

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 3 JULY 2002**

Chairman: Mr. Raimundas Karoblis (Lithuania)

Addendum

Resumption of the meeting on 26 July to discuss item I, Technical Assistance

1.1 The Chairman informed Members that he wished to discuss the programme for the seminar on technical assistance, planned for 6-7 November 2002. Following the meeting of 3 July and Members' reluctance to adopt the proposed structure incorporating "break-out" sessions into the seminar, the Secretariat had prepared a second revised programme. This revision was faxed to all Members and circulated as document G/VAL/W/96/Rev.2. He wished to work on the basis of this revision with a view to incorporating comments and views into a final version. He added that the timing of the sessions would also have to be revised according to the interpreters' schedules. However, this would not change the substance of the programme which was to be the focus of the Committee's discussion. Finally, he added that there was still no decision on the matter of funding capital-based participants. Several requests for funding had been received which would be held on file until the matter was resolved.

1.2 The representative of the European Communities asked that the words "and providers" be incorporated into the second session of the first day and the first session of the second day of the programme in the phrase, "Issues for technical assistance donors". She also asked that in the second session, a sub-item be added on what was the most appropriate type of technical assistance to address specific areas such as risk analysis, post-importer audit, or administrative know-how. Finally, she asked that the concept of scheduling technical assistance activities be incorporated into the second session of the second day.

1.3 The representative of Pakistan asked what was meant by the word "provider"?

1.4 The representative of the European Communities replied that it was a more general term and also covered private persons. Technical assistance might be received not only from the WTO but from other governments or from private persons.

1.5 The representative of Australia stated that certain building blocks needed to be in place in order to facilitate implementation of the Agreement such as capacity and training. While his delegation did not believe that the draft programme needed to be revised, it assumed that the Secretariat would provide some guidance for presenters at the seminar to give consideration to these particular building blocks which supported implementation of the Agreement.

1.6 The representative of Guatemala agreed with the draft programme and the suggestions by the EC and Australia. He emphasized that his delegation was very interested in participating in the seminar but would need funding to send an expert from its capital. He asked whether it would be necessary to write a letter to the WTO Secretariat or simply mention this in the meeting?

1.7 The Chairman noted that he was consulting with the Technical Cooperation Division on the matter. He advised Members to write a letter explaining their financing needs, to be kept on file.

1.8 The representative of the Philippines noted the importance of the topic of coordination among the various donors and providers. This would assist recipients in coping with their needs. She supported the statement by Guatemala and added that the seminar would only be useful if it benefited from the widest participation of developing countries as well as from the participation of capital-based experts.

1.9 The representative of Bolivia considered the draft programme balanced and appropriate. Her country was in the midst of reforming its customs administration in order to be able to apply the Agreement. It would, therefore, be very interested in participating in this seminar but would also need funding.

1.10 The representative of India asked what form the summary of the seminar would take. She noted that it should be in a form that would allow easy extraction of elements which could be put to practical use.

1.11 The Chairman understood that the summary would be a factual statement regarding the problems raised and possible solutions proposed or tried. He added that the Committee could meet afterwards to follow-up the issues raised at the seminar in concrete terms.

1.12 The representative of Canada agreed with the programme and with the EC's suggestions. His delegation agreed on the need for the widest participation by developing as well as developed countries in this seminar. His delegation believed that the seminar should conclude with a factual summary highlighting the key elements as well a compendium of the documents presented by the presenters, to be circulated. This latter document would be useful as working material and would form the basis for further discussions in the Committees.

1.13 The representative of Honduras said his delegation would like to send an expert from its capital. However, it would need funding and supported the statements made by Guatemala and the Philippines.

1.14 The representative of Pakistan supported the suggestion by Canada to disseminate the documents as wide as possible, particularly to audiences in capitals. He also suggested video-taping the seminar and providing the tapes to capitals for people to view.

1.15 The representative of China asked if the panel discussions would be in groups or in plenary sessions?

1.16 The Chairman confirmed that presentations by panellists would be in the plenary sessions as would the question and answer sessions. The seminar would not break into groups. He added that Members should inform the Secretariat if they wished to participate as panellists and indicate in which session of the programme they would wish to participate. A revised programme would be issued after the summer break.

1.17 The meeting was adjourned.

---