

**Council for Trade-Related Aspects
of Intellectual Property Rights**

MINUTES OF MEETING

Held in the Centre William Rappard
on 27 and 28 November 2001

Chairperson: Ambassador Boniface Chidyausiku (Zimbabwe)

Subjects discussed:

A. NOTIFICATIONS UNDER PROVISIONS OF THE AGREEMENT

(i) Notifications under Article 63.2

(ii) Notifications under Article 69

B. REVIEW OF NATIONAL IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION

(i) Responses to initial questions, posed to Kuwait in the review of its legislation initiated in November 2000, which remained outstanding at the previous meeting

(ii) Responses to initial questions, posed to Bolivia, Cameroon, Congo, Grenada, Guyana and Suriname in the review of their legislation initiated in April 2001, which remained outstanding at the previous meeting

(iii) Responses to initial questions, posed to Albania, Argentina, Bahrain, Botswana, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Georgia, Honduras, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritius, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, the Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and the United Arab Emirates in the review of their legislation initiated in June 2001, which remained outstanding at the previous meeting

(iv) Responses to follow-up questions, posed in the reviews initiated in 2000 or 2001, which remained outstanding at the previous meeting

(v) Legislation of Members scheduled for review in November 2001 (Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, Gabon, Ghana, India, Lithuania, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, Uruguay and Zimbabwe)

(vi) Arrangements for future reviews

C. OTHER BUSINESS

(i) Implementation of Article 66.2(ii) Council meeting dates in 2002

1. In opening the meeting, the Chairperson said that, following consultations with delegations, the agenda for the meeting had been limited to the items concerning notifications under provisions of the Agreement and review of national implementing legislation, in view of the need for delegations to have more time to consider the implications of the outcome of the Doha Ministerial Conference for the other agenda items to which the Council had agreed, at its last meeting, to revert to at the present meeting.

A. NOTIFICATIONS UNDER PROVISIONS OF THE AGREEMENT

(i) Notifications under Article 63.2

- *Notifications from Members whose transitional periods under Article 65.2 or 65.3 expired on 1 January 2000 or who acceded to the WTO after that date*

2. The Chairperson informed the Council that the Secretariat had updated and circulated its note reflecting the status of the notifications received from these Members so far (JOB(01)/157). The note showed from which of the Members in question notifications had been received by 21 November 2001. Since then, additional notifications of laws and regulations had been received from Brunei Darussalam, Ghana and Uruguay; and additional notifications of responses to the Checklist of Issues on Enforcement (IP/C/5) had been received from Ghana, India and Malaysia. From the 74 Members in question, there were now 10 who had not yet submitted any notification concerning their implementing legislation. Notifications from a number of other Members were incomplete. Once again, he urged these Members to submit the outstanding material without delay recalling that pursuant to Article 63.2 of the Agreement the notifications of the laws and regulations in question were due as of 1 January 2000. He also urged the delegations in question, if not all the material to be notified was ready yet, to submit whatever could be notified now and complement the notification as soon as other parts of the material to be notified were ready for submission. He reminded delegations again that, under the Agreement Between the World Intellectual Property Organization and the World Trade Organization and decisions taken by WIPO's Governing Bodies, the International Bureau of WIPO was in a position to assist delegations with the translation of their main dedicated intellectual property laws and regulations, as required.

- *Notifications relating to Article 70.8 and 70.9*

3. The Chairperson informed the Council that, since the last meeting, a notification received from Brazil concerning amendments to its legislation relevant to patent applications in respect of pharmaceutical or agricultural products filed after 1 January 1995 had been circulated as document IP/N/1/BRA/I/1/Add.1.

- *Other notifications received under Article 63.2*

4. The Chairperson informed the Council that, since the last meeting, a notification had been received from Korea concerning amendments to legislation that it had notified earlier, which would be circulated in the IP/N/1/- series of documents as soon as possible.

5. The representative of Canada said that his delegation would submit a notification later in the week.

6. The Council took note of this statement.

(ii) *Notifications under Article 69*

7. The Chairperson informed the Council that, since the last meeting, a notification of a contact point under Article 69 of the Agreement had been received from Germany. This notification would be made available in the IP/N/3/- series of documents as soon as possible. There were 109 Members who had made the necessary notifications under Article 69.

B. REVIEW OF NATIONAL IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION

(i) *Responses to initial questions, posed to Kuwait in the review of its legislation initiated in November 2000, which remained outstanding at the previous meeting*

8. The Chairperson recalled that, at the previous meeting, the Council had noted that Kuwait had not responded to some initial questions posed in the review of its legislation, which had been initiated in November 2000. Since then, Kuwait had provided these responses, which had been circulated in document IP/C/W/232/Add.5.

(ii) *Responses to initial questions, posed to Bolivia, Cameroon, Congo, Grenada, Guyana and Suriname in the review of their legislation initiated in April 2001, which remained outstanding at the previous meeting*

9. The Chairperson recalled that, at its previous meeting, the Council had noted that responses from Bolivia, Cameroon, Congo, Grenada, Guyana and Suriname, whose reviews had been initiated in April 2001, to initial questions remained outstanding. Bolivia had indicated at that meeting that the only questions that it had not answered were requests for statistics which it did not have. Its written confirmation of this response had since been received and circulated in document IP/C/W/251/Add.2. No replies had been received since the previous meeting from Cameroon, Congo, Grenada, Guyana or Suriname.

10. The representative of Cameroon provided a brief introductory overview of the structure of Cameroon's legislation in the areas covered by the Agreement and of the changes that it had had to bring about in order to make its legislation compatible with the TRIPS Agreement. The records of this introductory statement as well as the questions put to Cameroon and the responses given (including responses to follow-up questions given after the meeting) will be circulated in documents IP/Q/CMR/1, IP/Q2/CMR/1, IP/Q3/CMR/1 and IP/Q4/CMR/1.

11. Continuing, he wished to convey to the Council some points of concern his Government had regarding the TRIPS Agreement. First, Cameroon would appreciate it if the Council could grant a period of delay enabling his Government to carry out the necessary legal reforms and put in place the institutions and human resources necessary to facilitate the application of the TRIPS Agreement on Cameroon territory. Second, following the example of other African countries, Cameroon was in favour of provisions to be taken into account in the text of the TRIPS Agreement on the protection of

the cultural expressions of peoples, such as folklore. And third, the protection of geographical indications for wines and spirits as provided for by Article 23 should be extended to agricultural products, foodstuffs and handicraft products.

12. The representative of the United States welcomed Cameroon's comments and applauded its efforts to implement the TRIPS Agreement. Her delegation continued to examine Cameroon's progress in implementation. She recalled the Chair's comment under the previous agenda item concerning the Agreement Between the World Intellectual Property Organization and the World Trade Organization, underlining that WIPO's expertise was available to assist developing and least-developed countries in the implementation of their obligations under the TRIPS Agreement. She urged Cameroon to discuss with WIPO and the WTO any problems it was facing in the implementation of the TRIPS Agreement.

13. The Chairperson said that some of the issues raised by Cameroon could be taken up by the Council at its next meeting. He urged Cameroon to provide its responses to outstanding initial questions without delay. He proposed that he write to the delegations of Congo, Grenada and Suriname reminding them to submit their responses to the initial questions posed to them without delay.

14. The Council agreed to proceed as suggested by the Chair, while taking note of the statements made.

(iii) Responses to initial questions, posed to Albania, Argentina, Bahrain, Botswana, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Georgia, Honduras, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritius, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, the Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and the United Arab Emirates in the review of their legislation initiated in June 2001, which remained outstanding at the previous meeting

15. The Chairperson recalled that, at the previous meeting, some Members had indicated that they were still analysing responses to initial questions submitted prior to or at that meeting by Albania, Argentina, Bahrain, Costa Rica, Croatia, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Nicaragua and Oman. Responses to initial questions posed in the reviews of the legislation of the 22 Members initiated in June 2001 had been received, since the previous meeting, from Egypt, Fiji, Georgia, Jamaica, Morocco and United Arab Emirates. These had been circulated in documents IP/C/W/278/Add.3, 311, 290/Add.1, 266/Add.2, 265/Add.5 and Add. 6 and 291/Add.1, respectively. There were still responses to initial questions which remained unanswered in the review of the legislation of Botswana, Egypt, Fiji, Kenya, Mauritius, the Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis and the United Arab Emirates.

16. During the course of the meeting, the representative of Kenya provided a response to the only initial question it had not yet answered.¹

17. The representative of the Philippines said that his delegation would submit its responses to all unanswered questions before the next meeting of the Council.

18. The representative of Egypt drew attention to the responses submitted by his delegation since that last meeting and invited those delegations which had posed questions to indicate any which were still unanswered.

¹ This response was subsequently circulated in document IP/C/W/294/Add.1.

19. The Chairperson urged the delegations which had not received responses to questions from Egypt to respond to its request for clarification and suggested that the Council urge the delegations of Botswana, Egypt, Fiji, Kenya, Mauritius, the Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis and the United Arab Emirates to provide responses to unanswered initial questions without delay.

20. The Council agreed to proceed as suggested by the Chair, while taking note of the statements made.

(iv) Responses to follow-up questions, posed in the reviews initiated in 2000 or 2001, which remained outstanding at the previous meeting

- *November 2000 review*

21. The Chairperson informed the Council that Kuwait had now provided responses to all follow-up questions and that these had been circulated in document IP/C/W/232/Add.6. Paraguay's responses to follow-up questions had been circulated after the last meeting in document IP/C/W/231/Add.2. He suggested that the item concerning the reviews of Kuwait and Paraguay be deleted from the agenda, it being understood that any delegation should feel free to revert to any matter stemming from those reviews at any time.

22. The Council so agreed.

- *April 2001 review*

23. The representative of Australia, speaking on behalf of Papua New Guinea, provided a brief introductory overview of the structure of Papua New Guinea's legislation in the areas covered by the Agreement and of the changes that it had had to bring about in order to make its legislation compatible with the TRIPS Agreement. The records of this introductory statement as well as the questions put to Papua New Guinea and the responses given (including responses to follow-up questions given after the meeting) will be circulated in documents IP/Q/PNG/1, IP/Q2/PNG/1, IP/Q3/PNG/1 and IP/Q4/PNG/1.

24. The Chairperson informed the Council that Bolivia and Papua New Guinea had provided responses to all questions, including follow-up questions, and suggested that the item concerning the reviews of Bolivia and Papua New Guinea be deleted from the agenda, it being understood that any delegation should feel free to revert to any matter stemming from those reviews at any time.

25. The Council so agreed.

26. The Chairperson recalled that Cameroon, Congo, Namibia and Suriname, the review of whose legislation had also been initiated in April 2001, had not yet provided responses to follow-up questions. He suggested that he write to these delegations reminding them to submit their responses to the follow-up questions posed to them without delay.

27. The Council agreed to proceed as suggested by the Chairperson.

- *June 2001 review*

28. The Chairperson recalled that the reviews of the legislation of Bahrain, Costa Rica, Croatia, Dominica, the Dominican Republic and Honduras had remained outstanding at the last meeting, because some other Members had indicated that they were still analysing the answers to follow-up questions received at or prior to that meeting. Since the last meeting, responses to follow-up questions had been received from Argentina, Georgia, Jamaica, Morocco and Nicaragua. These had

been circulated in documents IP/C/W/271/Add.5, 290/Add.1, 266/Add.3, 265/Add.5 and 288/Add.3, respectively. He suggested that the item concerning the review of the legislation of Argentina, Bahrain, Costa Rica, Croatia, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Georgia, Honduras, Jamaica, Morocco and Nicaragua be deleted from the agenda, it being understood that any delegation should feel free to revert to any matter stemming from those reviews at any time.

29. The Council so agreed.

30. The Chairperson informed the Council that responses to follow-up questions were still outstanding from Albania, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, Oman, the Philippines and the United Arab Emirates.

31. During the meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire provided written responses to the follow-up questions posed to it.²

32. The representative of Kenya said that he would provide responses to outstanding follow-up questions shortly.³

33. The representative of Oman hoped to provide responses to the follow-up questions that it had not yet answered before the next meeting.

34. The Chairperson suggested that the Council urge Albania, Botswana, Kenya, Oman, the Philippines and the United Arab Emirates to provide responses, without delay, to the follow-up questions that remained unanswered.

35. The Council so agreed, while taking note of the statements made.

(v) Legislation of Members scheduled for review in November 2001 (Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, Gabon, Ghana, India, Lithuania, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, Uruguay and Zimbabwe)

- *Requests for postponement*

36. The Chairperson recalled that, by means of a communication dated 1 November 2001 (document IP/C/24), Senegal had informed the Council of its new status as a least-developed country Member, invoked the provisions of Article 66.1 and any further extensions that might be granted under it, and requested that the Council postpone the review of its legislation.

37. The representative of the United States said that her delegation had concerns about Senegal's new least-developed country status and wished to consult with it regarding this matter. Whilst the United States would not oppose a consensus to accede to Senegal's request to postpone the review of its legislation, her delegation wished to enter a reservation pending further analysis of the situation and consultations with Senegal on its status.

38. The Council agreed to postpone the review of Senegal's legislation, taking note of the reservation of the United States.

² These were subsequently circulated in document IP/C/W/287/Add.3.

³ During the meeting, the representative of Kenya provided written responses to all but one of the follow-up questions. These were subsequently circulated in document IP/C/W/294/Add.1.

39. The representative of Qatar said that the State of Qatar had recently finished the process of bringing its intellectual property laws into compliance with the TRIPS Agreement. The Ministry of Finance, Economy and Commerce had finished amending Copyright Law No. 25 of 1995. A new law would soon be issued by the Council of Ministers containing such amendments. The new amendments would bring the law in line with the requirements of the TRIPS Agreement. Regarding trademarks, the Ministry of Finance, Economy and Commerce had also finished amending the 1978 law on trademarks with support from, and in cooperation with, WIPO. As a result, the new law dealt with trademarks, geographical indications and industrial designs, and was fully compatible with the TRIPS Agreement. With regard to patents, trade secrets and integrated circuits, a new law for all Gulf Cooperation Council countries had just been enacted. This law had recently been reviewed by WIPO and its compatibility with the TRIPS Agreement had been confirmed. Furthermore, the necessary implementing legislation was currently under way in all the respective Gulf Cooperation Council countries. This implementing legislation would be entering into force for the State of Qatar during 2002. The State of Qatar reiterated its strong commitment to the rules of the multilateral trading system, especially in the area of intellectual property protection. He regretted that his delegation was unable to answer the questions raised by Canada, Japan and the United States at this stage, due to the heavy involvement of the Department of Commerce at the Ministry of Finance in the preparations for the 4th Ministerial Conference. He therefore requested the Council to kindly postpone the review of Qatar's legislation until the second half of 2002.

40. The Chairperson asked the delegation of Qatar to consult with its authorities on postponing the review of its legislation until the first half of 2002. The representative of Qatar said that he would.

41. The representative of Nigeria expressed his delegation's concern that it had not been able to conclude the work required to participate in the review of its legislation at the present meeting due to the preparatory process for the Doha Ministerial Conference. Nigeria had notified its legislation to the Council in September 2000. This had been circulated in documents IP/N/1/NGA/2, IP/N/1/NGA/C/1 to 5, IP/N/1/NGA/D/1, IP/N/1/NGA/I/1 to 3, IP/N/1/NGA/P/1 and IP/N/1/NGA/T/1 and 2. However, the burden of carrying out the preparatory process for both the Ministerial Conference and the review of TRIPS legislation within one month had been too heavy and caused such a delay in the preparations for the review that Nigeria had only submitted its responses to the Checklist of Issues on Enforcement (document IP/N/6/NGA/1) in the week prior to the meeting. He therefore requested that the Council reschedule the review of Nigeria's legislation until the next meeting of the Council, in March 2002.

42. With respect to the review of the legislation of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the Chairperson informed the Council that he had received a fax from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Commerce and Trade informing him that the preparations for the Doha Ministerial Conference had absorbed the attention of the officials responsible for WTO matters over the preceding three months under very uncertain circumstances. More specifically, the officers with direct responsibility for TRIPS matters were unavailable during the period in which preparations for the review of legislation should have been finalized. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines therefore regretted that it was not able to participate in the scheduled review on 27 November 2001 but would ensure that it would be in a position to comply with the conditions and procedures for an effective review of its TRIPS legislation at the next meeting of the Council. It would therefore be grateful for the Chairperson's personal cooperation and the kind approval of the Council for the review of the legislation of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to be postponed.

43. The Chairperson suggested that the Council postpone the reviews of the legislation of Nigeria and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines until its next meeting in March 2002.

44. The Chairperson suggested that the Council revert to the review of the legislation of Swaziland at its next meeting, noting that Swaziland was not represented at the present meeting.

45. The Council agreed to proceed with the suggestions by the Chairperson as reflected in paragraphs 40, 43 and 44 above, while taking note of the statements made.

- *Review of the legislation of 16 Members*

46. Turning to the 16 other Members whose legislation was scheduled to be reviewed by the Council at the present meeting, the Chairperson informed the Council that 12 of these 16 Members had provided notifications of their implementing legislation prior to the meeting, although not all of these notifications were comprehensive. Eleven had provided responses to the Checklist of Issues on Enforcement (IP/C/5). The Members under review had received questions from Australia, Canada, the European Communities and their member States, Japan, Switzerland and the United States, which had been circulated in documents IP/C/W/228, 314, 320 and Add.1, 322, 315 and 316, respectively. Despite the short time available to answer questions, some responses had been received prior to, or during, the meeting from Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, India, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tunisia, Pakistan, Uruguay and Zimbabwe; these had been circulated in documents IP/C/W/317 to 319, 321 and 323 to 331 and addenda, respectively.

47. In accordance with the procedures for the review of legislation, the delegations of Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, Gabon, Ghana, India, Lithuania, Malaysia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tunisia, Uruguay and Zimbabwe each provided a brief introductory overview of the structure of their legislation in the areas covered by the Agreement and of the changes that they had had to bring about in order to make their legislation compatible with the TRIPS Agreement. The records of these introductory statements as well as the questions put to them and the responses given (including responses to follow-up questions given after the meeting) will be circulated in the following documents with the following symbols:

Antigua and Barbuda	IP/Q/ATG/1; IP/Q2/ATG/1; IP/Q3/ATG/1; IP/Q4/ATG/1;
Barbados	IP/Q/BRB/1; IP/Q2/BRB/1; IP/Q3/BRB/1; IP/Q4/BRB/1;
Brazil	IP/Q/BRA/1; IP/Q2/BRA/1; IP/Q3/BRA/1; IP/Q4/BRA/1;
Brunei Darussalam	IP/Q/BRN/1; IP/Q2/BRN/1; IP/Q3/BRN/1; IP/Q4/BRN/1;
Cuba	IP/Q/CUB/1; IP/Q2/CUB/1; IP/Q3/CUB/1; IP/Q4/CUB/1;
Gabon	IP/Q/GAB/1; IP/Q2/GAB/1; IP/Q3/GAB/1; IP/Q4/GAB/1;
Ghana	IP/Q/GHA/1; IP/Q2/GHA/1; IP/Q3/GHA/1; IP/Q4/GHA/1;
India	IP/Q/IND/1; IP/Q2/IND/1; IP/Q3/IND/1; IP/Q4/IND/1;
Lithuania	IP/Q/LTU/1; IP/Q2/LTU/1; IP/Q3/LTU/1; IP/Q4/LTU/1;
Malaysia	IP/Q/MYS/1; IP/Q2/MYS/1; IP/Q3/MYS/1; IP/Q4/MYS/1;
Pakistan	IP/Q/PAK/1; IP/Q2/PAK/1; IP/Q3/PAK/1; IP/Q4/PAK/1;
Sri Lanka	IP/Q/LKA/1; IP/Q2/LKA/1; IP/Q3/LKA/1; IP/Q4/LKA/1;
Thailand	IP/Q/THA/1; IP/Q2/THA/1; IP/Q3/THA/1; IP/Q4/THA/1;
Tunisia	IP/Q/TUN/1; IP/Q2/TUN/1; IP/Q3/TUN/1; IP/Q4/TUN/1;
Uruguay	IP/Q/URY/1; IP/Q2/URY/1; IP/Q3/URY/1; IP/Q4/URY/1;
Zimbabwe	IP/Q/ZWE/1; IP/Q2/ZWE/1; IP/Q3/ZWE/1; IP/Q4/ZWE/1.

48. The representatives of Australia, Canada, the European Communities, Japan, Switzerland and the United States congratulated those delegations who had been able to respond to questions and participate in the review and expressed appreciation for the presentations made and the information provided. The representative of the United States said that her delegation took the reviews seriously and believed that they were important for the proper implementation of the TRIPS Agreement. Some Members under review had already provided responses to her delegation or given assurances that their responses would be submitted shortly. She urged those delegations to provide their responses as quickly as possible and thanked them in advance.

49. The Chairperson urged those Members who were under review to submit their notifications of laws, where they had not already done so, and suggested the following arrangements for the subsequent follow-up:

- that outstanding responses to initial questions be submitted to the country concerned and the Secretariat by 11 January 2002;
- that the texts of any further follow-up questions be submitted to the country concerned and the Secretariat by 1 February 2002;
- that a target date of 5 March 2002 be set for the submission by the countries under review of responses to follow-up questions that may be submitted before the 1 February 2002 deadline; and
- that the Council revert to the sub-item concerning the reviews of these Members' legislation at its next meeting.

50. The Council agreed to proceed as suggested by the Chair.

(vi) Arrangements for future reviews

51. The Chairperson recalled that, at the previous meeting, the Council had agreed to take up the review of the legislation of Moldova at its first meeting in 2002, i.e. at its meeting scheduled for 5 to 7 March 2002.⁴ Therefore, in accordance with the procedures for the review of legislation, he proposed that the Council set the following target dates for the submission of questions and answers in this review:

- questions should be submitted to Moldova, with a copy to the Secretariat, by 20 December 2001, i.e. 10 weeks before the meeting in March 2002; and
- responses to questions posed within that deadline should be submitted by 5 February 2002, i.e. four weeks before the meeting in March 2002.

He suggested that the same date for responses to questions posed should also apply to Nigeria and to Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the review of whose legislation the Council had agreed to postpone until the meeting in March 2002.

52. The Council so agreed.

53. The Chairperson reminded Moldova to make its notification of legislation under Article 63.2 (IP/C/2) without delay, and to reply to the Checklist of Issues on Enforcement (IP/C/5) without delay, so that its legislation could still be circulated to Members well in advance of the meeting in March 2002.⁵

54. The Chairperson recalled that, on 11 December 2001, China would become the 143rd Member of the WTO and that the accession of Chinese Taipei as the 144th Member of the WTO was also imminent. Consequently, the Council would have to decide, at its next meeting, on when it would

⁴ See under "Other business" below.

⁵ See also paragraph 2 above.

take up the review of the legislation of China and, assuming that it would accede in the near future as planned, Chinese Taipei, and set dates for the submission of questions and answers in this review.⁶

C. OTHER BUSINESS

(i) Implementation of Article 66.2

55. The Chairperson said that, as some delegations might be aware, he had been informed recently by UNCTAD that it would like to introduce, at the present meeting, the written information that it had recently submitted in response to the request from the Council at the last meeting on the outcome of the UNCTAD Expert Meeting on International Arrangements for Transfer of Technology in June 2001. However, UNCTAD had just informed him that it wished to withdraw its request for the floor explaining that, following contact it had had with Members, it would appear to be preferable for it to make its statement at the next meeting, when the Council would revert to the agenda item concerning the implementation of Article 66.2.

(ii) Council meeting dates in 2002

56. The Chairperson said that the Secretariat had pencilled in, tentatively, the following dates for formal meetings of the Council in 2002:

5 to 7 March

25 to 27 June

18 to 20 September

25 to 27 November

57. He said that, while the Council might need to make adjustments to its schedule of meetings or organize additional meetings in the light of how it would decide to respond to the Doha Declaration, he suggested that these dates be tentatively reserved, given the likely intense demand for meetings next year. In addition, he announced his intention to hold informal consultations, early in 2002, on how the Council should organize its work in the light of the Doha Declaration. He said that he would convey the arrangements for such informal consultations at a later date to Members.

⁶ Subsequently having submitted the instrument of ratification of its Protocol of Accession to the WTO, Chinese Taipei will become the 144th Member of the WTO on 1 January 2002.