

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

RESTRICTED

TBT/M/7

5 August 1981

Special Distribution

Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON
12 JUNE 1981

Chairman: Mr. S. Tamura

1. The Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade held its seventh meeting on 12 June 1981.

2. The agenda of the meeting was as follows:

	Page
A. Request for Accession by Bulgaria	1
B. Statements on Implementation and Administration of the Agreement	4
C. Procedures and Format for Notification	6
D. Technical Assistance	7
E. Enquiry Points: Suggested Meeting	8
F. Regional Standards-Related Activities	8
G. Applicability of the Agreement to Processes and Production Methods	10
H. Derestriction of Documents	12
I. Private Standardizing Organizations	13
J. Date and Agenda of the Next Meeting	13

3. In opening the meeting, the Chairman, on behalf of the Committee, welcomed Pakistan as a new signatory to the Agreement.

A. Request for Accession by Bulgaria

4. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Chairman of the Working Party on the Accession of Bulgaria presented, on his own responsibility, his second progress report on the work of the Working Party. He gave an account of developments in the negotiations for the accession of Bulgaria since the last meeting of the Committee and said that the Working Party had agreed to meet within about one month's time to hear further reactions to a draft proposal for terms of accession that had emerged from its fourth meeting and to approve its report to the Committee. The text of his progress report, together

with the text of the draft proposal for terms he had referred to, is being circulated as TBT/7.

5. The representative of Hungary, recalling that more than six months had elapsed since the Working Party had been given its mandate, expressed its regret and concern that a group of signatory countries had still not had sufficient time to make up their minds on the terms for the accession of Bulgaria which were elaborated by the Working Party on an ad referendum basis. The ad referendum terms of accession reflected a wide measure of compromise, while safeguarding, though marginally, some of the basic principles of the GATT system. One could therefore have reasonably expected that they would be acceptable to everybody, if they were acceptable to the acceding country. The Hungarian delegation had taken an active part in the Working Party's deliberations. They felt that a group of signatory countries had not acted in the present case in line with their repeatedly stated policy objective to invite as many countries as possible to accept the results of the MTN. Bulgaria had manifested her profound and sincere interest to follow this invitation and advice, but the delaying tactics of some signatory countries had made it impossible to finalize the task of the Working Party by the present meeting of the Committee. The Bulgarian delegation had shown a great deal of flexibility in order to reach a reasonably speedy conclusion of the negotiations. They had accepted a thorough examination of their practice and policy in the fields covered by the Agreement, which had been carried out to the mutual satisfaction of the members of the Working Party. During its subsequent examination the Working Party had reached the important conclusion that the terms of accession would for both to Bulgaria and the signatory countries, give rights and obligation exclusively in the fields covered and defined by the Agreement. Any trade policy consideration of any signatory country or a group of them, apart from those stemming strictly from the provisions of the Agreement had thus been discarded and would remain out of place as a result of this conclusion. Another common understanding of the Working Party had been that in drawing up the terms of accession, it had to take into account the fact that Bulgaria is not a contracting party to the GATT, and, therefore, Article 14.23 of the Agreement is not applicable between Bulgaria and the other signatory countries. The draft terms of accession arrived at in the Working Party were acceptable to all participants except the European Communities. The basic difference between the European Communities' approach and that of the other participants had been, that the Communities would wish to exclude the multilateral, collective function of the signatory countries, represented by the Committee, from authorizing the suspension of obligations under the Agreement between Bulgaria and a signatory country. The Community would wish to replace that multilateral authority and function of the Committee by seeking to get a free hand for bilateral actions, which would be totally out of the control of the Committee. The Hungarian delegation, with some support from other signatory countries, had opposed that approach, because the dispute settlement provisions proposed by the European Communities would undermine the integrity of the Agreement, would result in a serious lack of balance between rights and obligations to the detriment of Bulgaria, would be in contradiction with the multilateral surveillance and dispute settlement spirit of the Agreement, and would result in a discriminated signatory status for Bulgaria in the Agreement. The Hungarian delegation attached considerable significance to the full

application of the above-mentioned principles of the GATT and expected the same attitude from the other signatory countries, being as they are in the GATT system. The terms of accession elaborated on ad referendum basis did represent a compromise. The difference between the European Communities' approach and that of other signatories including Hungary was that the said terms of accession gave a certain authority to the signatory countries' collective entity in the course of dispute settlement between Bulgaria and the signatory countries, in accordance with the Agreement provisions. The European Communities' approach, on the other hand, would exclude the Committee's role from the substantial part of such exercise. Such an approach was unacceptable to the Hungarian delegation. Any further undue delay in accepting the terms of accession elaborated in the Working Party could only strengthen the impression that multilateral dispute settlement, the strengthening of the GATT system, the balance of rights and obligations, the exclusion of unilateral, arbitrary actions from the GATT system, etc. were not, for certain contracting parties, mutually accepted norms to be followed.

6. The representative of the European Economic Community said that the Chairman of the Working Party had properly identified the status of the draft proposal for the terms of accession. In this regard he disagreed with the analysis of the outcome given by the representative of Hungary and in particular with the statement that the draft proposal had been elaborated ad referendum. He could not accept other aspects of the representative of Hungary's analysis of the situation and, without going into detail, he stressed that the aim of the exercise was to reach mutually satisfactory terms of accession. The Parties to the Agreement and Bulgaria had entered into negotiations for this purpose. Many formal and informal meetings and consultations had been held and work had proceeded at a normal pace for GATT negotiations. There had not been any undue delay. Indeed, since this was the first time that a non-contracting party requested to accede to an MTN Agreement, the matter needed to be examined carefully in all its implications. The European Economic Community had always assured Bulgaria both bilaterally and multilaterally of its political will to see Bulgaria accede to the Agreement, but it must be clear that the terms of accession must be mutually satisfactory to all the signatories to the Agreement as well as Bulgaria. His delegation could agree that the Working Party should meet again within about one month's time to pursue its work and the European Communities could assure the Committee that they would seek to reach mutually satisfactory terms for the accession of Bulgaria.

7. The observer from Czechoslovakia said that in the light of his country's intention to join the Agreement in the near future his delegation had a particular interest in the work of the Working Party and therefore wished to place some comments on record. The Working Party had efficiently carried out its initial fact-finding exercise as well as the elaboration of a draft proposal for terms of accession, which represented a compromise solution. The fact that the initial exchange of information had shown that Bulgaria was able, and willing, to fulfill in a meaningful way all the obligations under the Agreement had made such progress possible. At the present stage, any unnecessary delay in completing the task of the Working Party or attempting to modify the balanced text of proposed terms of accession as drafted would risk impairing the balance of rights and obligations as achieved in that text. It might further discourage other GATT

contracting parties in their efforts to join the MTN Agreements, as it was no secret that many countries, especially developing countries, still maintained a somewhat sceptical aloofness vis-a-vis these agreements. There was now an opportunity to show a real will to implement the often-stated policy of encouraging the broadest possible participation in the MTN Agreements.

8. The observer from Bulgaria stated that the draft proposal for terms of accession of his country to the Agreement was a reasonable compromise which his government could accept. In this connexion he paid special tribute to the Chairman of the Working Party in preventing deadlock and helping to find such a compromise. Though his delegation believed that all the conditions were met for the Committee to decide on Bulgaria's accession, they were still prepared to wait for the European Communities to take a decision in the matter on the understanding that this decision would be based on the compromise text. He hoped that there was no misunderstanding as to the status of this text. In his view the stage had now been reached where delegations must react to the draft terms of accession and the issue was no longer to try and elaborate mutually satisfactory terms. He expressed a hope that the Committee would agree to adjourn consideration of this item until the Working Party had concluded its work and would continue to show a real will to bring about the accession of his country, as a non-contracting party, to the Agreement.

9. The Committee noted the progress report presented by the Chairman of the Working Party as well as the statements made by delegations on the issue.

10. It decided to adjourn consideration of this item of its agenda and to hold a special meeting in about one month's time, to examine the report of the Working Party, the exact date of the meeting to be fixed by the Chairman in consultation with delegations.

B. Statements on Implementation and Administration of the Agreement

11. In introducing this item, the Chairman suggested that delegations might keep in mind the points he had referred to at the previous meeting (TBT/M/6, paragraph 25).

12. The representative of the United States said that measures taken by his country to implement and administer the Agreement were fully described in TBT/6. His delegation nonetheless remained ready to answer any question concerning this matter either in the Committee or bilaterally. For their part, they had addressed a number of follow-up questions to some other signatories which he hoped would be answered at this meeting.

13. The representatives of Argentina and Austria said they would provide replies to questions addressed to them by the United States bilaterally in the near future.

14. The representative of Chile gave details of the coordination established between ministries for purposes of implementation. He said a special working party had been established to coordinate all activities related to the Agreement, on which several ministries were

represented as well as other administrative bodies and the Institute for Standardization. The Association of Chilean Exporters, a private body, also was available to give or receive information on standards in consultation with the Ministry of Economic Affairs, which was in charge of coordinating all these activities. Requests for information were channeled through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or the Chilean delegation in Geneva.

15. The representative of Switzerland stated that the Agreement was being fully implemented in his country and that the Federal Ordinance regarding administration of the Agreement which was in preparation dealt with purely internal organizational matters and would not have any influence on the application of the Agreement vis-a-vis other Parties.

16. The representative of Italy indicated that local government authorities in Italy did not have competence in fields covered by the Agreement and that a fundamental law provided that all technical matters fall in this hands of the central government. Notifications of proposed technical regulations were handled by the Italian Mission in Geneva. With regard to publication and time limit for comments, he referred to the relevant parts of document TBT/6.

17. The representative of Japan announced that his authorities had taken three measures to ensure full implementation of the Agreement in Japan. First, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Home Affairs had jointly sent a notice to local public bodies that they must take measures similar to those adopted at central government level to ensure the implementation of the Agreement. Second, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had given notice to other ministries that they must give guidance to the same effect to non-governmental bodies within their competence. Thirdly, the government had edited a new manual describing the content of the Agreement and the measures which should be taken by local and non-governmental bodies to make known the contents of the Agreement to all interested parties.

18. The representative of the Netherlands indicated that following parliamentary approval, the Agreement was being applied de jure as from 15 May 1981 in his country.

19. The representative of the European Economic Community, speaking in the name of Greece, said that ratification procedures were nearing completion in Greece and that meanwhile the Agreement was being fully applied on a de facto basis. He said that several questions addressed by the European Economic Community to other signatories had not been fully answered as yet and that his delegation wished to pursue these requests for information bilaterally and hoped that replies could be given in the Committee.

20. The representative of Spain said that the necessary instruments of ratification would soon be deposited in the secretariat.

21. At the close of the discussion, the Committee noted that further information on implementation and administration of the Agreement was being provided through exchanges of questions among signatories and that this item would remain on the agenda for consideration at its next regular meeting in conjunction with the second annual review.

22. The Chairman recalled the conclusions reached at the sixth meeting regarding preparations for the second annual review and said that informal consultations might be held to finalize the arrangements for the review.

C. Procedures and Format for Notification

23. The Chairman, referring to document TBT/W/20/Rev.1, said that there were four points to be decided by the Committee. The first and most important one was the format for notifications on which informal consultations had been held. He said the Committee should adopt the format at this meeting so as to ensure a smooth and efficient operation of the procedure, which is central to the Agreement.

24. The Committee's discussion centred on two aspects of the proposed format: (1) reference to international standards, and (2) notification under Articles relating to local and non-governmental bodies.

25. The representative of Sweden, speaking for the Nordic countries, said that these countries could go along with the proposal contained in paragraph 4 of the secretariat document, without the square brackets. Sweden for its part would like to come back to the question of reference to international standards in the context of the three-year review of the operation of the Agreement.

26. The representatives of Brazil, Canada, Chile, European Economic Community, Switzerland and the United States said they could also accept the approach suggested in paragraph 4 of TBT/W/20/Rev.1. The representatives of Canada and the United States, said, however, that in practice their authorities may have difficulty in following the recommendation contained under Item 8 of the Guidelines.

27. Regarding the reference to other Articles under which notification could arise, in point 3 of the Guidelines, different views were expressed regarding the appropriateness of notifications under those Articles and the Committee noted that some signatories would notify under them and others would not.

28. After a further exchange of views on other aspects of the format and the Guidelines, the Chairman noted that these would be finalized by the secretariat in the light of the discussion and in consultation with interested delegations and suggested that to the extent possible, delegations begin to notify in accordance with the revised format one month following circulation by the secretariat of the agreed format and Guidelines. It was so agreed.

29. The Committee agreed to the points mentioned in paragraph 6 of document TBT/W/20/Rev.1, namely, to:

- (a) urge all signatories to make notifications where this is called for under the Agreement.
- (b) request signatories to transmit the text of their notifications to the secretariat rapidly, e.g. by telex
- (c) formally request the secretariat to ensure that notifications are processed within three working days and that the attention of developing signatories is drawn to notifications of interest to them within the same time limit.

30. The representative of Switzerland raised the question of the possibility of making exchanges of information on proposed standards more rapid and effective through arrangements between signatories for the automatic exchange of documentation relevant to notifications, on the basis of strict reciprocity between interested countries.

31. The representative of the European Economic Community welcomed the suggestion by Switzerland, which was consistent with a suggestion previously made by his delegation in the Committee. He suggested that such arrangements could be concluded on a voluntary basis. The representative of Chile also expressed interest of his delegation for the Swiss suggestion.

32. The Chairman invited the Committee to take note of the suggestion by Switzerland and to revert to the matter in the context of the discussion of notification procedures that would take place during the Second Annual Review of the operation of the Agreement. It was so agreed.

D. Technical Assistance

33. The delegations of Brazil, the European Economic Community and the United Kingdom on behalf of Hong Kong said the information circulated in TBT/W/28 showed the scope and variety of technical assistance being given to developing countries in the field of standardization and welcomed the circulation of this information which helped bring more transparency into the operation of the Agreement. The delegation of Brazil said they had requested assistance from Japan under Article 11 and would keep the Committee informed about the follow-up to their request. The delegation of the United Kingdom on behalf of Hong Kong welcomed the willingness expressed by signatories to provide technical assistance in response to specific requests.

34. The representative of the European Economic Community said that the EEC was offering technical assistance in the field of export promotion to both associated and non-associated developing countries. Proposals for assistance should be formulated by the interested countries themselves and they would be examined in the light of their feasibility and of available financing.

35. The delegations of the Canada, France, Germany and Japan said they would supply more detailed information about the activities of the relevant bodies in their countries, in particular private bodies, in the field of technical assistance.

36. At the close of the discussion, the Committee took note of the statements made by delegations and also noted that it was up to developing countries parties to the Agreement to formulate specific requests for assistance under Article 11 to which other signatories in the Committee could respond. The Committee also agreed to continue to devote attention to the matter and invited delegations to furnish information on their activities in this area on a continuing basis.

E. Enquiry Points: Suggested meeting

37. The Committee discussed the organization of a meeting of persons responsible for national enquiry points on the basis of the secretariat proposal contained in TBT/W/29.

38. Following a broad exchange of views on the matter, the Committee agreed to include the subject of enquiry points as one of the first items on the agenda of its next regular meeting. Persons responsible for enquiry points would be invited to attend the Committee meeting during the discussion of this item. After an initial examination of any policy questions, discussion of the item would be adjourned. Persons responsible for enquiry points would then have an opportunity to hold informal discussions on a bilateral and multilateral basis. The Committee would resume its discussion of enquiry points at the end of its meeting to reach any appropriate conclusions, including the eventual need for a further meeting to discuss particular subjects relevant to the operation of enquiry points. The suggestions for subjects to be taken up, contained in paragraph 3 of document TBT/W/29, would remain on the table as a basis for the discussion in the Committee and for the consultations among persons responsible for enquiry points.

39. The Committee invited delegations to bring with them to the meeting written statements giving information on points in the checklist contained in paragraph 3 of TBT/W/29. This documentation would be circulated informally at the Committee's next meeting. Delegations wishing to raise questions of policy for discussion in the Committee itself were invited to inform the secretariat of this fact one month before the meeting, so as to allow time for informal consultations on the matter if required.

F. Regional Standards-Related Activities

40. The representative of the United States said that his delegation had requested that work be started in this area because of his country's long-standing concern about the development of regional standardizing bodies. This had been one of the prime reasons why the United States had entered into negotiations on the Agreement. The preoccupation of the United States was that the establishment of regional standards might prevent the products originating in countries not members of the regional bodies from being certified for sale on the markets of the member countries. It was for this reason that the United States had supported the inclusion of Article 9.3 in the Agreement. However, the wording of the obligation laid down in this Article may have the effect that regional standardization bodies fall outside the effective purview of the Agreement, especially as regards access to notifications as well as notification and publication of standards. The United States were concerned that if standards are substantially evolved regionally their notification to the GATT would only be pro forma, and comments to proposed standards would not be taken into account because the elaboration of the standards would be so far advanced that their content would be practically immutable. Regarding the work undertaken by the secretariat, the representative of the United States welcomed the information supplied and suggested that the secretariat might contact regional bodies in order to seek

further information on a number of questions which his delegation was circulating to the Committee (reproduced in TBT/W/32), particularly regarding the operating rules of these bodies in the fields of access to certification and the opportunities available for commenting on certification procedures, which the United States believed might have repercussions on the operation of the Agreement. He also suggested that at some future time, representatives of regional bodies might be invited to address the Committee on their activities, and requested that the Committee revert to this item at its next meeting on the basis of a revised secretariat document.

41. The representative of Finland supported the suggestion to update and expand the coverage of document TBT/W/30 and indicated some changes to be made in the document as it stood.

42. The representative of Romania said that his delegation supported the proposal for studying the activities of regional standardization bodies and in that connexion the study circulated in document TBT/W/30 was useful. Romania was participating in standardization and certification activities within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) for problems in which it was interested and which concerned the preparation of standards-related technical documentation (CMEA standards, methodological materials, etc.). Romania had not signed the Code and Convention of 1975. Consequently, CMEA standards were not mandatory in Romania and their content was introduced - in full or in part - into national standards as determined by the competent national bodies.

43. The representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of Hong Kong agreed that the question of the activities of regional bodies was one in which the Committee should take an interest. He said that Hong Kong manufacturers generally have to produce to the standards of their different export markets and there was therefore always a concern that regional standards might create barriers to trade to products originating in non-member countries. He stressed, however, that it was important not to discourage the development of international standards and saw regional standardizing activities as a step in this development. In the view of his delegation it was important that the Committee should be aware of how regional organizations operate. He could therefore agree that the Committee should revert to this item at its next meeting though at the present juncture there seemed no need for further work by the secretariat, as he felt delegations needed more time to reflect on the situation beforehand.

44. The representative of the European Economic Community supported the view expressed by the previous speaker that the activities of regional bodies did not necessarily result in increased protection of their members' markets and said that on the contrary they were trade liberalizing and should be looked at as a first step towards the establishment of international standards. In fact, some regional organizations had eventually become international standardizing bodies. His delegation also felt that the Committee should resume its discussion of this item in the light of comments made at this meeting and of replies to questions raised, but that there was no need at this stage to ask the secretariat to study the matter further.

45. The representative of Chile shared the concerns expressed by the United States delegation particularly on the question whether or not

regional bodies promote trade liberalization and also supported the suggestions for further work put forward by that delegation.

46. The representative of the United States emphasized his delegation's concern about regional standardizing activities centred on two issues: first, third countries having a legitimate interest in these activities should have access to information on the development of any results achieved if these were likely to affect their trade interests; second, the United States hoped that the over-riding principle guiding the activities of these bodies was non-discrimination not only among members but also vis-a-vis third parties, so as to ensure that regional trade liberalization efforts did not operate to the detriment of the latter.

47. The Committee noted the statements made and agreed to revert to this item at its next meeting in the light of these statements. In the meantime the secretariat would assemble any further information on regional standardizing and certification bodies that may be made available to it and would make the necessary corrections in document TBT/W/30.

G. Applicability of the Agreement to Processes and Production Methods (PPMs)

48. The Chairman recalled that at its last meeting the Committee had had a preliminary exchange of views on the proposals contained in paragraph 16 of TBT/W/24. At the present meeting, the United States delegation was circulating an illustrative list of processes and production methods (reproduced in TBT/W/33).

49. The representative of the United States said that the aim of the illustrative list circulated by his delegation was to highlight types of situations that occur in practice and that could create unnecessary obstacles to trade as well as to establish a factual basis for proceeding with consideration of this issue in the context of the first three-year review of the operation of the Agreement.

50. The representative of the European Economic Community said that any delegation was of course free to submit papers on topics which they felt were related to the work of the Committee, but that this did not imply any decision of the Committee to proceed in any particular way, nor could it prejudge the content of the three-year view. In any case the item should be removed from the agenda of future meetings of the Committee. Should the matter be brought up again, the Committee would have to decide anew whether to put it on the agenda. This being said, his delegation would not dispute the right of the United States to circulate any documents.

51. The representative of Finland, speaking in a personal capacity, indicated that contrary to what was said in TBT/W/24 and TBT/W/27, the ECE/ISO definitions did not include any mention of PPMs and that this was one reason among others why PPMs were not included in the definitions adopted for purposes of the Agreement. Speaking for the Nordic countries, he said that in principle the United States' approach was a productive one which might help solve the problems related to PPMs in an acceptable way sometime in the future. They could agree that the matter be taken up in the three-year review and

they also on their side intended to take up some problems in that review to which they had alluded at previous meetings of the Committee. The Nordic countries also believed it would be useful if interested countries were to notify to the secretariat problems encountered in the field of PPMs so that the secretariat could keep an inventory of them and provide basic information for the Committee on concrete cases at the three-year review. On the other hand, the Nordic countries felt that it would not be within the competence or the mandate of the GATT secretariat to undertake case studies as suggested in the United States' paper. Such work belonged to the Committee itself. Of course, interested Parties might, if they so wished, prepare such studies and present them to the Committee at the three-year review. Finally, the Nordic countries were of the view that it would serve no useful purpose to keep the item of PPMs on the agenda until the three-year review and appealed to the United States to withdraw that proposal.

52. The representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of Hong Kong said that his delegation was favourably disposed to the idea of maintaining an inventory of PPMs. As regards the three other proposals in paragraph 16 of TBT/W/24 they held a position similar to that of the Nordic countries. Though they had some difficulty with the United States' interpretation of Article 14.25 as it stands, they agreed that this was a matter that could be taken up at the three-year review.

53. The representative of New Zealand said that his delegation found the United States understanding of the position regarding PPMs substantially correct. The problems of substance which underlie Article 14.25 should be clearly addressed by the Committee. Given the differences of views that existed on the negotiating history of Article 14.25 he supported the United States proposals as a positive step forward towards solving the problem. While his delegation could agree to all four proposals, they could support a consensus on the first three only, that is, they could agree to remove the item from the agenda of future meetings.

54. The representative of Argentina supported the position of New Zealand. The representatives of Brazil, Canada, Chile, Romania and Switzerland agreed with this suggestion to take up the matter on PPMs at the three year review. These delegations could also go along with the idea of drawing up lists of concrete cases either in the form of an inventory or otherwise. However, some of these delegations did not give support to the suggestion that the secretariat should undertake case studies, while others did not comment on this point. The representative of Chile indicated that the possibility of instructing the secretariat to do so should nevertheless be left open. The representative of Switzerland proposed that the item be removed from the agenda of future meetings and that if any new developments occurred, the matter be taken up under "other business".

55. Several of these delegations recalled their positions on the substance of the matter as expressed by them at previous meetings of the Committee. The representative of Brazil in particular said his delegation shared the interpretation given by the United States in paragraphs 14 and 15 of TBT/W/24.

56. The representative of Austria said it would be useful for all Parties to the Agreement to continue and study the issue of PPMs, but he stressed that his authorities could not accept any additional obligation under Article 14.25 nor any interpretation that might involve any such additional obligations, because Article 14.25 had legal force in Austria and any extension of its provisions would need to be submitted to Parliament. He noted that there was no obligation in the Agreement to notify or publish PPMs and therefore could not accept the US proposals on this score.

57. The representative of the European Economic Community said that his delegation would not object to any delegation submitting papers on PPMs but they would not accept any secretariat role in the matter, for instance to establish an inventory nor any decision of the Committee at this stage regarding the content of the three-year review. It was too early to discuss this last point or what the outcome of the review might be. He noted, however, that there seemed to be a consensus in the Committee to remove the item from the agenda of future meetings and that the secretariat should not involve itself in any case studies. Regarding the question of inventory, he drew attention to the procedures of notification to the Inventory of Non-Tariff Measures which were still available and constituted a proper way of proceeding with this issue.

58. The representative of the United States, noting that there was no consensus in the Committee to include the question of PPMs on the agenda for the three-year review, suggested that at this stage the Committee might limit itself to recording the proposals and the statements made on this point. Regarding the inventory proposal he suggested that delegations might make submissions to the Committee relating to PPMs that might create unnecessary obstacles to trade, which would be circulated to the Committee but not consolidated into a single document in the form of an inventory. Delegations should also be free to submit any relevant working documentation and case studies of how the Agreement's coverage of PPMs could lead to the elimination of trade barriers. He reserved the right to request the inclusion of PPMs on the agenda of some future meeting prior to the three-year review.

59. The Chairman noted that the Committee agreed to proceed along the lines just presented by the United States delegation (see paragraph 56). The secretariat would follow normal practice in circulating any documents submitted by Parties on the subject.

H. Derestriction of Documents

60. At the request of the delegation of Canada, the Committee agreed to derestrict document TBT/6 immediately on the understanding that this decision did not set a precedent.

61. The representative of Japan raised the question of the eventual derestriction of notifications of proposed technical regulations or certification systems and said his authorities were considering possibilities of making these known to all concerned through appropriate media. The representative of Switzerland said that his authorities had also considered the issue and had come out in favour

of derestricting notifications; he suggested that delegations reflect on the matter so that the Committee could revert to it at the next meeting and if possible make a positive decision. It was so agreed.

I. Private Standardizing Organizations

62. At the request of the representative of the European Economic Community the Committee agreed to invite the secretariat, for consideration at the next meeting, to examine the feasibility of preparing a study on private standardizing bodies including the objectives, operating rules and activities of the organizations concerned.

J. Date and agenda of the next meeting

63. The Committee agreed to hold its next regular meeting on 20-23 October 1981. Among the items for inclusion in the agenda are the following:

1. Enquiry Points
2. Second Annual Review
3. Statements on Implementation and Administration of the Agreement
4. Regional Standardizing Bodies
5. Private Standardizing Bodies
6. Other Business (this may include election of officers for 1982).

64. Regarding preparation for the second annual review, the Chairman recalled the procedures agreed to at the sixth meeting of the Committee (TBT/M/6, para.28). He also suggested that consultations on the organization of the review be held sometime before it, in particular if there were suggestions for inclusion of other items than those discussed in the first Annual Review.