



## WTO NEGOTIATIONS IN AGRICULTURE

### TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR TRADE OFFICIALS AND NEGOTIATORS FROM PAKISTAN

GENEVA, 6 – 10 JUNE 2005

#### Meeting report

A five-day seminar at ITC in Geneva was held on WTO negotiations in agriculture for five trade officials from the Government of Pakistan as well as for officials and negotiators from the Permanent Mission in Geneva. The meeting had more than 22 speakers from a wide array of backgrounds, including secretariats of international organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) and ITC, coalitions of trading countries (G10, G20 and G33), key WTO Members, as well as the South Centre and the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD). The aim was to update participants on background information to current trade talks on agriculture in order to prepare to participate more effectively in ongoing WTO negotiations.

The seminar provided a good opportunity to resume and discuss negotiating positions of the trade groupings of developing countries, other trade groupings and major players from among the industrialised countries and regions. Other advisers from international organization secretariats were also on hand to provide in-depth analysis of developing country trade agenda options.

Discussions looked at efforts underway to eliminate trade-distorting measures such as domestic support and export subsidies. The seminar also focused attention on the third pillar of current trade talks, market access.

The meeting allowed participants to take stock of current mechanisms, instruments and provisions covering intellectual property, biodiversity and protection of plant species. A special session was dedicated to the complexities of Technical Barriers to Trade and SPS, measures that can be trade-restrictive when applied unilaterally.

*The following is a brief summary of the five-day event:*

- Speakers alluded to the Uruguay Round, which established rules on market access, domestic support; export competition and special support in agriculture, as well as strengthening dispute settlement.



UNCTAD/CNUCED



WTO OMC

- Since the WTO Agreement on Agriculture (hereafter AoA) came into force, developing country imports have grown faster than exports and import surges have persisted. Although provisions exist, “defence options” are limited due to lack of capacity to take advantage of legal recourse, and difficulty in providing “proof of injury”.
- Available “defensive” measures include Special Safeguards, but few developing countries seem to have access. Options such as higher tariffs and price and non-price transfers to farmers exist, but the latter are limited by budget constraints. The Special Safeguard Mechanism (SSM) can be triggered by either import surge or fall in price, and take the form of additional tariff or quota with one-year renewable period. For Special Products, the suggested criteria are subsistence strategies, livelihood in disadvantaged regions, significance in consumption profile, contribution to country’s economy, etc.
- Of the proposals tabled by major trading groups, G33 appears to best illustrate what is referred commonly as the “defensive” agenda. It wants food security to become an integral part of the negotiations and believes that only by resolving outstanding issues will current imbalances be redressed. It sees opportunities using the concepts of “Special Product” and “Sensitive Product” as useful policy tools, subject to developing countries being able to select for themselves products considered “special” and “sensitive”.
- Discussions also pointed to the use of the SSM as being also plausible as long as it is simple, effective and transparent; if it becomes too complex then it becomes difficult for developing countries to implement, especially in cases where they lack data collection capacity.
- *De minimis* provisions are frequently the only options available to developing countries to strengthen domestic production, the “amber/blue/green” box system being in general applicable only in developed countries. Current difficulties relate to designating products and agreeing on parameters. For the moment, more specific criteria, e.g. proportion of exports, employment, female employment, are not on the table.
- Some developing countries also seem to have an “offensive” agenda: to achieve greater market access under the prevailing trade distorting condition in some developed countries, characterized by generous subsidies and tariff peaks. In their view, the implementation of the AoA did not always retain the original spirit of the agreement; developed countries seem to have reduced subsidies but devised new means of circumventing requirements, and reduced domestic support but shifted from one kind of protection to another. The problem of tariff peaks remains, notably for key exports from developing countries competing with temperate zone products.
- A major challenge for developing countries is diversifying exports into higher value processed products; nonetheless they could face the problem of tariff escalation and costly SPS compliance measures, in particular with tropical raw materials such as cocoa, coffee, tea, sugar.
- In trade negotiations, it was said that “self-interest” often prevents the rise of a common front, because some developing countries want to maintain already-existing MFN preferences. For this reason, there appears to be more

common ground on the “offensive” rather than on the defensive agenda, where there are occasionally conflicts of interest.

- An important lesson out of the discussions for participating effectively in the negotiations seems to be to target issues, not countries, focusing on well-identified problems and designing rules to address them. The G20 proposal provides a model for negotiating from a position of strength. It was said to represent a large part of the developing world: (i) has a well-articulated agenda, e.g. to remove trade distortions first; (ii) makes the defensive agenda conditional on the offensive agenda, for example by agreeing to market access once subsidies are reduced; (iii) uses techniques employed by developed countries, e.g. proactive/clear strategy with rapid counter proposals, (iv) privileges facts over rhetoric; and, (v) eschews favours, in the form of Special and Differential Treatment.
- An example presented of targeting issues is the special case of cotton. Presenters said that it illustrates how you can focus on a single issue where the other side has a weak negotiating position. The argument, that cotton subsidies threatened the livelihood of farmers in the poorest countries, together with the moral clarity of the issue, has attracted wide support from WTO membership. (See below, summary of discussions on the cotton dimension).
- The G20 proposal focuses on elimination of domestic support, food aid and export credits. The group consider that discussions on market access are lagging behind, held up by lack of agreement on *ad valorem* tariffs, which G20 considers very transparent in developing countries, not so in developed countries.
- G20 seems equally concerned with monitoring and surveillance mechanisms so as not to allow room for commitments not to be fully implemented. It views some green box measures, in principle non-trade distorting, with a certain degree of suspicion. Some of the proposed green box measure might, in their view, have a trade distorting effect and welcomes the opportunity to open discussions on criteria
- G10 countries, which account for approximately 13% of the world’s food imports, are moving away from their historical goal of food self-sufficiency, but current negotiations have come under fire from lobby groups, frequently focusing on agriculture from the point of view of the environment, biodiversity, rural development, etc. Market access remains the most difficult issue for all negotiating groups, with “shock therapy” reform likely to fuel opposition.
- G10 countries seem to view the AoA as an incentive for action: direct payments to farmers will be progressively phased out, the export subsidy element removed from food aid and export credits, and, in general, the move will be from amber box to green box measures, to achieve other policy goals.
- Specific tariffs remain the preferred option of some G10 members.
- All interest parties in the US are aware of current debate through the monthly meetings of the Agricultural Trade Advisory Committee (ATAC), where proposals are discussed and new sectoral initiatives proposed. It was stated that countries should not underestimate the efforts and commitments

undertaken by the US and the EC: 85% of *ad valorem* issues seem resolved, and other market access issues will be resolved, together with cuts in domestic support. Reduction of export subsidies by the EC and review of food aid policy by the US seems to be part of their agenda.

- The concerns about domestic support programmes seems to be understood by major trading countries as they are related to market access issues and a good result in one will lead to a good outcome in other discussions. Some view that the green box encompasses an important group of programmes that should continue to operate with no cap. Blue box measures are transitional, but need to be available, but with better defined criteria. According to some major trading partners, domestic food aid has no impact on trade.
- The July framework may provide an opportunity to launch initiatives in specific sectors such as cotton. According to the views of some major trading countries, the priority is to resolve first the market access issue, then other issues can be negotiated under the three pillars. Some tariff systems need simplification and some specific tariffs are still under negotiation. Clarification is needed on *ad valorem*, verification measures. A definition has yet to be found for tropical products, and it remains unclear which products are sensitive: a possible result would be a sectoral initiative divided into sensitive and non-sensitive.
- The Hong Kong ministerial provides an opportunity to get things down on paper. An effort is underway to prepare short outlines of subject areas as a contribution to the July 2005 approximation, likely to be longer than its July 2004 counterpart because more detailed.
- According to some countries' views, blue box and green box criteria are not up for re-negotiation. However, some are ready to discuss the notification procedure, revisit blue box measures, and reduce recourse to *de minimis*. Concerns over "box shifting" seem split. G20 proposals cautions on box shifting whereas some other major countries, or regions say that there is little evidence that "box shifting", in a strict negative sense, has occurred.
- An important issue raised by a presenter was the positive aspects of "box shifting" i.e. that certain measures remain in place, but efforts are directed towards minimising their impact on trade. Measures such as decoupling price from production, imply that the farmer has to commit to producing in a more environmentally friendly way, which will result in a decrease in production.
- Geographical Indications has become the fourth pillar of trade talks as part of the TRIPS negotiations, although it also relates to market access and the WTO AoA. The aim is to protect high quality products, support rural development, and provide a marketing mechanism for small-hold farmers who would otherwise be unable to defend their interests. GI protection can be a useful marketing tool and support for a high quality product, and a new proposal calls for the extension of existing protections and the creation of an international register for wine and spirits.
- For competitiveness, a good strategy is to provide added value to a product through its reputation as having a particular origin. The idea should be not to reduce standards to allow market access for products, but maintain or raise standards and market products based on their reputation for quality.

### **State of play**

- The discussions seem to point to the fact that there is a real commitment to continue negotiations, with important input being provided to the July 2004 Framework by the Group of Interested Parties (5 members): Brazil, India, US, EU, Australia. The current round of talks seeks to reduce substantially trade distorting domestic support. Pressure groups post-Cancun are exacting more flexibility from EU and US on eliminating export subsidies, with reciprocal efforts on direct and indirect support.
- Nevertheless, developed countries are still supporting USD 360 billion in trade value with USD 200 billion in subsidy, while USD 20 billion in developing countries goes to for USD 180 billion in trade, i.e. 10 times as much is given in subsidy by the developed countries for only twice the value of trade.
- Some presenters referred to further commitments not being envisaged on blue box measures. Although initially a feature within EU trade policy for agriculture, a “new” blue box may be considered to take into account the United States policies. In any case, blue box criteria seem up for negotiation. Other issues up for negotiation are: establishing limits for blue box payments, seeking to reduce the number of blue box measures; prohibiting accumulation of support on specific commodities; specifying product ceilings; and defining target prices.
- Under the July 2004 framework for *de minimis* provisions, reductions are to be negotiated for developed countries, with *de minimis* support for subsistence and resource poor farmers already exempt. Avoiding reductions in *de minimis* is a priority issue for developing countries.
- Some presenters mentioned that the July framework criteria on green box measures seems open to review, at the same time as ensuring that basic concepts, principles and effectiveness remain intact. Priorities for developing countries as mentioned by presenters can be summarized as: strengthening criteria (avoid accumulation of support measures, define a fixed reference period, and a limited timeframe for receiving payments); incorporate developing countries criteria; establish an effective monitoring mechanism
- The July Framework provisions for export competitiveness seek to eliminate export subsidies, adopt a disciplined approach, agree “credible” end date for payments, phase out subsidies and ensure parallelism and equivalence in commitments and implementation. Some speakers said that developing countries want to ensure that a timeframe is defined; that there is a “down payment” in terms of tariff reduction, that backloading is avoided, and products for early elimination of subsidy are identified.
- An interesting point made during the discussions was that new negotiating opportunities could lie in treatment of “sensitive” and “special” products, and options on Special Safeguards. It was mentioned that in this context, it is vital for developing countries to remain informed of discussions of the Group of Interested Parties. The main danger lies in no solution being found or the solution being imposed. This is the first time that the WTO debate mandate

covers objectives such as food security, livelihood and rural development needs.

- The flexibility to designate certain agricultural products exempt from further tariff reduction commitments is therefore, according to many speakers, an important policy tool for developing countries. The problem arises from how to define these products, and what steps to take once they have been designated. It was advised that each developing country identify and select products that best meet its development needs.
- During the meeting it was stated that criteria such as food security, livelihood security and rural development are not easy to quantify. Quantifiable criteria apply to products with reasonably low tariffs, where the country concerned is a net importer and has a minimal share in the world market. Self-designation of products takes into account local contexts that render products special. Negotiators were advised to focus on product coverage, whether uniform or varying within countries, and on Special Products and SSM, where some countries have more products to designate, and differences in the levels of bound tariff rates, low bound rates implying a greater need for SP protection. Policy makers, for their part, were advised to focus on ensuring that definition and selection criteria are compatible with national goals and rural development policy.
- The ICTSD SP-SSM Project aims to achieve a better understanding of trade issues and enable constructive input into WTO negotiations, and assist stakeholders in developing countries in translating SP-SSM concepts into effective pro-poor pro-sustainable development negotiating language. It is in the process of developing guidelines and has initiated six country studies on SP-SSM: Barbados, Honduras, Kenya, Pakistan, Peru and Sri Lanka. They are all members of G33 and leading proponents of SP-SSM, reflecting the diversity of SP proponents and with differing agro-economic realities, but all supportive of SP-SSM.
- ICTSD has engaged a consultative process, which should result in a Special Products blue print: (1) reflecting the key ideas and methodologies from the six country studies as well as cross cutting and background papers and dialogues; (2) illustrating some of the key developing country priorities; (3) proposing options for a strategy on SP-SSM for WTO negotiations.

In discussing Geographical Indications (GI), speakers referred to The Doha Declaration, paragraphs 12 and 18, and the Panel Report on EC Regulation (*EC vs. US, EC vs. Australia*) which resume the current situation on GI, and parts of the Paris Convention (1883) have been incorporated into TRIPS. The international agreements, which apply only to signatory parties, are: Paris (1883), defined indicators of source and appellation of origin. Later, Madrid (1891) and Lisbon (1958).

- The GI focus is on characteristics of product, with uniqueness (*typicité* in French), derived collective goodwill (reputation) defined according geographical origin and contributing to added value. The TRIPS definition of GI is: "Indication which identifies a good as originating in the territory of a Member, or a region or locality in the territory, where a given quality, reputation or other characteristic of the good is essentially attributable to its geographical origin".

- According to some presenters, GI's can be a useful marketing tool, associating region of production with quality: an example in Asia is Basmati rice. Problems can arise when a producer decides to re-locate manufacture of a product, even though the product's characteristics derive from its region of origin.
- The definition of "appellation of origin" (covered by Lisbon Agreement) is: "the geographical name of a country, region or locality, which serves to designate a product originating therein, of which the quality/characteristics are due exclusively or essentially to the geographical environment, including natural and human factors."
- Work is currently underway in issues of quality, reputation, and product registration requirements, means of protection, laws focusing on business practice, and possibilities for enforcement. *Sui generis* legislation contains for monitoring appellations of origin and registering geographical indications. WTO Secretariat keeps under review the means of protection available; definition and criteria for recognition; procedures for recognition; eligible/authorized users and monitoring and protection against those not eligible/authorized to use of using improperly; enforcement; relationship to trademarks. The WIPO Standing Committee provides definition of GIs; protection in Country of Origin; generic terms; conflicts between trademarks and GIs; homonymous GIs; link between product and origin.
- Some participants mentioned that there is a need to raise awareness in developing countries of intellectual property through workshops and meetings with experts, develop intellectual protection strategies, strengthen the operations of individual IP offices, and focus on training and enforcement activities. To reap full benefits of GI protection, it was said that the way forward is to carry out a product audit to identify products to be defined under geographical indicators. The audit should: indicate product, define its specific qualities, include details of processes involved in its production and describe the business aspects of its production and marketing.
- The presentation on the UPOV Convention explained it is charged with the protection of new plant varieties. Plant breeders need protection to cover their investment because plant breeding is a long and expensive process, and plant varieties can be easily and quickly reproduced. New and improved plant varieties are needed to increase productivity, in response to population growth, improve quality, provide better resistance to pests and diseases; make more efficient use of inputs; and, in general, contribute to economic development.
- UPOV can also set specific conditions for granting breeders rights. They include: novelty, distinctness, uniformity and stability. The advantages of the system are that germplasm sources remain available to breeders, genetic basis for plant improvement is increased, variety improvement is enhanced and provides opportunity for all breeders to share in benefits of breeding activities. Provisions for "farmer's privilege" provide a balance so as not to reduce incentive to breed new varieties.
- The speaker of UPOV stated that breeder's authorization is not required for acts done: privately and for non-commercial purposes; and for experimental

purposes. In addition, a protected variety can be used in other breeding programs, and farm privilege allows farmers to save the seeds.

- Granting breeders rights requires formalities and the payment of fees. Discussions on breeding methods led to the clarification that UPOV is neutral, for example, in the use of genetically modified organisms. Signatories to the Convention have the obligation of enforcing its provisions and the legal rights of breeders, and provide facilities for legal remedies.
- The presenter of the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade and Sanitary and Phytosanitary agreements (TBT and SPS) said that benefits of the TBT agreement for the business community include transparency, prompt information, monitoring on standards, regulations and conformity assessment procedures. Benefits also include harmonization, non-discriminatory conformity assessment procedures between domestic and imported products, and avoidance of retesting and re-certification through mutual recognition. Finally, the agreement provides for equivalence of technical regulations (if they fulfil the same objective), and a dispute settlement mechanism.
- The current third triennial review of the agreement is looking at its implementation and administration, good regulatory practice and transparency of procedures, i.e. sharing information on proposed technical regulations and conformity assessment procedures (CAP), notifications and handling of comments, timing of entry into force of measures, and code of good practice. For CAPs, issues include implementation of the relevant provisions, supplier's declaration of conformity, accreditation and mutual recognition agreements. They also include provisions for technical assistance, special & differential treatment (SDT) and a variety of other elements.
- The expert said that where international standards, guides or recommendations are not available or a higher level of protection is needed and SPS measure affect international trade, measures should be based on science and an appropriate assessment of risks and governments should inform other WTO members and take their comments into account.
- Exporters advantages include transparency on essential information, prevention of unfair exclusion from market, and ability to develop a market access strategy. For importers, there is protection of legitimate national measures and a means to avoid trade disputes.
- In the discussions, the TBT and SPS expert emphasized that in order to develop a market access strategy using the SPS agreement, exporters should identify national market access problems and see which one involves technical barriers to trade; define whether the issue is a TBT or SPS; clarify the issue with trading partner countries, working with export stakeholders and their importer contacts and via agency-to-agency dialogue.
- The expert insisted countries should prioritise issues by consultation between relevant government agencies and the business community, look at short term and long term goals; see whether there is a large trade potential or a small one (taking into account the advice from business); evaluate the chances of success in removing barriers. They should also develop a market access agenda and a targeted programme of activities.



- Multilateral elements of strategy may include discussions in margins of SPS committee; raising matter of specific interest in SPS Committee; engaging “good offices”; formal consultations and, as final resort, WTO dispute settlement, which is long, expensive, provocative, but effective.
- Current issues under consideration or discussion include: SDT for developing countries; implementation of equivalence positions; trade concerns such as the US Biotechnology Act; international phytosanitary standard on wood packaging materials; participation by developing countries in international standard-setting bodies; and lack of effective infrastructure at national level.
- Some compliance problems for developing countries presented are lack of participation international standardization process; difficulties in meeting requirements of export markets and demonstrating compliance; limited resources for national standards and conformity assessment infrastructure and difficulty in concluding Mutual Recognition Agreements. The need to develop a national system of quality assurance management infrastructure comprising standardization, Quality Assurance (Certification, testing, inspection); accreditation; and metrology was also mentioned. Quality support services include: laboratories for testing and calibrating, inspection agencies, certification bodies, national standards body, national enquiry points for technical information, training and consultancy, technology diffusion, national weights and measure organisation, national measurement institute for measurement of traceability and national accreditation body.

### ***The “cotton dimension”***

- The presentations on cotton all made reference to four countries - Burkina Faso, Chad, Benin, and Mali, which tabled a motion in May 2003 requesting that subsidies on cotton be eliminated and a fund set up to compensate farmers. They noted that these countries were not asking for STD or for foreign aid, they were only asking to be able to compete fairly on the world market, according to the principles of the WTO. The issue contributed to the deadlock in Cancun. The four countries produce 20% of the world’s cotton with cotton comprising 40% of trade and 8% of GDP. They have the backing of G90, with other major players such as Paraguay and Brazil, Uganda and China, which now imports cotton from the four countries, proving very supportive.
- The cotton submission has the support of the EU, which has a small (2.5% of world market) heavily-subsidised cotton sector, currently undergoing reform and, in any case, not subject to tariffs. It is opposed by the United States, where cotton is a very sensitive issue. Some major trading countries feel that countries have unrealistically high expectations of world price increases in as a result of the elimination of subsidies.
- However, since that time, the result of a trade dispute between Brazil and the US has provided support for the four countries’ case, according to some speakers and led them to propose eliminating all trade-distorting support, with deadlines in July and September, corresponding to deadlines set by the *Brazil vs. US* WTO panel. The panel in that case needed to identify which part of the support to cotton was trade distorting. It investigated the US cotton subsidy that based on production, provided incentive to produce more. The WTO

panel found that subsidy measures had made use of boxes “inappropriately.” The drop in the price of cotton was not deemed to be an effect of the subsidy, rather the reverse, the subsidy was the result of the drop in price.

- The presenters said that the case is unlikely to be used as a model in other disputes because elements, such as the proportion of the level of subsidy, are quite specific. It was said to unlikely provide a precedent for major trading partners to cease their subsidies. Nevertheless, as a result of the panel decision, it appears that the US will have to make substantial changes to the current policy , and keep interested parties informed of steps taken.
- Sugar provides another specific case study for WTO. In this case, the expert mentioned that the finding was that the EC was cross-subsidising high price sugar sold in the EU to cover the loss on low cost exports of sugar. According to the EC, preferential trade treatment is frequently for historical reasons, for example, India, as a former British colony, had traditionally exported sugar to the UK, and the UK negotiated a sugar protocol on accession to the EU.

## Appendix: Pakistan and the WTO negotiations on agriculture

- Pakistan is a member of two agricultural negotiating alliances in the current Doha Round negotiations: G20 and G33. Although it feels that there is a merit in the both the “defensive” agenda of G33 and the “offensive” agenda of G20, It has some reservations with the G33 agenda which sometimes goes to extremes in designating Special Products in ways that might inhibit South-South trade.
- On the other hand, it fully shares the very ambitious agenda of G20 for eliminating all forms of export competition, with export subsidies disappearing within a maximum period of 5 years. It also agrees with those countries that are seeking parallelism through elimination of subsidy element of export credits and export guarantees.
- Pakistan also fully supports the G20 objective of achieving an overall cut in domestic support to agriculture, with capping for specific products. Some flexibility may be necessary in current blue box criteria but unlike the claims of the G10 countries, the existing criteria for Green Box should be reviewed and clarified.
- On the market access pillar, Pakistan favours an ambitious result. It favours steep cuts in the existing rates through application of Swiss formula. Pakistan’s own import regime is open and transparent. Except for edible oils, duty rates are lower than 25%. On many of its major import commodities, such as wheat, sugar, cotton and pulses applied duties are zero per cent though there are high bindings.
- As far the impact of domestic support and export subsidies on our major agricultural produce is concerned, Pakistan is adversely affected for all its major crops. For example, in case of cotton which was under a WTO dispute proceedings recently and where Pakistan was a third party, the panel found a substantial portion of US subsidies to be illegal. It is estimated that through yearly subsidies of USD 3 billion by the United States; prices of cotton are depressed by 11 cents per pound. If those subsidies could be eliminated income of Pakistan’s farmers could increase by US\$ 600 million per year.
- Similarly in case of sugar cane, although Pakistan is a far more efficient producer compared to the EU whose cost of production is almost 3 times that of Pakistan, unlike the EU it is unable to export its surplus production in the international market. If the EU subsidies were removed, Pakistan could export its surplus production of at least 2 million tons.
- Another major export product of Pakistan is rice. Here again the US subsidies of over \$1 billion not only lowers the price but also takes away many of our markets. There is also tariff escalation in case of rice. If polished rice is exported to the EU instead of brown rice in husk, it faces high tariffs. As a result value addition is discouraged for Pakistani exporters.
- Pakistan is the sixth largest producer of milk powder in the world but, again, the EU subsidies prevent it from reaping the benefits. Instead of being an exporter of milk, it imports as it is cheaper to do so because of subsidies. Thus for all its major products – cotton, sugar, rice and milk powder – which

comprise 90% of agricultural production, there are serious problems caused by subsidies given by developed countries.

- Pakistan should join African countries' struggle for getting cotton subsidies issue resolved on a fast track basis. It should also seek that any expansion of TRQs should be transparent and on a MFN basis. The country has a vested interest in definitions and designations of tropical products and getting preferential market access for those products.
- In the past, Pakistan followed a defensive strategy in the WTO negotiations. However, considering that its interests can be better served if we followed a more offensive strategy, it should actively engage in the DDA negotiations. It should strongly support the African countries struggle for getting export subsidies eliminated on a fast track basis. Other areas which need to be looked into are: where else should Pakistan stress for early elimination of export subsidies, what should be priority areas for getting domestic support eliminated upfront and where it should seek reduction of tariff peaks.

.....



## ITC

Your partner  
in trade  
development

### WTO NEGOTIATIONS IN AGRICULTURE

TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR TRADE OFFICIALS AND NEGOTIATORS FROM  
PAKISTAN

GENEVA, 6 – 10 JUNE 2005

**Monday, 6 June 2005**

ITC – Room 6-40

10:00 Opening Remarks

Mr. Ramamurti Badrinath, *Officer-in-Charge, ITC*

H.E. Dr. Manzoor Ahmad, *Ambassador, Permanent Representative of  
Pakistan to the WTO*

10:30 Introductions to the EC-ITC TRTA Project in Pakistan

Mr. Eric Alvarez, *Chief, OAPLAC, ITC*

11:00 Coffee break

***What It Means for Business***

11:30 Business Implications of the Agricultural Framework Agreement

Mr. Peter Naray, *Senior Consultant, ITC*

13:00 Lunch break

***Perspectives of Negotiating Groups***

15:00 Perspective of the G-33

H.E. Gusmardi Bustami, *Ambassador, Permanent Representative of  
Indonesia to the WTO and Coordinator of the G-33*

15:45 Perspective of the G-10

Mr. Didier Chambovey, *Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent  
Mission of Switzerland to the WTO and Coordinator of the G-10*

16:30 Coffee break



UNCTAD/CNUCED



WTO OMC



## ITC

Your partner  
in trade  
development

16:45 Perspective of the G-20  
Ms. Maria Izabel Vieira, *Counsellor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Permanent Mission of Brazil to the WTO and representative of the G-20*

**Tuesday, 7 June 2005**

WTO – Room 1121

### *Current State of Play*

9:30 Agriculture Negotiations and WTO  
Mr. John Finn, *Counsellor, Agriculture and Commodities Division, WTO*

11:30 Coffee break

### *The Cotton Dimension*

11:45 The Cotton Initiative  
Ms. Marieme Fall, *Economic Affairs Officer, WTO*

13:00 Lunch break

ITC – Room 6-40

### *Selected Issues*

14:30 Recent Disputes on Agriculture  
Mr. Matthew Kennedy, *Counsellor, Legal Affairs Division, WTO*

15:30 Main Issues of Interest to Developing Countries in the Current Agriculture Negotiations  
Ms. Luisa Bernal, *Team Leader on Trade in Goods and Commodities, Trade and Development Programme, South Centre*

16:30 Coffee break

16:45 Protecting Rural Livelihoods: The Case of Special Products (SP)  
Mr. Constantine Bartel, *Assistant Programme Director, ICTSD*



UNCTAD CNUCED



WTO OMC



## ITC

Your partner  
in trade  
development

ITC – Restaurant

17:30 Cocktail

**Wednesday, 8 June 2005**

WIPO Main Building – Bilger Room 1<sup>st</sup> Floor

### *Agriculture and Selected Intellectual Property Issues*

9:30 Geographical Indications  
Mr. Matthijs Geuze, *Senior Counsellor, Office of the Assistant Director General, WIPO*

10:15 Plant Varieties Protection under the UPOV Convention  
Mr. Rolf Jördens, *Vice Secretary-General, UPOV*

11:30 Coffee break

ITC – Room 6-40

### *FAO Perspective*

11:45 Challenges and Opportunities for Developing Countries in the Context of the WTO Negotiations on Agriculture  
*Mr. Panos Konandreas, Senior Liaison Officer, FAO*

13:00 Lunch break

ITC – Room 6-03

### *Building Capacity for Agricultural Exports*

14:30 Packaging and Export Competitiveness of Agricultural and Food Products  
Mr. Jacky Charbonneau, *Senior Advisor, ITC*

15:30 MAS Tools: How Can They Be Used in Agriculture?  
Ms. Helen Lassen, *Senior Advisor, ITC*

16:30 Coffee break



UNCTAD CNUCED



WTO OMC



## ITC

Your partner  
in trade  
development

16:45 Dealing with SPS and TBT Issues  
Mr. Shyam Kumar Gujadhur, *Senior Advisor, ITC*

**Thursday, 9 June 2005**

### *National Perspectives*

#### ITC – Room 6-03

9:30 Perspective of the USA  
Henry Schmik, *Agricultural Attaché, USDA*

11:00 Coffee break

11:15 Perspective of the EU  
Mr. Peter Thompson, *Deputy Permanent Representative of the European Commission*

13:00 Lunch break

#### ITC – Room 4-40

14:30 Options in the Context of the Framework Agreement on Agriculture  
Mr. Gabriel Taboada, *Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Argentina to the WTO*

16:00 Coffee break

16:15 Perspective of Pakistan  
H.E. Mr. Manzoor Ahmad, *Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the WTO*



UNCTAD/CNUCED



WTO OMC





Friday, 10 June 2005

## ITC

Your partner  
in trade  
development

### *Concluding Session*

#### Permanent Mission of Pakistan

9:30 Brainstorming and Discussions  
H.E. Mr. Manzoor Ahmad, *Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the WTO*

11:30 Conclusion

.....



UNCTAD CNUCED



WTO OMC