

Global Services Coalition Mission to Geneva, 26-27 September 2007

Notes of Meetings

(All meetings chaired by Ambassador Sergio Marchi, and held in the World Meteorological Association, unless otherwise stated.)

26 September 2007

Meeting 1 11:00am

Ambassador Fernando de Mateo, Chair of WTO Council for Trade in Services (Special Session), and Hamid Mamdouh, Director, Trade in Services, WTO

Ambassador Fernando de Mateo

- The GSC presence is timely as the plurilateral negotiations are going on, with the GATS Council meeting soon.
- The negotiations are moving towards conclusion; things are changing for the better on agriculture/NAMA. By the end of October or beginning of November, the texts on agriculture/NAMA are expected to be revised, and other negotiations groups are expected to also revise theirs.
- The Enchilada Group has had eight meetings with ministers. The Group enables ambassador to be involved in the nitty-gritties of the services negotiations. Progress was made though still far from our objectives.
- The most difficult negotiations are not in Geneva, but in the capitals with regulators. This is now happening.
- We need a high level of ambition. The sectors that require special efforts include education, Mode 4, energy, legal, air transport. Sectors with some convergence include tourism, engineering, architecture. Sectors requiring further discussion and clarification include logistics, telecom, environment, construction, financial services, services in support of agriculture.
- Annex C of the Hong Kong Declaration is sacrosanct. A date is required for tabling of services offers and submission of final schedules, according to the sequence established in MC6.
- The private sector can help by lobbying your own governments.

Hamid Mamdouh

- The plurilateral negotiations over the last 18 months had been very useful. A lot of work has been done, so now we know the sectors of strategic interests and the barriers to these sectors; who are the critical participants – of which there are a known critical mass of about 30.
- But that is not enough. The negotiating objectives are not advancing well. Services are still held hostage to agriculture/NAMA. An indigenous obstacle is the deficit in political will at the high levels of government to advance the negotiations. One compares the negotiations with the accession commitments and clearly the latter are much better because of political will.
- What is lacking is ministerial commitment. Services did not figure in the mini-ministerials. Ministerial interest has to come from capitals, not Geneva.

Comments and questions from GSC members

- How to ensure attention for services in mini-ministerials? Is text drafting starting already?

- Capital market practitioners have been active in pushing things forward in market access, and in freedom of choice over Mode 3. Are there movements in these areas?
- There has been little progress despite the messages. What have we not been doing? What are the additional options? What is the progress on dispute settlement? What are the obstacles in the express delivery sector and what can industry do?
- Countries need to send experts to Geneva to help reach deal. A ministerial event on services is important to reflect political will. Is there a roadmap towards that happening?
- How is collective view reached to prepare for the outcome from agriculture/NAMA, to enable convergence of progress?

Fernando de Mateo

- Services are different from agriculture/NAMA. Services need continuous negotiations, whereas for agriculture/NAMA as soon as modalities are agreed the negotiations would be easy.
- There are frustrations in all the negotiations, including agriculture/NAMA, but there is movement now; the mood is more optimistic than one month ago. For services, a draft text is needed, and the least is to have new dates for tabling offers and an assessment on market access.
- Most countries are sending the regulatory experts to the important sectoral negotiations. The core group of services negotiations are now known.
- The delegations are in charge in agriculture/NAMA, not the chair. For services, the ones in charge are the requesters of the bilaterals, and the coordinator in plurilaterals. The delegations are still in charge.
- Financial services is one sector with flexibility shown. There is still huge gaps in the negotiations on the express delivery sector.
- There have been two disputes settlement panels so far.

Hamid Mamdouh

- In the preparation of clusters meetings: sectoral experts were engaged as part of the profiling of clusters. What is lacking is mandate for decision making. The issues are quite well-known in advance.
- The problem is not the process. The accession negotiations follow the same process. The problem is political will: ministers should have followed up on the Hong Kong Declaration, then trigger domestic negotiations in capitals to generate mandate to come back to Geneva.

Conclusion by Chair

- We are allies. The services text needs upgrading. We want to elevate the services negotiations, and to force ministers to progress.

Meeting 2 12:00 noon
Mr Ronaldo Costa, Services Negotiator, Brazil

Ronaldo Costa

- There is a sense of frustration that services negotiators' hands are tied. We need to know what is available in agriculture, our main interest, before progress can

be made in services.

- Through the plurilateral negotiations we have indicated what we are unable to offer and what is up for grabs. The final give and take will depend on agriculture.

Comments and questions from GSC members

- Can the dynamics be changed to change the results, i.e. Brazil shows a clear hand on services, to encourage more ambitious offers in agriculture?
- It is in Brazil's interest to pursue liberalization offensively. For financial services, under Mode 1, there is a memorandum of understanding among regulators, e.g. for protection of institutional clients. Brazil can have offensive interest in Mode I. On insurance, the difficulty for regulators to undertake is understood, but from experience it is not impossible.
- How can the message be better delivered that services is important for development?
- Besides problems in market access, there is a question of binding existing commitments even without further market opening. Many sectors are already open but we want the legal security through bindings. Besides binding, we want new levels of liberalization too.
- What would Brazil say to having a safeguard mechanism, as a means to provide comfort?
- The express delivery sectors helps Brazilian companies by providing access and connectivity. They want a level playing field with the monopoly provider. There is de facto liberalization but we want commitment from the regulator.

Ronaldo Costa

- Clear indication has already been given in the plurilaterals; now is the question of price. We need a signal from the other side so we can discuss the price.
- On progress of the negotiations, meetings are still going on in computer services. An education process is needed for regulators who have not had experience with multilateral negotiations. Negotiators need help to understand what problems the private sectors encounter to take back to regulators.
- For financial services, our market is essentially open. We have concern over supervision of market opening in Mode 1 and Mode 2, e.g. with money laundering. New market access demands will be difficult to meet, because not much is closed, except reinsurance, but even there a gradualist approach is being pursued.
- The reform in the postal sector was being pursued, but suspended in Congress pending court judgments.
- Brazil appreciates the message already that services is important for development. Numerical targets are meaningless e.g. in terms of new sectors offered, India has 41 (top), Brazil is second. But it is difficult to put figure to the value of offers. What is needed is for the business sector of developed countries to lobby their own governments on linkage between agriculture and services.
- With the slow progress in negotiations over GATS rule, the concept of safeguards is difficult to apply in services; but we are open minded.
- On revised text, we see a pressing demand for a new text. Agriculture/NAMA have been four and a half years behind schedule. In services we have modalities in 2001 plus Annex C in Hong Kong, which we are comfortable with. We would not object to a text, within the parameters of the modalities and Annex C.

Lunch with the Enchiladas Group – 1:00 pm
(Heads of delegations only; chaired by Bob Vastine)

Ambassador Crawford Falconer, New Zealand

Ambassador Bruce Gosper, Australia

Ambassador Peter Allgeier, Deputy USTR

Ambassador Manuel Teehankee, Philippines

Main messages

- There should be a renewed effort to improve revised offers. A “signaling conference” of ministers would be useful for services.
- The agriculture/NAMA texts are aimed at agreeing on modalities. For services, the new text, if prepared, should address negotiating objectives and liberalization commitment.
- The role of ministers is to conclude, not to decide; decisions need to be pre-cooked.
- On emergency safeguard measures, there is considerable sympathy for the concept to give comfort for developing countries, though European Services Forum is strongly against the idea.

Meeting 3 12:00 noon
Ambassador Ujal Singh Bhatia, India
(Chair: Christopher Roberts)

Ujal Singh Bhatia

- November saw one of the periodic bouts of frenzy, since the last G4 failure in June in Potsdam. But since then there is progress in agriculture and NAMA through the draft texts.
- Major deliverable of Doha is to reduce distortion in agriculture, but big numbers are yet to be seen. Once agriculture is OK, NAMA should be simpler.
- For services, the plurilaterals have been useful in clarifying positions, but now there are diminishing returns.
- The real issue is that this is a developing round which should deliver market opening and rules to ensure developing countries gain market access in sectors of their interest, i.e. through Mode 4 and Mode 1). Results in services need to wait for that from agriculture/NAMA modalities.

Comments and questions from GSC members

- In general, what can we expect on capital restrictions on joint ventures? There has been excellent progress in telecoms liberalization in India but we encourage binding of the liberalization as commitments. On IT services, IBM employs 17,000 employees in India, given the liberalization in IT. India is encouraged to push hard in commitments.
- Financial services: Financial centers have to take measures to attract FDI. For Mumbai to develop as a financial centre, foreign ownership must be allowed. Recently Temasek took up 10% in an Indian bank while the limit for others are capped at 5%; such bilateral deals may undermine multilateral efforts. Further progress on capital markets liberalization for securities industries will be welcomed.

- There is commitment in financial services information, but will there be new commitments or autonomous liberalisation in news agency? In professional services, can foreign law firms take equity in Indian law firms and use their names?
- The transport and logistics sectors should encourage more FDI through commitments in WTO, improving on the current restriction of 49% equity for foreign investors.
- Should there be a conference between ministers, and should it be driven by ministers? What is your view on a new text on modalities in services? Should it go beyond the 2001 modalities and Annex C? What is India's stance on the progress of NAMA?
- Is India shifting from multilateral to bilaterals, being quite keen on FTAs? Has India attempted to get China more involved?

Ujal Singh Bhatia

- For joint ventures, the long term goal is complete liberalization and there is reform to increase the percentage ownership for FDI. India has little hesitation in opening because of comparative advantage in services, and because of job creation. But there is a difference between autonomous liberalization and WTO commitment, the latter depends on commitments from others. On the securities industries, clarity through dialogue will help autonomous liberalization but not necessarily multilateral liberalization. We want to test internally before taking liberalization to the WTO.
- We cannot confirm whether there will be commitment in news agency services, but will work on related market access. On legal services, we are exploring dialogue between the Indian Bar Council and the British Bar, which can be a template to broaden to others.
- On transport and logistics, we have legislation of more than 100 years, which will take time to progress.
- Many developing countries are already open in Mode 1 in sectors such as professional services, computer, research and development, management consulting and environment services. The markets are relatively open. On the other hand, for Mode 4, there has not been new market opening from developed countries since the Uruguay Round.
- A services text would need to be acceptable to developing countries across the board. On a conference of ministers, the question is whether it should be an official WTO Conference or a conference of the willing. Only 35-40 members are interested in services. Thus the conference should be hosted by a member, e.g. the EU, with the Director General and the chair of the GATS negotiations. On NAMA, to take the negotiations forward would require members to understand and address concerns e.g. of small economies.
- We are extremely involved in trade facilitation, which has good progress. We are looking for a high standard agreement. There are no losers in trade facilitation, only winners. In the worst case, if the talks fail, trade facilitation is one area which we can take forward.
- India is committed to multilateral rules; only the WTO can rectify agricultural trade. But India has a conscious policy of looking East, e.g. Japan, to complement WTO, therefore we would pursue WTO-plus negotiations. China is a recent member and it is not easy for officials from the capital to come and negotiate freely. They need time to learn. But India is working closely with

them on joint requests.

Meeting 4 4:30pm (at the WTO “Green Room”)
Pascal Lamy, Director General of WTO
and Hamid Mamdouh, Director, Trade in Services, WTO

Pascal Lamy

- There are draft texts on the table, and people are really engaged now. Convergence in agriculture/NAMA is do-able in the next two months.
- For services, the request/offer negotiations are terrible in terms of PR and visibility. To clinch services into the agriculture/NAMA convergence, the imbalance in public perception of the negotiations have to be addressed, hence a speech is being planned for the WTO DG to be delivered on 15 October at the London School of Economics, to help plug services into the discussion on agriculture/NAMA and to generate momentum for drafting of the services text.
- We shall need an agreement without ministerial involvement; minister are simply to bless the agreement. The question is, can we signal the level of ambitious to lock in political determination for services.
- There is solidarity between emerging countries on agriculture, but not on services. GSC is recommended to work with India/Pakistan/Egypt who have offensive interests in services. A big political hurdle coming is that of Mode 4, which to services is like cotton to subsidies or banana to tropical products.
- Will try to work towards convergence, but expect resistance.

Comments and questions from GSC members

- A ministerial would be needed for political involvement in services; on the other hand, ministerial meetings are risky. Can we build on the useful plurilateral meetings with some 35 players and 21 sectors to work towards some results?
- We need a process to let the US say there is enough progress in services when the breakthrough in agriculture/NAMA happens, so that we can get the TPA through Congress.
- Brazil was asking what people can give in exchange for services, while India said it had a de facto liberal regime but will not bind it. Does South Africa have a leadership role? And where does China come in?
- There is convergence now in agriculture/NAMA but the same is difficult to perceive in services. How to draw voices together for services? Can the Director General take the lead to draw the 30 members together?
- Is the importance of the multilateral system understood enough at capitals? Is there anything we should do?

Pascal Lamy

- The question is do we need a ministerial for agriculture/NAMA. If we do, we can work services in. If not, we need to work separately. The plurilateral invention has brought momentum but no visibility.
- We are beyond the TPA now. Let us have a package and confront Congress. Whatever the timing, services must be part of it. We don't want the multilateral system to be lost on a lost bullet.
- On the overall picture, the debate between autonomous liberalization and binding is an ongoing one, but it is more important to look at what is on the table. For

South Africa, it is a matter of domestic sequencing. For China, they are concerned about a EU/US/Japan “plot” to corner them on services once agriculture/NAMA is agreed. Their stance is that they have offered much more in accession already, so why now. If the US/EU/Japan align, they may re-adjust. The advice is for the big shots to pre-cook the negotiations; there may be a moment in the negotiations for expectations to be asked of China. They have to give something on market access in agriculture. They free ride on NAMA, but they maintain recent-accession ideologically.

- The DG is totally open on what to do in services, if it is useful, but will not be able to change the obscurity syndrome in services.
- The big bosses understood the importance of the multilateral systems and their importance beyond trade. The priority is to work on developing countries.

27 September 2007

Meeting 5 9:00am

**Ambassador Don Stephenson, Canada, NAMA Chair
and John Drummond, services negotiator**

Don Stephenson

- A text on NAMA was tabled in July, which was more complete than that of agriculture; even the US said it was within the universe of their deliberations. There has been serious engagement since then though no real convergence. Will try to move to a revised text next week, and issue revised text by end of October. A Green Room across all (agriculture/NAMA) issues is expected, to be chaired by Trade Negotiations Committee Chair Pascal Lamy, for trade-offs. The Director General will convene the chairs for clarification meetings.
- The prospect of the whole round depends on US politics, how committed they are. The chance of TPA renewal is zero in the absence of a deal. A limited deal with agriculture/NAMA is possible for TPA renewal.
- The next few weeks could decide and a deal should be delivered at least on agriculture/NAMA modalities, perhaps with services offers, before Christmas. A services deal is needed for balance in the package, but there is lack of clarity over the road map on services.

Comments and questions from GSC members

- How is plurilateral on financial services going?
- Canada has limited FDI in telecom, and is urged to open up.
- On NAMA, the range of figures in the text is fairly wide. Can agreement be reached?
- Is a ministerial in services possible, for signaling purpose? Or with agriculture/NAMA closing? If there is revised text in agriculture/NAMA and revised text in services, a point of political engagement is needed. We do not want that point to be where agriculture/NAMA reached agreement but services advocates are forced to either go along without progress or withdraw support.

Don Stephenson and John Drummond

- Plurilaterals are useful in clarifying intentions on market access at technical level. There were four rounds of plurilaterals on financial services with 20 participating,

useful for signalling redlines and movements, and helped move on specifics of offers. There was a direct and confrontational mood which was good because it helped clarification. The problem was the stalemate as there was no movement beyond generals without indication of ambition – binding was not enough as we wanted new market access commitments.

- On telecom, the question is how to separate cultural issues from telecom. Watch the debate.
- On NAMA figures, the focus will be on flexibility for developing countries, but it is believed the deal is within the numbers.
- For NAMA, try to stay away from ministers until a deal is closed. Once a ministerial conference is announced, negotiations stop, therefore ministerials are useless for negotiations. A signaling conference on services close to the closing of agriculture/NAMA – maybe, but not sure how this can be done in practice; so, no for a broad ministerial, but maybe a mini-ministerial.

Meeting 6 10:00am
Ambassador Eckart Guth, European Union
with Petros Sourmelis, services negotiator

Ambassador Eckart Guth

- Negotiations are not in full speed yet despite having the agriculture/NAMA text accepted as basis for negotiations. The negotiations are sequential, not concurrent: 3 weeks agriculture, 4 weeks NAMA, then agriculture. Revised text is expected in October/November. In agriculture, the no-go areas have been identified, the issues are reduced and they are closing gaps for ministers to compromise.
- Agriculture/NAMA should move in tandem so that there can be balancing in the end. Services will follow after modalities in agriculture/NAMA are agreed. It has to be part of the balanced outcome. Lamy's planned October 15 speech in LSE implies he is confident an agriculture/NAMA deal can be reached and it is time to push services.
- It is useful to have a signaling conference to reinforce the message on willingness to commit.

Comments and questions from GSC members

- Does the EU want only binding for services? What would be a reasonable scheduling period for services? There has been no improvement in the services package since the 2005, and ministerial engagement and a draft text have been suggested, with the EU suggesting a signalling or pledging conference – how to get political engagement?
- On domestic regulation, EU has not supported strong disciplines in domestic negotiations beyond transparency. The Singapore chair on domestic regulations has said developing countries seek freedom not to be bound by domestic regulations. How does one give the binding and new liberalization real commercial value?
- What is the situation on progress in financial services in regard to Mode 1 on access to institutional investors and Mode 3 on corporate form of their choice, say in India?
- November will see 10 years of the Telecom agreement. Developing countries

will need more convincing to open the value-added market, but the EU seems to be blurring the distinction between basic and VA services?

- What is France's position on agriculture? How is the outlook for agreement overall?

Ambassador Eckart Guth and Petros Sourmelis

- Brussels has always said it wants at least binding of autonomous liberalization and welcome additional market access on top, so the EU wants binding-plus. The EU is not unambitious, but the more the negotiations enter into substance, the more difficult it is for commonality in disciplines, because of the diverse views.
- The EU will push domestic regulations.
- On financial services, India supports Mode 1 negotiations. On telecom, we encourage commitments in both basics and VA, but there is a difference between telecom and content services.
- On agriculture, the EU has mandate to negotiate. The French President is using new language on agriculture, therefore some more opening is expected.
- There has been progress since 2005. A timeline is needed to end all lines of negotiations. On scheduling for services, 9 months will be too long; maybe 4 to 6 months. Two steps are needed for services: first to revise offers with a last set of offers, secondly to negotiate for final schedules. The signalling conference idea came from Mandelson and there is increasing acceptance, and Pascal Lamy's speech in October will be one step in political engagement. If modalities for agriculture/NAMA can be agreed by November, plus statement of objective for services, and adding another 4 months for scheduling, we may expect an agreement by April.

Meeting 7 1:30pm **Zhang Liping, Counsellor for Trade in Services, China**

Zhang Liping

- Not much is happening in services. On the plurilateral negotiations, there should be clear picture on what can be offered, but there is probably not much more than what we have now, with agriculture/NAMA drafting being the main task for negotiators. In services, the demandeurs are not setting good examples in the sectors they are asking others to open, e.g. financial services, telecom.
- On the question of a text on services, if it is to capture what is now achieved, and to use it as a re-affirmation of the desire to move forward, then it may serve a purpose, though it may not be needed from the technical point of view as the substance will be in the schedules. Hence the text should not go beyond Annex C apart from refinements.
- As to a scheduling conference, China would not object and would go along.
- On future prospect of services, because of the diversity and little export interest of developing countries, one needs to be realistic. One impediment is the lack of progress in sectors which developing countries are demanding to be open, therefore the outlook is not optimistic.

Comments and questions from GSC members

- What is the dialogue among developing countries in services?
- What is the progress on licensing process in China, and transparency in taxation?

- China is preparing to be a services exporter, why not offer itself more?
- The securities industry has explored with government and got treatment beyond WTO commitment, to mutual benefits. Consumers also demand wide range of products which international involvement in capital markets can provide. So, can china improve offer, e.g. in Mode 1 for institutional investors and Mode 3 to offer choice in corporate form? In insurance, a lot more can be offered that are not risky. Will there be more in revised offers? In banking, there are still barriers, e.g onshore data center requirement.
- There is no commitment yet on financial services information. With Xinhua News Agency as both regulator and provider, there is a conflict of interest.

Zhang Liping

- One cannot find a group of developing countries with the same offensive interests; their interests are mainly defensive interest, except India which has strong export interest in services.
- The securities sector is the least liberalized in China, because the industry is in its infancy stage. The banking offers are very good, very liberal. For insurance, the schedule is quite liberal compared with others at the same level of development. China has to consider the balance of interests, and cannot convince the financial services sector to offer commitments if demandeur countries do not offer theirs. On taxation, the playing field is level; it has not created any national treatment problem. Under the single undertaking, if others move, services won't stand still.
- We do have export interest in some sectors such as medical, space transport, construction. There was initial enthusiasm but then they encountered barriers. Not many other sectors have been identified.
- On securities sector, government will continue to reform. But regulators have to be cautions, because they were entering uncharted waters.
- Not sure about news agency services, but her personal view is that it is regulated as new agency, not provider of financial information. More communication is needed.
- WTO commitments are not autonomous liberalization. For new commitments, understandably there will be a more cautious attitude. But liberalization is a stated policy which will go on and it is difficult to turn back. Making WTO commitments is another matter, it will be more difficult.

Meeting 8 2:30pm Ambassador Ichiro Fujisaki, Japan

Ambassador Ichiro Fujisaki

- We see agriculture as a difficult issue, e.g. it is difficult to cut subsidies before an election. But now is practically the last chance for an agreement.
- Services is important to Japan. Japan wants services and rules in the balance of outcomes because they are limited in what they can get from agriculture/NAMA.

Comments and questions from GSC members

- The quad used to play a pivotal role, but lost its currency or unity now. Is there any new energy in the quad group?
- Does Japan support a revised text on services or a mini-ministerial in November

to cover all the triangle of issues?

- What are the relative merits of the different forums, WTO, ASEAN, free trade agreements, etc.

Ichiro Fujisaki

- The Quad group still has merits and should be continued.
- On services, the Enchilada engagement has been useful but there is too much negotiation on the technical level. Certain negotiations should be done at higher levels.
- Yes to mini-ministerial, and services should be one element.
- It would have been better without FTAs, but given that it has happened, WTO should be the main pillar, though FTAs will stay.

Meeting 9 3:45pm

Louis Niscovolos and Roberto Bosch, Argentina

Louis Niscovolos and Roberto Bosch

- The outlook for services is not optimistic.
- The US is not giving much on agriculture while putting pressure on Argentina in NAMA. It is difficult to demand the same in services than in say NAMA.
- We do not agree that services is lagging behind. Bindings are not easy for developing countries. A lot of foreign companies are actually doing business in Argentina.
- Argentina will comply with Annex C, nothing more. If there were to be a text in services, what is it you would like to have in the text? A mini-ministerial will not happen just in services.

Comments and questions from GSC members

- We do not want to revise Annex C, but just to have a text to make sure the services talks go on if there is agreement on agriculture/NAMA.
- Argentina has made good offers in the Uruguay Round, so why is there not more forthcoming in this round? What does it take to get Argentina to come forward?
- The European services sectors are against emergency safeguard measures.
- How would the NAMA negotiations go forward? Will good results in agriculture give room for the services package, or give political cover for services commitments?

Louis Niscovolos and Roberto Bosch

- It is a matter of price; the price is too high. Argentina has presented its first draft of GATS offers. Help us get agriculture then we help you get services.
- Emergency safeguard measures will not be a blank cheque, but there will be stringent criteria. There will be an instrument to permit assurance that exception is limited.
- On NAMA, there is not enough flexibility now for developing countries. The ball is in the other side.

Meeting 9 4:45pm

Boonyarit Kalayanamit, Chief Negotiator for services, Thailand
(Chair: Pascal Kerneis)

Boonyarit Kalayanamit

- Developing countries get direct benefits from agriculture/NAMA, but are less competitive in services.
- We will revise the services offers according to Annex C which is sacrosanct.

Comments and questions from GSC members

- What is the situation with the Foreign Business Act?
- Thailand is encouraged to make solid commitment binding under WTO.

Boonyarit Kalayanamit

- The Foreign Business Act amendment was recently withdrawn from the National Legislative Council, to be revised. The intention is not to make it restrictive but to create more and better transparency. The matter is now subject to the general election. The FBA amendments to be passed will respect international commitments.
- If there were to be a new text, Annex C has to be the basis. Anything going beyond Annex C will risk opening up Annex C itself and prolonging the process. Nevertheless, we can go along with the idea of a mini-ministerial on services.

CSI's Main messages

1. Revised offers
2. Revised text, from Annex C
3. Signaling Conference /Scheduling
4. Mini-ministerial

All to provide progress in services so that services won't be held hostage

Long-term Developing Countries Concerns

1. help them with agriculture/NAMA
2. help them get relate access in services eg. Mode 4
3. ESM
4. Let them pursuer autonomous liberalization