great importance to the early establishment of the data base. With regard to the other two points raised, his delegation had a different opinion. The US delegation had submitted import statistics relating to all countries receiving m.f.n. treatment. Although he agreed that only imports from GATT members were relevant to the Article XXVIII negotiations, his delegation had supplied the information with a view not only to the Article XXVIII negotiations but to wider purposes of the data base to which other delegations had previously agreed. His delegation was looking forward to the list of possible programmes for applications which had been put together by the GATT secretariat and he hoped to be able to return, in the near future, to this question of suitable applications of the data base material. With respect to the third point concerning the scope of the contents of the data base, he agreed that the question of key files was important in that it defined participants in the common data base. He was, however, concerned about chapters which would not be provided, particularly inasmuch as one of the important applications concerning the data base information had to do with the drawing up of bilateral balance sheets. For this purpose, all chapters should be available and he urged participants to provide all chapters as soon as possible.

4.10 The representative of Canada stated that his delegation intended to supply trade information based on all suppliers. In his view, it was important not to limit the purpose of the data base information to Article XXVIII negotiations and he encouraged the secretariat to find ways of accommodating the concerns expressed by the European Communities in this respect.

4.11 The representative of the European Communities stressed that the question of statistics was of great concern to his delegation. He asked the secretariat to which extent the work programme of the secretariat would be affected and which delay would occur if his delegation's concerns were to be accommodated as suggested by the representative of Canada. With regard to the statement made by the representative of the United States, he wished to confirm that his delegation shared the appeal of the United States delegation to the effect that all chapters be submitted as soon as possible and his delegation was doing its best to do so. However, the door should not be closed irremediably to any exchange of data if some chapters were missing in the submissions of a participant. He hoped that some flexibility would be maintained in the exercise so that no undue delay be incurred.

4.12 Mr. Raynal (secretariat) suggested that, at this stage, the secretariat load into the data base only information relating to GATT countries. After the Article XXVIII negotiations were completed, the secretariat could supplement the information by adding, for all participants, imports from other countries. He stated that this solution would limit the secretariat work, would be less costly and would not incur any delay in the setting up of the data base or of application programmes.

4.13 The representative of the United States stated that his delegation had calculated trade allocations from the TSUS to the Harmonized System in terms of m.f.n. trade and he would be very concerned about any changes in the data base which would change those allocations. He thought it would be useful if the secretariat could make its proposal in writing. His delgation was not in a position to agree to any specific proposal at the present meeting.

4.14 The representative of the European Communities, while agreeing to the secretariat preparing a paper explaining its proposal, considered that the problem was not a technical one. His delegation considered that under Article XXVIII the EC would be negotiating with their GATT partners and he wished to formally request that this option be submitted to the consideration of the Committee so that a clear-cut decision could be arrived at.

4.15 The representative of Switzerland stated that he agreed with the first point raised by the European Communities to the effect that the data base should be set up as soon as possible. His delegation still had minor problems but could submit its data in the very near future. As to the second question, it shared the views expressed by Canada; his delegation was of the opinion that the data base should contain as complete information as possible. For the Article XXVIII negotiations, his delegation agreed that only GATT members should be taken into account. However, a technical problem remained and his delegation was looking forward to the proposal to be made by the secretariat in its paper. He hoped that a decision on this point could be taken promptly to avoid any further delay. With regard to the third point raised by the European Communities concerning access to the data base, his delegation had already made it known that the general principle should be that a country would have access to the data if it had submitted all "sensitive" files covering all chapters. Some exceptions to this general rule could be accepted on request on a bilateral basis.

4.16 The representative of Japan stated that the common data base should not be set up for the purpose of Article XXVIII negotiations only. The data base would also be useful after the negotiations were completed. GATT Tariff

Study files were used during the Tokyo Round and this new data base should be seen as a continuation of the Tariff Study exercise. For that reason, his delegation would submit import statistics from all origins and would further study the implications of the secretariat proposal.

4.17 The Chairman suggested to revert to these questions at the next meeting of the Committee since at least one delegation had clearly indicated that it was not in a position to take any decision at the present meeting. The Committee should take note of the statements made by the delegations and also note that there will be more informal consultations on matters relating to the common data base.

### III. Technical consultations

4.18 The Chairman recalled that at the July meeting there seemed to be general agreement for a need to accelerate the work and that some delegations had proposed the end of October as a target date to conclude those consultations.

4.19 The representative of the United States reported that his delegation had worked hard to review the documentation provided since the summer break and that it had forwarded written queries to a number of delegations. He felt that there had been sufficient time for material to be presented by the active participants and for that material to be reviewed, and he was looking forward to an extensive round of consultations this autumn leading to the conclusion of Phase I by the end of the year.

IV. Article XXVIII negotiations

1. Opening of negotiations

4.20 The Chairman recalled that in previous discussions, this item had been sub-divided into three different aspects: (a) timing, (b) need for formal decision or consensus on a time frame, and (c) circulation of documentation.

4.21 The representative of the United States said that assuming that Phase I consultations could be completed by the end of the year and recognizing the essentially bilateral character of this exercise, his delegation could suggest opening Article XXVIII negotiations as the next step. This process should be triggered by the tabling of Annex II and related documentation as called for in document L/5470/Rev.1. While a formal decision on the opening was, in his view, not necessary, he suggested that it would be useful to set a common target period during which the opening of Article XXVIII could be envisaged. He proposed that this target period be as early as possible in 1986.

4.22 The representative of the European Communities said that there was no need to take a formal decision on opening the negotiations, which remained a bilateral process and, accordingly, a consensus among certain delegation was sufficient for starting the negotiations as rapidly as possible. To that end, his delegation had proposed that a certain negotiation period should be accepted by interested countries, since the completion date of the negotiations was just as important, and that the period should be situated grosso modo between 1 February and 31 July 1986. On the assumption that that period could be observed, very few months would remain until 1 January 1987,

the date of implementation of the Harmonized System. Accordingly, his delegation was of the opinion that implementation on 1 January 1987 was no longer realistic. The negotiation programme suggested, which seemed to be acceptable to a number of delegations, would not allow the Community to bring the Harmonized System into effect on 1 January 1987, since the period between the end of the negotiations and the effective date of implementation was not long enough. In his view, it would be reasonable to consider that a later date - for example, one year later - would be more accessible. Nevertheless, any acceptance of the idea of delayed implementation should be binding on all concerned and any new date announced must be observed in practice.

4.23 The representative of Canada, referring to the comments made by the US delegate, agreed to conclude the technical consultations on Article XXVIII very soon. Because of the bilateral character of the negotiations, countries should start negotiating as soon as they were ready. In his view, it was less important at the present time to envisage a closing date for the negotiations. Considering the date of implementation of 1 January 1987, his delegation felt that, because of the time needed to implement the new system, the 1987 target date would be very difficult to meet. However, his delegation intended to work as hard as possible to try to complete all the work required to implement the system.

4.24 The representative of Sweden, on behalf of the Nordic countries, could agree with the idea of starting the negotiations early next year and finishing them in the summer of 1986, and that no formal decision was necessary because of the bilateral nature of Article XXVIII negotiations.

4.25 The representative of Switzerland supported the idea of setting a certain period for the negotiations. His delegation could join a consensus setting that period for February to July 1986. As for reviewing the implementation date for the Harmonized System, his delegation was hesitant at the current juncture about envisaging any other date; the target of 1 January 1987 should be maintained for all countries so that internal work would not be influenced by unduly pessimistic or surrealistic views. It was only in the light of progress in the negotiations in the course of the coming year that it might be appropriate to review that date.

4.26 The representative of the United States was encouraged by the statements made by other delegates and the fact that there seemed to be a consensus among certain delegations in favour of the opening of the negotiations early next year; he, however, felt hesitant in joining any consensus on the other points raised. As noted previously, the United States had made the necessary preparations to meeting the 1 January 1987 target date. He also expressed some disappointment over the lack of sufficient documentation and reviews. He agreed that meeting the 1 January 1987 date was made more difficult. However, his delegation saw no other credible alternative and, therefore, still held the view that the 1 January 1987 implementation date should be maintained.

4.27 Concerning the proposal made by the European Communities to carry out Article XXVIII negotiations between the period February-July 1986, the representative of Japan was worried about the fact that the preparatory work so far had been lagging behind and felt that delegations should aim at starting and concluding negotiations earlier than the period proposed by the EEC.

4.28 The representative of the United Kingdom speaking on behalf of Hong Kong also favoured an early start and an early completion of the Article XXVIII negotiations, but the time frame suggested appeared very tight to his delegation, particularly in view of the fact that not all the documentation was as yet available. He asked the EEC delegate whether there was room for flexibility for contracting parties who were not ready to participate in the negotiations before the summer, to do so after the summer.

4.29 The representative of the European Communities replied that the period proposed was a target that should not be transformed into a formal decision and, in his view, should be respected by the great majority of contracting parties; clearly, however, it would not be feasible for all countries and that fact should be taken into consideration when the question of publishing the results was taken up.

4.30 The Chairman noted that it had been recognized in the discussion that the Article XXVIII negotiations were principally of a bilateral character. Also, a number of delegations had indicated their objective to reach consensus that the negotiations be opened and concluded as early as possible in 1986 in order to implement the Harmonized System at an early date. Some delegations mentioned, as a tentative date for starting the negotiations, the beginning of February with the aim of concluding them by the end of July.

4.31 The observer from the CCC, Mr. Asakura, expressed great concern over the interventions made by various delegates. He appreciated the efforts made towards accelerating Article XXVIII negotiations in order to ensure the prompt implementation of the Harmonized System. He informed the Committee

that on 8 October 1985, Zaire had signed the Harmonized System Convention, subject to ratification, bringing the number of signatories to thirty-five. He reported that the Nomenclature Committee and the Interim Harmonized System Committee had held a meeting from 14 to 25 October and had examined a number of questions concerning classification, including two queries raised by GATT. They had also examined some policy questions such as the withdrawal from the Nomenclature Convention. Moreover, they had had a lengthy debate concerning the implementation of the Harmonized System Convention. Technical assistance by the Council secretariat had been given to several developing countries with regard to tariff transpositions. Some developing countries had already completed draft tariffs based on the Harmonized System and many of them were in the course of transposing their national tariffs. At the last joint session of the Nomenclature and Interim Harmonized System Committees, he had had the impression that, at least from a technical standpoint, many customs administrations from industrialized countries were ready to implement the Harmonized System on 1 January 1987, although the delegate of a group of countries had expressed doubts as to meeting that date. He pointed out that the Harmonized System had been developed over the last ten years and that not only government officials but everyone engaged in international trade were waiting for its prompt implementation. On behalf of the CCC, he stressed the wish of the CCC to implement the Harmonized System on 1 January 1987.

4.32 The representative of the European Communities assured the CCC representative that his delegation was aware of the tremendous amount of work done by that organization; it was necessary now to incorporate the results of those ten years of work in national tariffs with the corresponding customs duties, taking account of the concessions granted to various countries over a number of years. The delegation of the European Communities had expressed

doubt at Brussels as to the material possibility of implementing the Harmonized System; it seemed surprising that not more delegations had expressed the same doubt, because some of them which had declared themselves ready to implement the Harmonized System on 1 January 1987 had not yet furnished any documentation at all under document TAR/W/25/Rev.2.

## 2. Documentation

4.33 The representative of Sweden raised the question of the documentation to be submitted for the forthcoming negotiations. Although document L/5470/Rev.1 contained guidelines for its preparation, he felt it would be useful to discuss the content of each document to be prepared, and whether all documents described were absolutely necessary.

4.34 Mr. Kautzor-Schröder (secretariat) recalled that the Committee had in June 1983 adopted certain ground rules for the negotiations under Article XXVIII, subsequently endorsed by the Council in July 1983. Phase I was an informal exercise, and whatever documentation had been circulated so far did not constitute a legal basis on which Article XXVIII negotiations could be conducted. Document L/5470/Rev.1 contained those ground rules, and for example its paragraph 4.1.2 spelt out precisely what the proposed Harmonized System schedule (Annex II) should contain. He also recalled that a preceding document, TAR/W/25/Rev.2, had reproduced sample annexes containing the various items which would be required. Taking Annex II as an example, four basic elements were to be given: new tariff number, complete product description, proposed rate of duty, and actual INR. He further recalled that if practicable this documentation should also contain information on historical INRs, but that was certainly a point which needed further discussion and consultations among delegations.

4.35 The representative of the European Communities likewise recalled the consensus already reached not to furnish Annexes V and VI and to replace them by symbols in Annex II so as to identify the headings to be renegotiated.

4.36 Mr. Kautzor-Schröder pointed out that he had limited his intervention to Annex II; he added that according to the procedures contained in L/5470/Rev.1 it was recognized in a footnote that "delegations should have a certain flexibility in regard to the presentation of data" which could apply to Annexes V and VI. Some delegations had previously indicated that they would asterisk the items which they considered would be subject to negotiation, or that they would be using a shading technique, and a general consensus had been reached that Annexes V and VI could be integrated into the other Annexes.

### 3. Legal procedures

4.37 The Chairman drew the attention of the Committee to document TAR/W/51, submitted by the Japanese delegation, and document TAR/W/55 containing the views of the secretariat on the legal aspects related to the publication of the results of Article XXVIII negotiations.

4.38 The representative of the United States stated that with respect to the publication of results and the presentation of Harmonized System schedules, his delegation was of the view that the end results should be a consolidated schedule in Harmonized System loose-leaf format. His concern was to find the most efficient process for this purpose and his delegation had been examining both options presented in the documents. Although his delegation's initial view had been to prefer the certification approach, in re-examining the

documentation that the secretariat had provided, certain new questions had emerged with respect to the Protocol for which his delegation would like to seek clarification. He noted that until 1959 protocols had been used to embody rectifications and modifications of schedules including results of Article XXVIII negotiations and that those protocols contained increased rates as well as reductions, but that they entered into force only once they had been accepted by all contracting parties; subsequently, contracting parties had adopted the certification procedure for rectifications and modifications which, in fact, operated on what could be called a negative clearance basis. Consequently, the representative of the United States had the impression that the protocol approach was perhaps more flexible than the secretariat document had indicated on first reading. He asked the secretariat whether it would be possible to reach an agreement using the protocol approach in which the results of the negotiations, including both increases and decreases in duties, would be subject only to verification by interested contracting parties having a negotiating interest while it would be signed only by the countries presenting schedules.

4.39 The representative of Japan felt it necessary to consider and solve those legal issues as soon as possible because any decision taken in this respect would have an important effect on the deadline for finalizing the results of the negotiations; it would fix the length of a time-period during which his delegation could conduct Article XXVIII negotiations. His delegation would like to select one of the approaches from the viewpoint of expeditiousness. Referring to the disadvantage, raised by the secretariat, that would derive if the results of the Article XXVIII negotiations were incorporated directly into schedules, he said that the results of the bilateral negotiations could be forwarded to the secretariat after the Article XXVIII negotiations were terminated.

4.40 The representative of the European Communities stated that his delegation had as yet not adopted a final position regarding the comparative merits of the different procedures proposed. For the time being, he shared the doubts expressed by the United States delegation concerning the certification procedure and associated himself with that delegation's questions to the secretariat concerning the consequences of adoption of the protocol approach.

4.41 The representative of Japan pointed out that the advantage of the protocol approach was that a certified copy was issued immediately after the negotiations were concluded and respective GATT schedules were attached to the protocol; under the certification approach, a certified copy was issued when at least three months had passed without objection which, in the case of Japan, would delay the commencement of Diet approval procedures. Another merit of the protocol was that it could be opened for acceptance as soon as a certain number of countries had annexed their schedules to the protocol. His delegation had, however, legal interpretation problems regarding Article XXX. As stated by the secretariat, the Dillon Round Protocol was a useful precedent and his delegation would study it further with the assistance of the secretariat. Referring to the "key country" approach mentioned by the secretariat in its paper, his delegation feared that it would involve a lot of time until the protocol could be opened for acceptance since it could be delayed by the submission of the schedule of any one country referred to as a "key country". Therefore, Japan was hoping that the protocol approach could be adopted in such a way that the main protocol could be opened as soon as some countries - even if only a few - had annexed their schedules. Even in the case of a protocol, a certain period of time was necessary to check the contents of the protocol (one month in the case of the Geneva (1979) Protocol).

4.42 Mr. Kautzor-Schröder (secretariat) pointed out that in view of the complexity of certain legal issues raised by delegates, his intervention should be considered as preliminary in nature. Starting with the question of records available in the secretariat on the results of bilateral Harmonized System negotiations, he pointed out that delegations had often come to the secretariat in order to check their tariff commitments since their files were not complete. It would therefore be useful if the secretariat would continue to keep those records. The secretariat's idea about the key-country approach meant that some countries might not be willing to implement the Harmonized System unless certain other contracting parties would do so at the same date, and to open a protocol for two or three countries might not be advisable. He confirmed that the 1962 Dillon Round Protocol contained both tariff increases resulting from Article XXVIII negotiations as well as decreases under the general tariff cutting exercise, and that the Protocol had been signed only by those contracting parties that had schedules annexed to it; there had of course been a period for verification. The fact of annexing a schedule of concessions to a Protocol and accepting it represented a commitment taken by a particular contracting party but did not necessarily mean that all bilateral negotiations had been terminated, and it had happened that additional concessions had been reflected in supplementary protocols.

4.43 The representative of the United States suggested that the secretariat prepare an addendum to document TAR/W/55 which would further explain the points raised in the meeting.

4.44 It was so decided.

4. Policy issues

4.45 The Chairman recalled that this item had been divided into three separate issues: INRs, definition of suppliers' rights and review clause. At the last Committee meeting, the Swiss delegation had raised an additional issue and had informed him that it would present those ideas in a working paper to be distributed shortly.

4.46 No discussion took place on those items at the meeting and it was agreed to revert to those questions at the next meeting of the Committee.

5. Report to the Council

5.1 The Chairman suggested that since the next meeting of the Council would be held on 5 and 6 November 1985 he would, as had been done in previous years, deliver an oral statement, on his own responsibility, to the Council on the activities of the Committee. His report would then be distributed to all contracting parties as document TAR/119.<sup>1</sup> Delegations would be free to make any comments at the Council meeting.

5.2 It was so agreed.

6. Other business

6.1 The Chairman noted that there were several important issues which needed to be further discussed and about which decisions had to be taken in the not too distant future. For those reasons, he suggested holding another meeting of the Committee before the end of the year and proposed 11 December 1985 as a tentative date for the meeting. It was also planned that the expert group on the Common Data Base would meet in the afternoon of 10 December 1985 and

---

<sup>1</sup>Subsequently distributed on 13 November 1985.

that the morning of 11 December 1985 would be reserved for informal consultations related to the work of the Committee.

6.2 It was so agreed.