

The World Trade Organization's
Doha Development Agenda
The Doha Negotiations after Six Years
Progress Report at the End of 2007

SERVICES



LAW OFFICES OF STEWART AND STEWART
2100 M STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037
WWW.STEWARTLAW.COM

JANUARY 2008

The law firm of Stewart and Stewart this year is celebrating 50 years of helping companies, workers, and governments navigate the complex and ever-changing international trading system. We help clients maximize their options in trade disputes (WTO or NAFTA panels, antidumping, countervailing duty, safeguard actions), trade negotiations (including accessions to the WTO and regional agreements), trade policy development, market access, development of legislative and regulatory options, and transactional work. Known for our work product excellence and our integrity, we provide our clients cost effective and innovative approaches to today's challenges and help them identify tomorrow's opportunities.

SERVICES

BACKGROUND

The current WTO negotiations on services were initiated in 2000 under the “built-in agenda” of the Uruguay Round. Part IV of the Uruguay Round General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), entitled “Progressive Liberalization”, committed Members to successive rounds of negotiations, beginning not later than five years after the entry into force (in 1995) of the WTO Agreement. The prospects seemed relatively bright, given that there had already been success between 1995 and 2000 in finishing off outstanding Uruguay Round sectoral negotiations through the Fourth Protocol to the GATS relating to basic telecommunications in 1997 and the Fifth Protocol relating to financial services in 1999. In accordance with the overall architecture of the GATS, negotiations aimed at further progressive liberalization would take place according to the twelve sectors in the Services Sectoral Classification List and the four modes of supply identified in the GATS.¹

Furthermore, in March 2001, the Special Session of the Council for Trade in Services (which is the WTO negotiating body in the services area) adopted “Guidelines and Procedures for the Negotiations on Trade in Services” (S/L/93). These guidelines covered not only negotiations aimed at progressive liberalization in terms of market access but also various rules issues which, under the GATS, had also been targeted for further work, viz :

- Article VI.4 on Domestic Regulation
- Article X on Emergency Safeguard Measures
- Article XIII on Government Procurement
- Article XV on Subsidies

The Fourth Ministerial Conference held in Doha in November 2001 then wrapped the “built-in agenda” negotiations on services into the Doha Round as a whole. Under paragraph 15 of the Doha Ministerial Declaration, initial offers in the field of services were to be put on the table by 31 March 2003 – a date chosen to coincide with the establishment of “modalities” in the parallel negotiations on agriculture and non-agricultural market access (NAMA). The previously agreed guidelines were reaffirmed as the basis of the negotiations.

¹ Mode 1 : Cross border supply
Mode 2 : Consumption abroad
Mode 3 : Commercial presence
Mode 4 : Movement of natural persons

Given the importance of services in the world economy, it might be expected that the negotiations on trade in services under the Doha Development Agenda would be very much at the forefront of the Round. Unfortunately that has not been the case so far. Indeed the negotiations on services have been lackluster and have made limited progress.

The difficulties experienced in establishing modalities in agriculture and NAMA filtered through and affected the negotiations on services. By early April 2003, only 18 initial offers had been made, and some of these were of dubious quality. Part of the problem – and this has continued to be the case ever since – is that there is no real equivalent of the agriculture and NAMA “modalities” in the services field, which proceeds in market access terms according to a “request and offer” process. Because of the linkages made by various Members between the negotiating subjects, with hindsight it was always unlikely that ground-breaking offers in services would precede the establishment of modalities in agriculture and NAMA.

As a result, there was little focus on services at the WTO's Fifth Ministerial Conference in Cancun in September 2003 and in the subsequent consultations leading to what became known as the “July 2004 package.”² The negotiations as a whole have continued to be very much led by agriculture. Nevertheless, offers continued to trickle in. Since March 2003 Members have submitted 69 initial offers; and since May 2005 30 revised offers have also been submitted. The Members making these offers are listed on the WTO website. Some of the offers themselves have been derestricted and can be consulted in the TN/S/O and TN/S/O rev.1 document series. The overall assessment however is that many of these offers would do little to provide new market access openings in trade in services, in some cases falling short of the actual situation in the Member making the offer.

Nor was much progress made in the Domestic Regulation and GATS Rules (i.e. Emergency Safeguards, Government Procurement and Subsidies) fields.

² See “Decision Adopted by the General Council on 1 August 2004 “ (WT/L/579). Paragraph 1(e) and Annex C relate to services.

MAJOR POSITIONS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS

The dynamics of the negotiations are less structured than in some other areas of the Doha Round, such as agriculture and NAMA. However, in general:

- Developed countries, along with some advanced developing economies, particularly those with relatively strong service economies, such as Singapore and Hong Kong ("Hong Kong, China" as it is known officially in the WTO), Mexico, Chile, Korea and Chinese Taipei, generally wish to see real progress in terms of liberalization, even if there may be some specific service sectors in which they have domestic constraints.
- An informal group originally known as the "friends of services", which included the above Members and India has given way to a "ginger group" comprising the US, EC, Canada, Japan, Korea, Chinese Taipei, New Zealand, Australia, Norway and Switzerland. The rump of the "friends", in particular, Chile, Mexico, Hong Kong China and Singapore now see themselves in more of a moderate, bridging position.
- Some developing countries, such as Argentina and Brazil, see the Doha Round as agriculture-led and try to ensure that the services negotiations stay in step. Thus, a perceived stalemate or setback in agriculture will result in the brakes immediately being applied in services.
- Some other developing countries, of which India is perhaps the prime example, seek to shield many service sectors from foreign competition while advancing their own "offensive" interests, in particular the temporary movement of professional workers.
- ASEAN countries, with perhaps the exception of Singapore, and led by Thailand, are cautious about opening some of their services sectors and wish to see in particular the development of an emergency safeguard mechanism in services.
- LDCs are concerned to ensure that the fragility of their economies is recognized through, *inter alia*, expecting less from them in undertaking commitments and paying special attention to areas of interest to them such as Mode 4 (movement of natural persons), of which Bangladesh is a leading proponent. They also stress the need for targeted technical

assistance to enable them to strengthen their domestic services capacity and to undertake regulatory reforms³.

- A small group, comprising Bolivia, Cuba and Venezuela has consistently attacked the process of the negotiations, on the grounds that basic rules concerning transparency and consensus decision-making have not been followed. However they have attracted little support.

THE WTO SIXTH MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE, HONG KONG, DECEMBER 2005

As a result of increased political pressure, work on services intensified in the period leading up to, and at, the Sixth Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong. Paragraphs 25-27 of the Declaration and Annex C set out a number of principles, objectives, approaches and timelines for the negotiations. It was stated that particular attention would be given to sectors and modes of supply of export interest to developing countries. Negotiations would also have regard to the size of economies of individual Members and the particular economic situation of the Least-Developed Countries (LDCs) was recognized.

A number of objectives were set out for new and improved commitments :

(a) Mode 1

- (i) commitments at existing levels of market access on a non-discriminatory basis across sectors of interest to Members
- (ii) removal of existing requirements of commercial presence

(b) Mode 2

- (i) commitments at existing levels of market access on a non-discriminatory basis across sectors of interest to Members
- (ii) commitments on mode 2 where commitments on mode 1 exist

(c) Mode 3

- (i) commitments on enhanced levels of foreign equity participation
- (ii) removal or substantial reduction of economic needs tests
- (iii) commitments allowing greater flexibility on the types of legal entity permitted

³ See "Modalities for the Special treatment of Least Developed Country Members in the Negotiations on Trade in Services" (TN/S/13 dated 5 September 2003).

(d) Mode 4

(i) new or improved commitments on the categories of Contractual Services Suppliers, Independent Professionals and Others, de-linked from commercial presence, to reflect *inter alia*:

- removal or substantial reduction of economic needs tests
- indication of prescribed duration of stay and possibility of renewal, if any

(ii) new or improved commitments on the categories of Intra-corporate Transferees and Business Visitors, to reflect *inter alia*:

- removal or substantial reduction of economic needs tests
- indication of prescribed duration of stay and possibility of renewal, if any

(e) MFN Exemptions

(i) removal or substantial reduction of exemptions from most-favoured-nation (MFN) treatment

(ii) clarification of remaining MFN exemptions in terms of scope of application and duration

(f) Scheduling of Commitments

(i) ensuring clarity, certainty, comparability and coherence in the scheduling and classification of commitments through adherence to, *inter alia*, the Scheduling Guidelines pursuant to the Decision of the Council for Trade in Services adopted on 23 March 2001

(ii) ensuring that scheduling of any remaining economic needs tests adheres to the Scheduling Guidelines pursuant to the Decision of the Council for Trade in Services adopted on 23 March 2001.

As a reference for the request/offer negotiations, the sectoral and modal objectives identified by Members might be considered.⁴

It was also agreed that Members would pursue full and effective implementation of the Modalities for the Special Treatment for Least-Developed Country Members in the Negotiations on Trade in Services (the so-called LDC Modalities) adopted by the Special Session of the Council for Trade in

⁴ As attached to the Report to the Trade Negotiations Committee on 28 November 2005 (TN/S/23)

Services on 3 September 2003 (TN/S/13), with a view to the beneficial and meaningful integration of LDCs into the multilateral trading system.

As regards GATS Rules, Members would intensify their efforts to conclude the negotiations on rule-making under GATS Articles X, XIII, and XV in accordance with their respective mandates:

- (a) Members would engage in more focused discussions in connection with the technical and procedural questions relating to the operation and application of any possible emergency safeguard measures in services.
- (b) On government procurement, Members would engage in more focused discussions and in this context put greater emphasis on proposals by Members, in accordance with Article XIII of the GATS.
- (c) On subsidies, Members would intensify their efforts to expedite and fulfil the information exchange required for the purpose of such negotiations, and engage in more focused discussions on proposals by Members, including the development of a possible working definition of subsidies in services.

Members also agreed to develop disciplines on Domestic Regulation pursuant to the mandate under Article VI:4 of the GATS before the end of the current round of negotiations.

In addition to intensifying and expediting bilateral negotiations, Members agreed on a new approach under which request/offer negotiations would also be pursued on a plurilateral or collective basis in accordance with the principles of the GATS and the Guidelines and Procedures for the Negotiations on Trade in Services. The results of such negotiations would be extended on an MFN basis. These negotiations would be organized in the following manner:

- (a) Any Member or group of Members could present requests or collective requests to other Members in any specific sector or mode of supply, identifying their objectives for the negotiations in that sector or mode of supply.
- (b) Members to whom such requests were made would consider them in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article XIX of the GATS

and paragraph 11 of the Guidelines and Procedures for the Negotiations on Trade in Services.

- (c) Plurilateral negotiations should be organised with a view to facilitating the participation of all Members, taking into account the limited capacity of developing countries and smaller delegations to participate in such negotiations.

As regards timelines, it was agreed in Hong Kong that any outstanding initial offers should be submitted as soon as possible; a second round of revised offers should be submitted by 31 July 2006. This was an interesting and important feature because, time-wise, it aligned revised offers in services not with the establishment of modalities in agriculture and NAMA but with the tabling of draft schedules of concessions in those two areas.

It should be noted that this rather detailed (by services standards at the time) outcome at the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference was somewhat controversial and was resisted by some developing countries. Nevertheless, in the final analysis, it was accepted.

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE HONG KONG

Considerable effort was put into the new plurilateral or collective negotiations. While the timelines stipulated in Hong Kong fell by the wayside given the slow progress of negotiations across the board, work continued.

In December 2007, the coordinators of 18 plurilateral or collective request groups presented progress reports to the Special Session of the Council for Trade in Services, covering –

- Postal and Courier Services
- Tourism and Travel Services
- Financial Services
- Architectural, Engineering and Integrated Engineering Services
- Maritime Transport Services
- Construction Services
- Distribution Services
- Energy Services
- Commercial Presence Commitments - Mode 3
- Environmental Services
- Air Transport Services

- Audiovisual Services
- Computer and Related Services
- Legal Services
- Telecommunications Services
- MFN Exemptions
- Private Education Services
- Logistic Services

The sponsors of these collective request groups, and their coordinators, are listed in the Annex. The progress reports do not identify the Members to whom the requests were directed. There has been some considerable sensitivity on this point; indeed, although the Members to whom requests were addressed were not named in the progress reports, there were still strong complaints from some that the reports constituted a breach of the confidentiality which normally surround request/offer negotiations. The annex nevertheless provides some general information as to whom the requests are likely to have been made.

In response to the progress reports, recipients have largely condemned them as being biased and have questioned their value for the negotiations.

It should be noted that not all collective request groups have submitted progress reports. For example, there was a group on "Mode 4" but the sponsors did not submit a progress report because of concerns over breach of confidentiality. Similarly, it is understood that groups on "Services Related to Agriculture" and "Cross Border Services (Modes 1 & 2)" have not reported.

While results do indeed seem to have been very limited, the plurilateral or collective request process has been useful in mapping out more precisely the territory for negotiation and sharpening the focus of the participants. It may now have run its course and it is possible that future request/offer negotiations will revert to an even more focused bilateral model along conventional lines, albeit with the work done in the plurilateral process as background.

Meanwhile, work also continued after Hong Kong on Domestic Regulation. A Chairman's draft text was tabled and has been the subject of consultations since April 2007.⁵ The main elements of the text are Definitions, General Provisions, Transparency, Licensing Requirements and Procedures, Qualification Requirements and Procedures, Technical Standards, Development and Institutional Provisions. The dynamics of the negotiation seem inverted from what might normally be expected in that it is developing countries, in some

⁵ This is not an official WTO document but can be found on the Internet.

cases concerned about inhibition of their Mode 4 exports through flexible use of regulations in the developed world, that are the main demandeurs for stronger and clearer disciplines. The Chairman has steered a middle course, proposing some further disciplines but often at a rather general level. While the text may not please everyone, there is at least a realistic prospect of eventual agreement. Interesting institutional features to follow will be whether an eventual agreement provides for any further work on Domestic Regulation, and whether an agreement will replace the transitional disciplines in the existing Article VI.5 of the GATS.

While there have been pressures on the Chairman in the Domestic Regulation area both to speed up (from many developing countries) and to slow down (from certain developed countries, including the United States), it seems likely that, following further consultations in January 2008, a new text, basically following the existing version but with some fine tuning, will emerge in late January or early February.

On GATS Rules, little progress has been made. Developing countries tend to see government procurement in services as an economic development policy tool and are unlikely to want to see the GATS move into this area. As regards disciplines on Subsidies (the main promoters of which are Hong Kong, Chile, Mexico and Chinese Taipei), finding a workable definition continues to prove difficult. It has been suggested that the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures in the goods area could provide some basis for disciplines but others, such as the United States, argue that this would not be appropriate. Definitional problems, such as defining who is a domestic service supplier, also dog the discussions on Emergency Safeguard Measures which are driven by the ASEAN countries (minus Singapore). Some opponents of this proposal also point out that the GATS is already a very flexible instrument, with plenty of room for Members to choose their commitments carefully.

The outlook in GATS Rules is for work to continue but the prospects of reaching any agreements in the short term seem remote.

OUTLOOK AND THE WAY AHEAD

The situation in services has to be seen in the context of the Doha Round as a whole. In agriculture and NAMA, the aim is to produce revised draft modalities by the end of January 2008, with a view to finalizing these in February/March 2008. In order to achieve some overall balance in the negotiations, given the importance which many Members attach to this field there is recognition of a need to produce something on services which can be put

on the table at the same time and be portrayed as parallel progress. The question is what?

The United States and European Communities have argued that the sequence foreseen in Hong Kong - that is, revised offers in services at the same time as draft schedules are tabled in agriculture and NAMA, which would mean no revised offers in services until probably late 2008 - has been overtaken by events and is flawed. They are under pressure to agree to modalities in agriculture in February/March 2008, and would perhaps like to use that opportunity to exert maximum pressure on market access in services. The European Communities have accordingly proposed that there should be a high level "signalling exercise" on services when the crunch point is reached on agriculture and NAMA modalities in February/March. Under this scenario, Ministers would give indications of what they can include in new services offers. In addition, the United States has proposed that there should be a well developed services text which would provide some benchmarks for future revised offers. These positions are however opposed by many developing countries who regard the sequence of the Hong Kong Declaration as still valid. They would prefer simply to reaffirm Annex C of the Hong Kong Declaration.

Against this background, the Chairman of the Special Session of the Council for Trade in Services, Ambassador De Mateo of Mexico, has been consulting in various formats on the various ideas, including the possibility of a text on services to complement the possible outcomes on modalities for agriculture and NAMA in the first quarter, and what such a text might contain. While the small group comprising Bolivia, Cuba and Venezuela have continued to contest his authority to do so without a clear consensus, he has persisted. One of his *modus operandi* is a series of what are called "*Enchilada*" group meetings, comprising 30 or so key delegations. The Chairman emphasises however that these meetings are Member-led, and full scale official meetings are held regularly for transparency purposes. He has scheduled a key meeting for 23rd January, 2008 at which the various points of view will be aired.

At this stage, it appears possible that any services text to emerge early in 2008 alongside agriculture and NAMA revised draft modalities may contain at least the following main elements: first, a reaffirmation of the Hong Kong Declaration, in particular Annex C thereof; second, a date for tabling of improved offers; third, a timeframe for further development of the LDC modalities; fourth, exhortation to pursue the work on Domestic Regulation and GATS Rules; and fifth, some political guidance on the level of ambition in terms of market access commitments, in the context of the single undertaking.

It is this last point which will perhaps prove to be the most troublesome. It raises the issues of “benchmarking” and “comparability.” Some Members, such as the “ginger group” are in favour of benchmarking – for example, a services text early in 2008 might in their view refer to binding at the status quo to the maximum extent possible, or to taking on board new commitments, or even to liberalizing. Others reject this approach as premature, bearing in mind the sequencing envisaged in the Hong Kong Declaration. As regards comparability, some Members, mainly developed, for whom services is a vital component of any final package, would like to link the level of ambition with that on agriculture and NAMA. Others, who look at agriculture as the main outcome, would like to keep services separate. They can point to paragraph 24 of the Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration which refers to a “comparably high level of ambition in agriculture and NAMA,” services being conspicuously absent.

Overall, the negotiations on services do not seem so far to have received the attention they deserve in the Round or the attention that their contributions to growth in global trade or domestic competitiveness around the world should justify. While some interest groups, such as coalitions of services industries, have consistently voiced support, this has not resulted in a change in the importance given to the area in ongoing negotiations. Indeed, Members wishing to keep the focus of the negotiations on agriculture have to date successfully kept attention away from the much larger part of the global economy represented by services (and within goods, by NAMA).

Time will tell whether an eventual deal on modalities will result in the focus shifting to the highly important services sector of world trade and lead to important additional liberalization commitments in this area.

ANNEX

PROGRESS REPORTS ON PLURILATERAL/COLLECTIVE REQUESTS

(December 2007)

1. Postal and Courier Services, including Express Delivery

Coordinator: United States

Co-sponsors: European Communities, Japan, New Zealand

Recipients: 20 Members (including sponsors)

Status in brief: according to the coordinator, very few recipients communicated any clear intention to undertake commitments in response to the request.

2. Tourism and Travel Services

Coordinator: Colombia

Co-sponsors: Ecuador, Mauritius, Morocco, Panama, Peru, Thailand

Recipients: 15 Members

Status in brief: according to the coordinator, no recipient positively stated that it would try to meet the request in its next offer.

3. Financial Services

Coordinator: Canada

Co-sponsors: Australia, European Communities, Japan, United States, Norway, Chinese Taipei, Ecuador, Hong Kong China, Korea, Panama

Recipients: 21 Members

Status in brief: sponsors expressed dissatisfaction with the nature of responses to date.

4. Architectural, Engineering and Integrated Engineering Services

Coordinator: Canada

Co-sponsors: Australia, Chile, Colombia, European Communities, India, Japan, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Switzerland, United States

Recipients: 24 Members

Status in brief: according to the coordinator, few of the recipients suggested that they could make new or improved commitments in response to the request, and only one indicated a firm intention to do so.

5. Maritime Transport Services

Coordinator: Japan

Co-sponsors: Australia, Canada, China (with respect to to one recipient only), European Communities, Hong Kong China, Iceland, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Switzerland, Chinese Taipei

Recipients: 25 Members (including sponsors)

Status in brief: sponsors appreciated, to some extent, positive indications received from some recipients, but were seriously concerned that their offers would still be far from meeting the requests.

6. Construction Services

Coordinator: Japan

Co-sponsors: Australia, Canada, Colombia, Chinese Taipei, European Communities, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Turkey, United States

Recipients: 19 Members (including sponsors)

Status in brief: according to the coordinator, although there were some positive indications, the offers were still far from meeting the requests.

7. Distribution Services

Coordinator: European Communities

Co-sponsors: Chile, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Singapore, Chinese Taipei

Recipients: 19 Members (including sponsors)

Status in brief: overall, sponsors expressed disappointment with the absence of ambition in most recipients' responses.

8. Energy Services

Coordinator: European Communities

Co-sponsors: Australia, Canada, Iceland, Japan, Korea, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, United States

Recipients: 23 Members (including sponsors)

Status in brief: sponsors expressed disappointment in both the level of offers tabled so far and the indications regarding potential improved offers.

9. Commercial Presence Commitments (Mode 3)

Coordinator: European Communities

Co-sponsors: Japan, Hong Kong China, New Zealand, Switzerland, United States

Recipients: 14 Members (including sponsors)

Status in brief: sponsors welcomed the engagement shown, however emphasising their hope to see further movement towards removing mode 3 limitations.

10. Environmental Services

Coordinator: European Communities

Co-sponsors: Australia, Canada, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland, Chinese Taipei, United States

Recipients: 21 Members (including sponsors)

Status in brief: sponsors view is that, while several recipients provided indications on possible improvements in this sector, many of the improvements outlined remain limited in scope.

11. Air Transport Services

Coordinator: Australia

Co-sponsors: Chile, European Communities, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland

Recipients: 21 Members (including sponsors)

Status in brief: sponsors expressed disappointment generally that the indications received highlighted gaps that exist between recipients' domestic practices and their GATS commitments.

12. Audiovisual Services

Coordinator: Mexico

Co-sponsors: Hong Kong China, Japan, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, United States

Recipients: 28 Members (including sponsors)

Status in brief: overall, sponsors expressed disappointment with the responses so far and the absence of ambition in most recipients' responses for this under-committed sector.

13. Computer and Related Services

Coordinator: Chile

Co-sponsors: Australia, Canada, European Communities, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, United States, Hong Kong China, India, Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Singapore, Chinese Taipei

Recipients: 14 Members; after receiving the request, two of these - Colombia and Israel - also asked to be incorporated as co-sponsors

Status in brief: the overall assessment by the sponsors regarding the responses received is positive, taking into account that only two recipients indicated extreme difficulties with the request.

14. Legal Services

Coordinator: Australia

Co-sponsors: Canada, European Communities, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, United States, Chile

Recipients: 16 Members (including sponsors)

Status in brief: sponsors expressed disappointment with the level of commitment in this sector and the lack of additional flexibility forthcoming during negotiations. Indications of possible improvements from only two recipients.

15. Telecommunication Services

Coordinator: United States

Co-sponsors: Australia, Canada, European Communities, Hong Kong China, Japan, Korea, Norway, Singapore, Chinese Taipei

Recipients: 22 Members

Status in brief: according to the coordinator, only a few positive signals were provided by some participants about meeting certain aspects of the request.

16. Most-Favoured-Nation (MFN) Exemptions

Coordinator: Hong Kong China

Co-sponsors: Australia, China, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Pakistan, Switzerland, Chinese Taipei

Recipients: No number of Members given; the request targets 165 specific MFN exemptions maintained by individual Members

Status in brief: according to the coordinator, of the 165 MFN exemptions targeted, 10 would possibly be removed in future offers; disappointment expressed with the dismal responses of most recipients.

17. Private Education Services

Coordinator: New Zealand

Co-sponsors: Australia, United States, Malaysia, Chinese Taipei

Recipients: 21 Members (including sponsors)

Status in brief: while sponsors welcomed the few indications of improvement, in their view responses in general fell well short of the request:

18. Logistic Services

Coordinator: Hong Kong China

Co-sponsors: Australia, Chile, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland, Chinese Taipei

Recipients: 34 Members (including sponsors)

Status in brief: sponsors appreciated the engagement of recipients and the positive indications by some; however quite a number of recipients did not provide any indication of their likely response.

Note on Requesting Members and Recipients

Requesting Members

A total of 34 Members have been involved in sponsoring one or more of the collective requests (this includes some who have not submitted a progress report):

Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Dominican Republic, EC, Ecuador, Egypt, Guatemala, Hong Kong China, Iceland, India, Japan, Korea,

Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, the United States, Uruguay.

Recipients of Requests

Almost 60 Members are believed to have received one or more requests:

Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, EC, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Georgia, Guatemala, Hong Kong China, India, Indonesia, Israel, Lichtenstein, Jamaica, Japan, Korea, Kuwait, Macao China, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, The Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, the United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.