

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON

TARIFFS AND TRADE

RESTRICTED

Spec(88) 26

9 May 1988

Committee on Trade and Development

Sixty-Third Session

19 April 1988

DRAFT NOTE ON PROCEEDINGS OF SIXTY-THIRD SESSION

Prepared by the Secretariat

1. The Sixty-Third Session of the Committee on Trade and Development was held on 19 April 1988 under the Chairmanship of Mr. P. Nagaratnam, Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to GATT. The Committee had the following items on its agenda: review of developments in international trade and in the Uruguay Round; review of the implementation of the provisions of Part IV and of the operation of the Enabling Clause; work of the Sub-Committee on the Trade of Least-Developed countries; and technical assistance to developing countries in the context of the Uruguay Round.

Agenda item (i): Review of developments in international trade and in the Uruguay Round

2. The Chairman noted that under this agenda item the Committee could take up the following sub-items: (i) review of developments in international trade and in the Uruguay Round; (ii) review of developments in negotiating bodies of the Uruguay Round with regard to special and differential treatment and fuller participation and reciprocity, and (iii) specific topics in the Uruguay Round of particular relevance to trade between developed and developing countries. The Chairman recalled that in

keeping under review developments in the Uruguay Round duplication with the work of the Trade Negotiation Committee and its subsidiary bodies should be avoided. He observed that under sub-item (i) the GATT Annual Report, International Trade 1986-87 and the assessment by the GATT secretariat on International Trade in 1987 and Prospects for 1988 (document GATT/1432) could provide a basis for discussion; in addition delegates might wish to make reference to trade, financial and monetary interlinkages in light of the objective laid down in Part A(iv) of the Ministerial Declaration on the Uruguay Round. Under sub-item (ii) the review could aim at identifying ways and means for promoting the implementation of the principles embodied in Part B(iv), (v), (vi) and (vii) of the Ministerial Declaration and also within the broader mandate of the Committee in order to make these principles operational within a strengthened multilateral trading system. The third sub-item enabled the Committee to examine specific topics that might be proposed by delegations as negotiations proceed.

3. The representative of a developing country described the areas of priority interest to his delegation, priorities which he believed were to a large extent shared by other developing countries. He assigned high priority to the dismantling or curtailment of all protectionist barriers to trade in particular those resulting from misused safeguard actions and non-tariff barriers which had been introduced by developed countries in order to prevent further expansion into their protected markets of manufactured exports from developing countries. Tariff escalation also had adversely affected developing countries' exports of tropical products.

Referring to the United States Trade Bill the representative acknowledged the efforts made by the Administration to bring the proposed Trade Bill into conformity with international trade rules embodied in the GATT. Nevertheless the Trade Bill remained a subject of concern and he expressed the hope that the legislation to be adopted would not endanger the interests of developing countries or the foundations of the international trading system. A second area of priority interest was related to growth, development and the principle of special and differential treatment. He voiced disagreement with the idea, expressed by some delegations in some Negotiating Groups that no special treatment was needed for developing countries if a liberalized trading system would emerge from the Uruguay Round. Apparently this view perceived developing countries primarily as potential markets for developed countries overlooking the need for developing countries to be given better access in developed countries as well. This latter goal required practical measures to implement the principle of special and differential treatment. Thirdly, he emphasized the need to strengthen multilateralism in the face of trends towards bilateralism. Fourthly, he highlighted the importance of adopting tighter disciplines on the recourse to safeguard measures. The representative expressed the view that due to the insufficient contributions made by major trading partners the negotiations on safeguards were still in a preliminary stage despite the work previously done in this area. This situation was in contrast with his country expectations when it signed the Punta del Este Declaration. He reaffirmed the importance attached by his authorities to reaching an agreement on this subject by the end of this year, with the

following elements: (i) a consensus on the "Protocol" to the General Agreement that modified or complemented the present provisions related to safeguards under Article XIX, by means of a formal amendment; (ii) a consensus on some basic definitions such as "serious injury", "drastic and substantial increase in imports" and "domestic producers"; (iii) a firm determination to eliminate "grey area" measures which distort international trade flows. Acknowledging that the Uruguay Round had made progress the representative expressed regret that progress had so far been concentrated on the areas of interest to developed countries, especially services, intellectual property and the functioning of the GATT system, and hoped that it would be possible from now on to advance in a more balanced way in accordance with the principle of globality. Finally, he emphasized that the close links existing between trade, money and finance must be taken into account if the Uruguay Round was to produce lasting and balanced results. Another representative supported the thrust of this statement noting the signs of a possible imbalance in the negotiations and sharing the previous speaker's disappointment with the lack of progress in the systemic issue of safeguards. This representative, furthermore, reaffirmed the special nature of tropical products negotiations and urged that developments in the functioning of the GATT system not erode or impair the principles of special and differential treatment.

4. Referring to specific topics in the Uruguay Round of particular relevance to trade between developed and developing countries a representative considered that it would be useful to initiate a discussion

in the Committee on how concessions in negotiations by developing countries could be flexibly implemented. To this end she proposed that the secretariat revise the document "Prospects for Increasing Trade between Developed and Developing Countries" (COM.TD/W/412 and Add.1) issued in 1984, by updating the analysis in light of recent trade flows and by elaborating on the factors governing possible further increases in trade (paragraphs 178-189) as well as suggestions made regarding the flexible implementation of concessions by less-developed countries (paragraphs 198-205). The secretariat could also further examine trade between developing countries and the ways in which this trade might be increased. Delegations of some other countries supported these suggestions. However, some members considered that these suggestions deserved further reflection. It was recalled that the study had been prepared in a context which was no longer prevailing. An update of this study seemed to have a low priority and, if pursued, should be undertaken in the context of comments made by governments following its initial circulation. A representative of the secretariat observed that the study could be updated as a whole and not by specific paragraphs, in the light of developments since 1984 including the adoption of the Punta del Este Ministerial Declaration and its relevant provisions with respect to special and differential treatment, fuller participation and reciprocity. He also pointed out that the 1984 study referred only to trade between developed and developing countries the trade among the latter being maintained as a separate exercise.

5. The Committee took note of the statements made. It was agreed that the

suggestion made in regard to an update of the 1984 study would be reverted to at a future date.

Agenda item (ii): Review of the implementation of Part IV and the operation of the Enabling Clause

6. The Chairman recalled that in accordance with its terms of reference the Committee kept under continuous review the implementation of Part IV and the operation of the Enabling Clause. For the purpose of the review at this meeting the Committee had before it a number of notifications and communications by governments in regard to measures relevant to the implementation of Part IV and the operation of the Enabling Clause. In this connection delegations were reminded that all GSP-giving countries had adopted or would soon adopt the Harmonized System and HS-based tariffs would be used in the Uruguay Round negotiations. Those GSP-giving countries which had not yet notified GSP listings according to HS-Tariff Classification were invited to do so as soon as possible.

The representative of Chile referred to the withdrawal of his country from the GSP Scheme of the United States. He emphasized that this measure constituted a new deterioration of the Generalized System of Preferences incorporated into the legal framework of the GATT through the Decisions adopted by the CONTRACTING PARTIES on 25 June 1971 and 28 November 1979. The suspension affecting Chile as well as the suspensions affecting other developing countries or the threats of suspension indicated that developed countries had forgotten their international commitments in regard to GSP

and that they were not respecting those Decisions that they themselves had adopted. Moreover through such measures those countries were contributing to increasing protectionism. The representative observed that the cost of protectionist measures such as those adopted by the United States against Chile was paid for by the American consumers and Chilean workers whose interests the United States claimed to protect. The measure taken by the United States was based on the allegation that Chile was not taking measures to grant its workers their rights recognized internationally, which was not the case. Other developed countries might invoke tomorrow other arguments in order to deny developing countries GSP benefits. This would endanger the very institution of the Generalized System of Preferences. Therefore every effort should be made in order to preserve the GSP, to improve it or to replace it with an institution which would fully comply with Part IV of the General Agreement. The representative also said that while sharing the view that developing countries should undertake liberalization measures he could not accept that a developing country like Chile which was complying with the provisions and spirit of the GATT be subject to illegal sanctions. His country had contributed to the growth of international trade and to development by lowering its tariff by about 15 per cent more or less across the board. However Chile would not be in a position to pursue this liberal policy if the principle of liberalization of trade was not applied universally as specified in the General Agreement. Chile had faithfully fulfilled the principles of GATT and was committed to the objectives of the Uruguay Round as well as to the

fight against any type of protectionism. Despite all these efforts Chile had been the subject of discriminatory measures such as that adopted by the United States which furthermore were based on arguments alien to the economic and commercial fields. The representative pointed out that the United States measure regarding the withdrawal of GSP benefits was not the only measure adopted against his country's exports. Indeed in pursuance of the so-called "Marketing Order", the United States would introduce serious restrictions on imports of Chilean grapes. On the other hand the EEC had just applied an absolutely discriminatory measure on the imports of Chilean apples thereby making trade possibilities even worse. Recalling that the developed countries wanted developing countries to pay their external debts the representative wondered how that objective could be attained if the same developed countries illegally hampered the developing countries from gaining the necessary earnings from their exports. The representative felt that the legal arguments put forward by Chile with respect to the measures adopted by the United States had received no adequate response. Stating that Chile would continue to make all efforts to fulfil all its commitments in particular those relating to the external debt, the representative urged developed countries to conduct their trade policies so as to strengthen the credibility of the free trade concept and of the GATT and demonstrate their value as instruments for development. The representative also expressed the wish that political, religious or any other considerations which were not related to trade and development be kept outside the GATT work.

7. The representative of Brazil recalled that his country already made its views known on the question of country-discrimination in the context of the GSP. His delegation supported the Chilean view at the Council meeting in February 1988 on the grounds that although preferential concessions constituted a unilateral act of the donor country the exclusion of countries from GSP was per se a discrimination which was not based on the agreed principles. This position was relevant not only to the case of Chile but was a position of principle. Brazil had expressed concern at the fact that some developed countries were clearly moving away from the observance of the basic principles set out in the Decision of the CONTRACTING PARTIES of 25 June 1971 and of 28 November 1979 concerning the granting of preferential treatment to products originating in developing countries. The representative recalled that developed contracting parties acting individually had been authorized to grant such a preferential treatment provided that the corresponding schemes were of a generalized, non-discriminatory and non-reciprocal nature. The fact that such schemes were of a voluntary character and did not constitute a binding obligation for the preference-giving countries did not in his view give them the right to ignore the legal framework under which they had been authorized to implement such schemes. He also emphasized that withdrawal of benefits from countries judged to be no longer in need of preferences on particular products continued to have an adverse effect on developing countries' trade. Brazil was extremely concerned over withdrawals from GSP benefits increasingly based upon arbitrary criteria and in a manner that did not comply with the relevant decisions of the CONTRACTING PARTIES.

8. Referring to the comments made by the representative of Chile the representative of the United States noted that those matters had been discussed twice bilaterally under the procedures of Article XXII. The United States continued to be ready to consult further. She recalled that the President of the United States took action on 24 December 1987 to suspend Chile indefinitely from the GSP. This action went into effect on 29 February 1988. The basis for the President's decision was the provision in the United States legislation that required beneficiary developing countries "to have taken or be taking steps" to afford internationally recognized workers' rights to their workers. As the Government of Chile was aware this provision was among a number of provisions that were added to the law by the United States Congress when the GSP programme was renewed for eight-and-a-half years in 1984. After two-and-a-half years of review the President had determined that the requirements of the law had not been met. Therefore, the President was required to deny Chile the unilaterally offered tariff preferences. The President's action was in accordance with the waiver from MFN treatment granted for GSP programmes on 25 June 1971 as extended by the 1979 Framework Agreement. All beneficiary developing countries were subject to the same provision in the law. The United States remained committed to its autonomous GSP programme as an integral component of its trade and development policy towards developing countries. The United States also remained committed to the importance of consultations with beneficiary developing countries in all decisions involving its GSP programme. This was reflected in the fact that the United States consulted

with Chile on numerous occasions throughout the course of the Chilean half-year review and had also held two Article XXII consultations.

9. The representative of Chile said that his authorities had never objected to the unilateral way in which the measure by the United States was taken as it reflected the unilateral character of GSP but they would not accept the discriminatory nature of the measure. If for a given reason, legally or not, one had to call into question an agreement with Chile then this agreement should be called into question with all those countries that had found themselves in the same circumstances. It was quite probable that all those countries had fulfilled the requirements of the ILO as Chile had and that was why the measure was considered to be discriminatory. Chile was now involved in a consultation process with the United States and hoped that it would bring about satisfactory results.

10. Referring to the agreement recently concluded in Belgrade by a number of developing countries on the Global System of Trade Preferences (GSTP) some delegations recalled their interest in obtaining information on the agreement as soon as possible. It was also enquired when the CONTRACTING PARTIES might have the opportunity to examine the agreement, either under the terms of the Enabling Clause or another GATT procedure if that avenue would be determined to be more appropriate given the nature of the agreement and the number of participants.

11. The representative of Yugoslavia informed the Committee that the Ministerial meeting on GSTP was held in Belgrade between 6 and 13 April 1988 with the participation of sixty-two countries out of which forty-five signed the GSTP Agreement. Information on this subject matter had been published in the South Bulletin. The GSTP Agreement would enter into force upon ratification by at least fifteen countries. As soon as the process of ratification would be completed the signatory countries would notify the agreement to GATT in accordance with relevant procedures.

12. One representative welcomed the notification by ALADI of the agreement between Argentina and Brazil on capital goods (L/6158/Add.1). The representative enquired whether the agreement was a part of the Brazil-Argentina Economic Integration Agreement signed in July 1986 which was supposed to include eleven protocols establishing a customs union for capital goods and outlining co-operative ventures in other fields such as agriculture, energy and biotechnology and when any agreement concluded in these other fields would be notified to the GATT. She also noted that neither the text nor a description of the agreements under the trilateral pact between Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay had ever been notified or circulated to the CONTRACTING PARTIES and reiterated the request that these agreements be notified particularly in view of recent reports that their provisions had been expanded and improved. The representative explained that this request was part of the larger issue that her delegation had addressed previously concerning the problems that third countries had in obtaining information with regard to integration efforts of developing

countries. Even if these agreements were not addressed formally under the procedures of Article XXIV, GATT custom and practice and the provisions of the Enabling Clause made it clear that such information should be provided and opportunity for discussion and evaluation be afforded. This request was aimed at promoting transparency and greater understanding of the effect of these agreements both on participants and on third-country trade and ultimately at ensuring that these agreements were consistent with the Enabling Clause and other GATT rules. Unfortunately, there was no first hand information on the agreements, most of which were missing from the notification contained in L/6158/Add.1. It seemed that the agreements might prevent access to markets by third countries, a situation which went far beyond the granting of preferences. In addition, the agreement appeared to allow access to Argentina into the Brazilian market where no access existed before, for example with respect to cars, the import of which were previously generally prohibited under the Brazilian Law of Similar. Furthermore, it appeared that the effect of the accords would be to extend the Law of Similar so that third countries would be prevented from exporting to Brazil not only goods similar to those produced in this country but also those goods similar to goods produced in Argentina. Commenting upon the Agreement on Capital Goods the representative expressed a number of concerns or sought clarification with respect to several specific points: the apparent restrictiveness of the agreement which seemed to result in planned trade flows; the exceedingly high rules of origin requirement of 80 per cent domestic content; special provisions on non-tariff measures contained in the agreement; quantitative targets set

for trade flows and the proposed mechanism for balancing trade; the implication of the freezing in place of protection levels currently applicable to third countries for those countries which would wish to seek concessions on capital goods from Brazil and Argentina in the Uruguay Round. The representative also requested information on the reported association of Uruguay with a number of agreements concluded between Brazil and Argentina and enquired when contracting parties may expect additional notification. She requested that this item remain on the agenda of the Committee and that the questions addressed be answered fully and in a timely manner.

13. The representative of Brazil speaking also on behalf of Argentina expressed regret that the information submitted through the ALADI secretariat (L/6158/Add.1) had not fully satisfied all Committee members. His authorities had worked together closely with those of Argentina so as to provide the Committee with all relevant information they deemed necessary for the fulfilment of their procedural obligations according to the decisions taken by the Committee and the Council. The representative underlined that the bilateral agreement between Brazil and Argentina was a legal instrument part of a larger undertaking which was the Montevideo Treaty of 1980. This Treaty constituted the framework of all bilateral agreements concluded between member States of ALADI. The initiative of Brazil and Argentina was taken under the legal framework of Article 11 of the Latin-American Integration Treaty. As it was known the Treaty had been notified to the GATT and its Article 11 had not been questioned. Since the

agreement between Brazil and Argentina was just in its preliminary stage of implementation it would be difficult to assess the full implication of its provisions even in the case of Brazilian and Argentinian direct interests. His authorities believed that the reinforcement of the integration process in Latin America would contribute to the expansion of multilateral trade. In this sense his authorities anticipated no breach of their commitment to Article XXIV or to the Enabling Clause. Neither did they anticipate that the integration would displace trade flows to the disadvantage of their main trade partners. The representative said that the new questions addressed at this meeting would be referred to capitals as well as to the delegation of Uruguay and hoped that the answers would be provided at the next meeting. He also said that all agreements between Brazil and Argentina which were relevant to the GATT would be notified.

14. The representative of Japan addressed the notification by his country concerning improvements made to the GSP scheme (L/4531/Add.16). He pointed out that as from 1 April 1988 New Caledonia (French territory) has been designated a new beneficiary and Burma has been made eligible for special LLDC measures under the scheme. As a result of special and regular expansions of ceilings on industrial products for fiscal year 1988 the total ceiling quota has been expanded by about 25 per cent. The ceiling control for unwrought aluminium has been released. The representative underlined that these improvements to Japan's GSP scheme were made only one year after the overall reform of the scheme despite the difficulties facing Japanese industries due to the appreciation of yen. These improvements

reflected the great importance attached by the Japanese Government to trading relations with developing countries.

15. The Committee took note of the statements and comments made. The Chairman noted that the GSTP agreement would be notified in due course after its entering into effect. He also observed that further information in regard to agreements concluded under the Montevideo Treaty was expected and that the Committee would revert to this matter at a future meeting.

Agenda item (iii): Work of the Sub-Committee on the Trade of Least-Developed Countries

16. The Chairman recalled that at the Sixty-First Session of the Committee in June 1987 it was agreed to re-activate the Sub-Committee on Trade of the Least-Developed Countries in order to keep under review issues in the Uruguay Round of particular interest to the least-developed countries. In accordance with the mandate given by the Committee, the Sub-Committee on Trade of the Least-Developed Countries met on 11 February 1988. The note on Proceedings of the Meeting held on 11 February 1988 was contained in document COM.TD/LLDC/10/Rev.1.

17. In his statement to the Committee, the Chairman of the Sub-Committee said that the meeting held on 11 February 1988, the first since the last meeting of the Sub-Committee in October 1985, was convened in response to the mandate given by the Committee in June 1987, providing for a regular

review of issues in the Uruguay Round of particular interest to the least-developed countries. The meeting was well attended by contracting parties as well as non-contracting party least-developed countries and observers from a number of international organizations. At the beginning of the meeting, the Chairman of the Sub-Committee reviewed the main international developments and initiatives of importance to the least-developed countries which had taken place since the last meeting of the Sub-Committee in October 1985, while the observer from UNCTAD briefed the Sub-Committee on the work in his Organization relating to least-developed countries. The rest of the meeting was devoted to its main agenda item, namely a review of developments in the Uruguay Round of particular interest to the least-developed countries, and was highlighted by the introduction by Bangladesh, on behalf of least-developed countries, of a list of preliminary proposals for consideration in the Uruguay Round. These proposals were now before the Sub-Committee for further examination. They comprised certain general and specific items for consideration in the various negotiating groups in the Uruguay Round as well as specific measures aimed at promoting a more effective implementation of the 1982 Ministerial Decision. A large number of delegations expressed the hope that these proposals and others which were made during the meeting would constitute a useful input in the negotiating process and would be given the necessary consideration in the various negotiating groups and fora. These proposals were preliminary and others could be made in the course of the negotiations. A first response to the proposals at the meeting from both developed and developing countries was positive. It was suggested that

consultations be held on how to proceed further with them. In the course of the meeting a number of delegations, including those of developing countries, also gave information on measures they had been taking or were contemplating in favour of the least-developed countries. The need for a greater volume of financial and other assistance to these countries was also emphasized; so was the need for more technical assistance in their favour, especially in the framework of the Uruguay Round. With regard to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee, delegations have agreed to keep open the possibility of a meeting before the summer recess, probably on 22 June.

18. The representative of Bangladesh observed that the significant deterioration in the overall macro-economic situation of those countries during the first half of the present decade, their declining share in the world economy and trade, an amounting debt/GDP ratio were now well documented. The historically low level of commodity prices, adverse terms of trade, insufficient external financial flows and other adverse conditions and natural calamities had led to the increase in the number of least-developed countries from thirty-one in 1985 to forty-one in 1987. Taking into account the particular economic situation and problems of the least-developed countries and in pursuance of relevant provisions of the 1979 Decision of the CONTRACTING PARTIES as well as of the Ministerial Declaration of the Uruguay Round Bangladesh, on behalf of the least-developed countries, submitted some preliminary proposals to the Sub-Committee on the Trade of Least-Developed Countries on 11 February 1988. Reiterating the proposals contained in document COM.TD/LLDC/10/Rev.1

which were addressed to (a) the negotiating groups under the Uruguay Round and (b) to the CONTRACTING PARTIES as a follow-up of the 1982 Ministerial Declaration, the representative recalled that they received understanding and support from many countries both developed and developing. The representative also stated that the request for exemption of LLDCs from product withdrawals and graduation under the GSP contained in the proposals should be read in context of the 1979 Decision on the Enabling Clause. Bangladesh recorded its deep appreciation to the international community for the commitment made in favour of the least-developed countries in various international fora and in the context of the Uruguay Round. What was involved now was specific action by the international community yielding visible results in favour of the least-developed countries. The proposals made encompassed some of this specific action.

19. Several delegations expressed support for the general thrust of proposals or for proposals in their entirety. The important rôle of the Sub-Committee on the Trade of Least-Developed Countries in keeping under review issues in the Uruguay Round of particular interest to those countries was again underlined. Some representatives of the least-developed countries also emphasized the need for strengthening the technical assistance accorded to the least-developed countries on all aspects of their trade development by the CONTRACTING PARTIES and the secretariat. One delegation welcomed the interpretation provided by the representative of Bangladesh in regard to the proposal concerning the exemption of LLDCs from withdrawals and graduation under the GSP and

reiterated that his country could not accept the notion that developing countries could be graduated.

20. The Chairman of the Sub-Committee said that at its next meeting tentatively scheduled on 22 June 1988 the Sub-Committee, was expected to undertake a deeper examination of the proposals made by Bangladesh on behalf of the least- developed countries.

21. The Committee took note of the statements made. Committee members were invited to reflect on the proposals made by Bangladesh. It was agreed that the Sub-Committee on the Trade of Least-Developed Countries would continue to examine these proposals at its next meeting.

Agenda item (iv): Technical assistance to developing countries in the context of the Uruguay Round

22. The Chairman recalled that at its Sixty-Second Session the Committee noted that other international organizations as well as individual governments were involved in technical assistance activities related to the Uruguay Round and that, with a view to ensuring greater complementarity of these activities, efforts towards increased transparency would be useful. He observed that the Canadian delegation had offered some suggestions to this end (COM.TD/W/457).

23. The Representative of Canada suggested that the GATT secretariat set up a system of notification whereby contracting parties and other international organizations would advise the secretariat on their technical assistance activities relating to the Uruguay Round. The GATT secretariat could play a co-ordinating rôle in order to minimize duplication of efforts and identify areas that needed more attention.

24. Many delegations supported the notion that the GATT secretariat serve as a focal point for information on technical assistance activities related to the Uruguay Round. However, some delegates emphasized that the system of notification envisaged should not create new obligations in addition to those already assumed by contracting parties, in the framework of GATT. Some delegates pointed out the need to have a broad number of participants provide information, including trade data, to ensure transparency and achieve improvements of technical assistance efforts. Several delegates recognized the need to fill in gaps and avoid overlaps given the great number of technical assistance activities undertaken outside GATT and therefore believed that some form of co-ordination by the Committee on Trade and Development would be useful. Other representatives questioned the need for co-ordination or the feasibility of this objective. The representative of a group of developed countries stated that his delegation would be submitting ideas on this issue at a future meeting. Other members emphasized that consultations should take place with developing countries in order to better identify their needs in the field of technical assistance and enhance their effective participation in the Uruguay Round

as foreseen in the Punta del Este Declaration. To this effect, the role of the Committee on Trade and Development should consist in conveying a proper and balanced perspective on the issues covered by technical assistance activities undertaken by other organizations.

25. The observer from the World Bank reiterated his agency's willingness to provide technical assistance to developing countries in order to enable them to fully participate in negotiations and to have the information and capability to analyse negotiating proposals. Recalling the existence of the Handbook on negotiating issues in the Uruguay Round prepared by the Bank, he informed the Committee that a second edition of the Handbook might follow. The representative also advised members that the Bank intended to organize new workshops on negotiating issues such as services (Geneva, May 1988), non-tariff measures (Geneva, October 1988) and textiles and clothing (Stockholm, April 1989). He also referred to a forthcoming software programme that would enable negotiators to analyze market access problems.

26. The representative of the Commonwealth Secretariat advised members that the Secretariat had established an office in Geneva. The secretariat issued a quarterly bulletin called "International Development Policies" which summarized developments in the evolution of international development policies and in the Uruguay Round. In addition a periodical bulletin was issued on work in the Negotiating Groups. The secretariat also prepared analytical papers on negotiating issues and provided assistance in accordance with the needs of Commonwealth members.

27. The Committee agreed to invite governments and international organizations which provided technical assistance to developing countries in relation to work in the Uruguay Round to keep the Committee periodically informed on activities which they had carried out as well as of facilities which were available under their programmes, in order to promote greater transparency and complementarity of these technical assistance activities. It was also understood that the Committee would keep the matter under review and pursue, if necessary, informal consultations regarding procedures to be adopted.

Next meeting of the Committee

28. The Chairman proposed that the next meeting of the Committee be tentatively scheduled for 13 July 1988 and that the final date be determined by the Chairman in consultation with delegations and the secretariat.