***Date: 21 April 2016***

***Venue: Room W***

***TRADE POLICY REVIEW BODY – REVIEW OF UKRAINE***

The first trade policy review of Ukraine was conducted on 19 and 21 April 2016.

The meeting on 21 April was composed of following parts:

1. Speech of Head of Ukrainian Delegation, Deputy Minister of Economic Development and Trade
2. Remarks of Discussant, Ambassador of Switzerland to the WTO
3. Members' statements
4. Concluding remarks of chairperson

**1. Speech of Head of Ukrainian Delegation, Deputy Minister of Economic Development and Trade**

Deputy Minister of Ukraine covered in her speech almost all fields for which the WTO Members raised concerns. She mentioned that it was highly appreciated by her delegation the positive statement of members on adoption by Ukraine GPA, TFA and TRIPS Amendment. She mentioned that despite of geopolitical challenges in Donets and Lugansk, Ukraine has introduced a lot of reforms covering all aspect of trade to ensure steady growth.

She made following clarifications:

**EU co-operation**

Ukraine signed Association Agreement with the EU and its main part Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (**DCFTA**) will be provisionally implemented starting from January 2016. She noted that the implementation of DCFTA would be done in line with the WTO obligations of Ukraine. DCFTA envisages the progressive removals of trade barriers and covers SPS, TBT, customs and IP related matters.

Beginning of 2016 the Action Plan 2016-2019 was adopted for the implementation of this DCFTA. Ukraine has close trade relations with the EU (33% of overall trade share) and main export products are the machinery, iron etc.

**VAT refund process**

She mentioned that VAT refund process is very important for the FDI attraction, therefore the Ministerial Order 1125 was adopted to perform relevant reforms in this field. According to the planned reform, the VAT refund requests will be addressed in the chronological order and online application will be used.

**Customs administration and valuation**

Prime Minister of Ukraine mentioned that the customs reforms are one of the top priority areas for Ukraine in 2016. The new Customs Code adopted in 2012 is in line with the Article VII of WTO GATT and other related provisions of WTO Acquis. Transparency and confidentiality, administrative and judicial appeals in this field are cornerstones. A lot of attention is paid to raising qualification of customs officials. The main purpose of reforms is to diminish the number of documents required for the customs purposes. The TFA implementation in this field is very important. Also in order to modernize the customs system risk management development program will be implemented for the authorized economic operators in 2017. Auditing will be strengthened for these purposes.

**Anti-corruption**

There were more than 1000 corruption related claims were registered in 2015. Around 1200 persons from civil service, judicial system etc. were prosecuted. The police fighting corruption was established in around 16 cities of Ukraine. National Anti-Corruption Bureau was established. E-government, e-procurement, e-services portals were created to facilitate for example the business registration of business operators during 2 days. Several legislative acts, as Laws on National Anti-Corruption Bureau, Anti-Corruption Strategy; Prevention of Anti-Corruption Practices etc. were adopted.

**Banking sector**

The financial crisis in 2013 created some problems for BOP in Ukraine, therefore Ukraine adopted some temporary measures to tackle such problems. But these restrictions concerning foreign currency exchange regulation market are gradually liberalized in cooperation with IMF. The National Bank of Ukraine launched a new project within which Action Plan was developed for these purposes.

**IP**

There are still challenges in the field of IP protection and enforcement. This field is very important for FDI attraction. Several related Laws and Codes were amended in the recent years to comply with WTO TRIPS Agreement, as well as EU Acquis. In January 2016 the new Law on Cinematography was adopted to amend the Law on Copyright and Related Rights with the view to introduce more strict protection of IPRs at internet. There are several draft laws are prepared that will introduce the compensation mechanism for IP violation, operation of collective management organizations etc.

To strengthen border enforcement of IPRs, there was draft law adopted recently that is in line with the EU Regulation 608/2013.

Nevertheless, IP enforcement still remains a priority for governmental reforms.

**Agriculture**

The Deputy Minister of Agrarian Policy and Food of Ukraine was also present within delegation. Several reforms were adopted for forestry, privatization of agrarian areas, VAT regime related matters, measures to fight corruption, abolition of mandatory licensing etc.

The challenge was the privatization of SMEs and for this purposes to apply best management practices Strategy 2015-2020 was adopted including 10 strategic directions.

**SPS**

Transparency was one of the important issues in this regard. The standards were adopted in line with the standards of 3 sister organizations. Also DCFTA established frameworks for SPS measures in line with WTO rules. The State Service of Ukraine on Food Safety and Consumer Protection became operational from 06 April 2016.

**TBT**

The Strategy 2015-2020 was adopted in this field to ensure the implementation of DCFTA (Article 54) in line with TBT Agreement. The main issues in this field the adoption of voluntary standards and their compliance with international standards, publication requirements etc. If there were no international standards in place then relevant info about the standards will be provided to the members of request basis. Till now there were no request received through Enquiry Point. The catalogue of standards is available at the web site of National Standardization Body.

**Trade remedies**

Ukraine takes WTO obligations and DCB compliance in this regard very seriously.

**Privatization of state owned enterprises (SOEs)**

After the Soviet period there were several SOEs established in Ukraine. There were reforms conducted for their privatization nevertheless there are still around 3000 SOEs exist. As a priority topic for 2016, Ukraine plans STEs management to be done in line with OECD relevant guidelines. A few days ago the reforms covered such a big SOEs of Ukraine as Ukrainian Post and Ukrainian Railways. The reforms are directed for privatization of non-strategic SOEs; only strategic SOEs will remain, as state owned ones.

In conclusion she thanked the delegation, WTO Secretariat, Discussant and Chairperson for their contributions.

**2. Remarks of Discussant**

Discussant mentioned the active role of Ukraine in the operation of WTO as well as summarized the *following positive points* mentioned by members in their both oral and written submissions:

* Banking stabilization
* Compliance with DSB rulings
* Privatization of SOEs
* GPA, TFA, TRIPS Amendment
* Consider in the future accession to ITA extension
* DCFTA's implementation

He mentioned the *following concerns:*

* Corruption and transparency, independent judicial system
* Use of trade remedies in line with WTO rules
* Delays in VAT compensation mechanism
* Customs valuation and transparency
* Import surges and BOP
* TBT – transparency and involvement of all stakeholders in the decision making process
* IP – cybercrime, royalties collection and copyright violations

**3. Members' statements**

3 members, the EU, the US and Russian federation took floor.

**EU** expressed the hope that DCFTA would boost economic relations between EU and Ukraine and looked forward for the signs of stabilization during next TPR of Ukraine.

**US** thanked Ukraine for responding its questions in timely manner and noted the follow up questions in 3 areas i.e. adoption of legislation on GMOs, electrical power and IP enforcement.

**Russian Federation** reiterated its statement on 19 April 2016 on the restrictions imposed by Ukraine and also mentioned that the prohibition of films and cartoon of Russia to be broadcasted in Ukraine was not trade friendly.

**4. Chairperson's concluding remarks**

She mentioned that Ukraine since its membership to the WTO in 2008 has shown steady growth in its economy and attraction of investment and one of the active members of WTO. The notifications were sent but still some in the field of agriculture were still missing. She also mentioned the temporary restriction lined to import surges, TBT, SPS, IP, local content requirement, alcohol beverages restrictions, delays in VAT reimbursement, customs valuation, corruption etc. related concerns of members. The adoption of new Tax and Customs Codes in line with international requirements marked to be good signs. The implementation of DCFTA would be a catalyst for strengthening of TBT, SPS and IP fields in the future.

Chairperson mentioned that UNIDO request to participate at the upcoming TPRs of the following countries as observer based on its technical assistance activities in these countries:

* Honduras
* Malawi
* Albania
* Congo
* China
* Guatemala
* Sri-Lanka
* Sierra-Leone
* UAE

Honduras, Congo, China, Albania and Sierra-Leone expressed their agreement to this, so it was agreed.

The chairperson asked the other remained countries from the list expressed their view on this point to the WTO Secretariat in a due course and as there were no objection from the floor it was decided that if the remained countries will agree on the participation of UNIDO as observer at their TPRs it would be so agreed.

***Date: 28 April 2016***

***Time: 10:00 a.m.-11:00a.m.***

***Venue: Room W***

***Informal Group of Developing Countries***

***Negotiating Group on Rules (Technical Group)***

**The chairperson** opened the meeting by mentioning of 3 pillars which WTO members adopted at the MC 10 in Nairobi, including SSM for developing countries, decision on public stockholding (PSH) for food security purposes and elimination of export subsidies for agriculture exports. Chairperson stressed that the MC level should not be the end level of Agricultural decision meaning that discussions have to be taken in various forums and he further assumed that the water (tariff reduction) issue must be the start point of the MC 11. Some members were concerned on Nairobi decisions expressing their useless and they even considered them not fruitful at all. The Chairperson asked members to put their concerns and the way forward on paper.

Negotiations on the two other pillars of the agriculture trade reform — domestic support and market access were the next topics of discussion among members. Members expressed their readiness and commitment to advance negotiations on domestic support and market access.

The following discussion was on Domestic support (DS) and Chair noted with regret that the only 24 notifications were submitted so far, which is a shocking number and by saying so urged members to submit and update their notifications on DS. He further added that since the Ministers in Nairobi instructed in finding the way forward we have to be patient despite knowing the final outcome whether it would be positive or negative.

Ecuador stated that Agriculture reform must be one of the main topics of the MC 11

Brazil expressed its support on ongoing negotiation of Agricultural reforms emanating from Nairobi MC Declaration

Egypt supported the discussion on SPS in agriculture and water reduction by members and expressed the willingness to work further

Cuba touched upon 3 pillars mentioned above and noted that although Cuba has defensive position in some issues, but acknowledges taken commitments to work and find way forward which satisfies interests of all members. Furthermore she touched upon sequencing and mandating issues of Nairobi decisions stressing that we altogether have to bring on the table key issues and subject in question for the sake of further positive outcomes. Lastly she has touched upon on SSM and PSH issues like other speakers addressing the importance of them for developing and net food importer countries.

***Date: 9 May 2016***

***DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BODY (DSB) – Special Session***

The 39 Special Session of the Dispute Settlement Body took place on 9 May 2016. The meeting was opened by Chairperson-Designate and it took up the only election of the chairperson. Since there was no any suggestion from the floor in regard to Agenda doc WTO/AIR/TN/DSB/1 so the Agenda was adopted. According to decision made on 31 March 2016 the Ambassador of the Kenya has been formally appointed new Chairman of the Dispute Settlement Body-Special Session.

Then Morocco took the floor and on behalf of the African Group of countries congratulated new Chairperson on his election and acknowledged the importance of the DSB role in the Multilateral Trading System. Similar to Morocco the Cameron took the floor to congratulate new Chairperson too. New Chairperson on his final statement expressed his thankfulness to delegations and counted their speeches as a support and encouraged members to approach him through the WTO Secretariat and in addition he expressed his full openness/availability for any consultations, discussion and further cooperation.

Dispute Settlement Body meeting started at 11:00 by adoption of the following proposed agenda:

**UNITED STATES – MEASURES CONCERNING THE IMPORTATION, MARKETING AND SALE OF TUNA AND TUNA PRODUCTS**

A. RECOURSE TO ARTICLE 21.5 OF THE DSU BY THE UNITED STATES: REQUEST FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PANEL (WT/DS381/32)

**ARGENTINA – MEASURES RELATING TO TRADE IN GOODS AND SERVICES**

1. REPORT OF THE APPELLATE BODY (WT/DS453/AB/R AND WT/DS453/AB/R/ADD.1) AND REPORT OF THE PANEL (WT/DS453/R AND WT/DS453/R/ADD.1)

On 3 December 2015, the DSB adopted the reports of the Appellate Body and compliance panel in United States – Measures Concerning the Importation, Marketing and Sale of Tuna and Tuna Products: Recourse to Article 21.5 of the DSU by Mexico (DS381). The DSB found that the "amended tuna measure" was inconsistent with Article 2.1 of the Agreement on TBT and Articles I:1 and III:4 of the GATT 1994, and was not justified under Article XX of the GATT 1994. Therefore, the DSB found that the US had not brought the dolphin-safe labeling measure into compliance with the TBT Agreement and the GATT 1994, as recommended by the DSB in this dispute.

US took the floor and noted that despite amended tuna measure, which has been brought into compliance with the TBT Agreement and the GATT 1994 Mexico, insists and requested authorization from the DSB to suspend concessions. Mexico complained that the amended tuna measure did not bring the US into compliance with its obligations under the WTO Agreement. In particular, Mexico argues that amended tuna measure violates Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement, Articles I:1 and III of the GATT 1994.

Mexico argues on lack of consultations to establish Panel and thus requests consultation with US shortly and proposes to create special group of consultation concerning Article 21.5 of the DSU.

Chinese Taipei supported Mexico, Guatemala and Argentina expressed its views in regard to granting authorization to suspend concessions under Article 22.6 of the DSU and recommends consultation between parties for solution.

The US mentioned with regret that Mexico raised the consultation issue and added that US stands ready to cooperate further. The US continues to be open to discussing the matter with Mexico. The US understands that Mexico disagrees that the amended tuna measure is consistent with the covered agreements and continues to ask to bring the dolphin-safe labeling measure into compliance with the TBT Agreement and the GATT 1994. However Mexico has not sought the establishment of a compliance panel in the light of this disagreement. The US accordingly considers it appropriate to seek recourse to Article 21.5 of the DSU to resolve the disagreement as to compliance.

Mexico again took the floor and stated that as in previous meeting our views were abused and further added that Article 21.5 of the DSU clearly covers all necessary provisions to deal with issue at question. Mexico concluded by statement that the issue was raised several years ago and looks forward for positive outcome.

Chairperson asked the floor whether any members want to take part as third parties. EU, Guatemala, Australia, Brazil, Norway, India raised their flag to participate as third party.

**Item 2. ARGENTINA – MEASURES RELATING TO TRADE IN GOODS AND SERVICES**

1. REPORT OF THE APPELLATE BODY (WT/DS453/AB/R AND WT/DS453/AB/R/ADD.1) AND REPORT OF THE PANEL (WT/DS453/R AND WT/DS453/R/ADD.1)

Since initially there was no intervention from the floor Argentina took the floor and thanked AB for their report and noted that no recommendation submitted by AB in regard to paragraph 1 Article 19 of the DSU. Precaution issue has been discussed and Article XIV of the GATS given as a reference to this matter. Further Argentina recommended settling the dispute in the context of likeness. To this end the paragraph 1 Article II and the paragraph 1 Article XVII proposed to evaluate likeness of services and service providers mentioning that Establishing Panel based on presumption of likeness of services and service providers much complex. AB findings on precautionary exception may be invoked, since it might imbalance member`s rights and obligations.

Then Panama took the floor and commented on different angels of the issue, namely in regard to discrimination, less favorable treatment, Article II and XVII of the GATS.

Panama and Argentina each appeals certain issues of law and legal interpretations developed in the Panel Report, Argentina – Measures Relating to Trade in Goods and Services. The Panel was established on 25 June 2013 to consider a complaint by Panama with respect to certain financial, taxation, foreign exchange, and registration measures adopted by Argentina, each distinguishing between "countries cooperating for tax transparency purposes" (cooperative countries) and "countries not cooperating for tax transparency purposes" (non-cooperative countries) in accordance with Decree No. 589/20133 of Argentina's Federal Administration of Public Revenue (AFIP).

Panama claims that measures are inconsistent with Article II: 1 of the GATS because these measures accord less favorable treatment to services and service suppliers of non-cooperative countries than that accorded to like services and service suppliers of cooperative countries. Panama also claims that some measures are inconsistent with Article XVII of the GATS because these measures accord less favorable treatment to services and service suppliers of non-cooperative countries than that accorded to like domestic services and service suppliers.

US as third party to the case commented on Panama`s claims expressing its inconsistences.

Canada took the floor and expressed its gratitude and mentioned despite the fact that Canada not being party to the case uses opportunity to express views on this matter, especially Canada surprised to the fact that AB did not seek proper analysis in regard to likeness. Further noted that in regard to less favorable treatment Canada welcomes AB clarification based on Article II:1 and XVII of the GATS.

At the end of the meeting the chairperson recalled next meeting of the DSB as 23 May 2016 and proposal submission date as 12 May 2016. Lastly the chairperson announced about the selection/appointment of one member of the AB, which takes place on 10 May 2016 at 15:00pm.

***Date: 25 April 2016***

***Committee on safeguards***

The committee on safeguards held its regular meeting on 25th-April-2016, after the welcome remarks of the chair following members requested to add topics under other business agenda item.

**Item 1,**

* **EU** added Tunisia safeguard cases
* **USA** added legislative notification of Kazakhstan
* **Russian Federation** initiating investigation in Aluminum products by USA

**Item 2.**

The committee has received 8 new notifications, members ad time to submit questions and comments until 11-April 2016.

Item 2.3

USA has submitted questions on developing of trade defense measures

* Kyrgyz Republic delegation provided reply on the basis of their membership in EEC

Item 2.4,

* Pakistan delegation informed members of more details on their reform on national tariff and trade remedy measures, specially safeguard measures act of 2015

**Item 3.**

* USA stated that his country like to once again draw the attention of Cameroon on the questions which were submitted by USA 18 months ago and yet have not received any reply.

**Item 3.2** Notification submitted by Qatar and Australia has submitted question in this regard, which was further, replied by Qatar.

* Qatar we have submitted the replies and in this stage we welcome any further questions.

Furthermore the chair stated that the deadline for submitting questions in these regards are 17-May-2016 and the deadline for submission of answers are 6-june-2016, he added that 22 members who has not submitted any legislation notification are requested to notify as soon as possible. Following that USA appreciated chairs efforts encouraging members to notify their legislations.

**Item 4 , Notification of actions related to safeguard measures**

* Japan has expressed its serious concern in regard to increasing number of safeguard measures imposed by members in steel sector.
* Australia, the delegation state that her country is a user of this measure but they have increased the time between findings and imposing measure and its initial term is 2 years.
* China Taipei raised concern on increasing number of safeguard actions further stated that we believe safeguard is an emergency measure but it seems to be a routine one.
* Brazil, the delegation raised concern on the increasing number of safeguard measures in all member countries in steel sector.
* Canada raised concern on the increasing number of safeguard actions and stated that this significantly impacts on international trade.
* USA, the delegation stated that now 26 safeguard measures are reviewed while 9 years ago there were only 6 measures to be reviewed,
* Norway raised general concern on safeguard measures that are being imposed and stated that it neutrally impacts trade.
* Korea raised general concern on safeguard actions and their adverse impact on trade.

**Item 4.1 Chile notification**

* Chile, the country has initiated three safeguard investigations at same time and same result so look all three as one, which are of Steel wire, Steel nits, and steel mash.
* EU, appreciate the view looking all three measures as one, but EU raised concern that Chile has initiated 4 safeguard measures in just 2 months and it has decreased the imports of steel remarkably.
* Mexico raised serious concern on the measures imposed by Chile and mentioned that there are number of inconsistency such has lack of definition of the product, no likeness of domestic and importing products, lack of clarity regarding the volume of imports, price analyze is not justified and lack on analyze showing the injury and casual link.
* Chinese Taipei supported the statement by EU and Mexico.
* China, the delegation stated that we are seriously concerned about that and we are looking forward for concrete evidence.
* Chile, the delegation further stated that his country has initiated these investigations’ on 15- January 2015 and extent the invitations for the members to join the public hearing on 26-April, he said the concerns raised by Mexico has clarified in the publication but I can have bilateral meeting with them as well. Regarding the concerns by Chinese Taipei he stated that they have joint the investigation has third party and since their share is less than 3% of imports so they are excluded from the measure.

**Item 2.4, Chile notification on steel wire load**

* Chile stated that the investigation was initiated on 6th – October 2015, public hearing was on 4th March 2016, the notification was submitted on 8th- April-2016 and the investigation closed on 22nd April.
* USA, serous concern on the process saying that the investigation was initiated on 5th October and provision imposed on 6th October, we don’t believe one day is enough. And further asked that what is the serious injury in this case according to Art 6 of the agreement?
* Chile, the statement 378 of the commission clarifies the injury and you an also find it online and as well as in our notification.

**Item 2.5 Ecuador investigation**

In this regard USA had asked questions and the answers are already submitted by Ecuador and the delegation of USA mentioned that they have no follow up questions.

**Item 2.6 Egypt notifications on investigation PAT**

* EU, in this regard EU raised concern and remind Egypt that safeguard measures are very exceptional and unique, they should study it very carefully before imposing any measure as safeguard the delegation state that domestic industries in Egypt claim that there have been serious injury due to low price imports, but as observed by EU the injury was due to un accurate market plan.
* Egypt, in response the delegation said that each country has the right to impose safeguard measures and domestic industries has the right to submit an application, Egypt admires the application of the domestic industries and also to be mentioned that Egypt has terminated two case of anti dumping, since there was no casual link.

**Item 2.7 Egypt notifications**

* Korea, appreciated Egypt ‘s termination of safeguard measures on auto motive battery and mentioned that Korea n exports has suffered loss during the investigation process.

**Item 2.8, India notification**

* Turkey, raised concern on India ‘s safeguard measures on some imports and suggested that since turkey constitutes less than 3 % share and it is a developing country so it needs to be removed from the list, and further concerned about the introduction of minimal price measure by India.
* Ukraine, said India has violated Art 2.1 and expressed further details, they mentioned that since this measures are imposed the imports in India has hugely decreased, and on the other side the competitiveness of domestic industries are remarkably increased, the certain injuries are not determined in this measure at all, since imposition of this measure the capacity of the application increased by 9%, the market share of all Indian industries in the sector increased by5% and the market share of the applicant increased by 3%.
* Japan, we noted India has initiated a large number of safeguard measures, it must have logical justifications, and asked India to fully take into account the WTO obligations.
* EU, safeguard measures are very exceptional and to be imposed very fair manner, in the case of India following elements are noted by EU:
1. Lack of correlation between decreased production of volume and imports,
2. The domestic sell of the applicant has increased only profitability has decreased and that is due to low prices that were generated due to decrease in raw material price.
3. Existence of casual link is questionable
* Brazil, strong concern on safeguards in steel sector
* India, the process of investigations are still ongoing I ask member to submit their comments and help the investigators

**Item 2.9 India unrolled steel**

* Japan, the delegation said they are very disappointed since India with the safeguard measures and claimed that the measures are inconsistent with article 19 GATT and other provisions.
* Ukraine, asked India to comply with WTO obligations, and noted the following elements:
1. Ukraine wants clarity on the production volume
2. Serious injuries are not approved
3. In Ukraine view there is no evidence in this case
4. India given no chance for bilateral consultation or prior consultation
5. Inconsistent with Art. 8.1
* Korea, the measures imposed by India do not meet the requirement of SCM agreement, there is no prove of serious injury, no typical problem to the industry, the measure is not allowed under the agreements of WTO and asked India to remove the measure.
* USA, we have serious systematic concerns on the way India initiates its investigations, since 2009 India has 19 safeguard measure an in none of them India has provided the list of members who are excluded, and this list is very important for the countries to know if they are excluded from the measures and it s a tool of transparency. The delegation objected the safeguard measures imposed by India in very strong words and asked a number of questions in this regard.
* EU, shared its concern and noted the below points in this case:
1. In this case serious injury is not proved
2. Market share and profitability not clear, the domestic share is 87%
3. Efficiency of domestic industry remains competitive
* India, delegation in response stated that she will revert the concerns of members to the capital and on the issue of developing countries list who are excluded from the measure she said that the list is publicly available on website, final findings was published on website on 15th-March 2015 and all causations are clearly mentioned.
* USA, providing a web link is not sufficient to meet Art 9 of the agreement.

Item 2.10, Jordan notification

No question posted

Item 2.11, Jordan notification on writing and printing paper

No question posted

Item 2.12, Kyrgyz republic notification

USA had submitted questions in this regard.

* Kyrgyz republic, the delegation mentioned that since its country is a member of Euro- Asian Economic Union, application of safeguard measures by ECC would be extended to Kyrgyz republic.

Item 2.13, Kyrgyz notification on table wear and kitchen wear

Item 2.14, Kyrgyz notification on wheat flavor

Item 2.15 Malaysia

For the above-mentioned notifications no question were posted.

Item 2.16, Morocco

USA as submitted some questions

* Morocco, thanks USA for questions the answers will be submitted in written shortly, and in regard to second question we have noted the error and the notification is amended and available.
* EU, expressed serious concern on prolongation of the measures and added that there is no justification for prolongation of the measure
* Morocco, in our enquiry regarding the extension of the measures we took all views in consideration including the view of EU.

Item 2.17, Morocco paper in rows

* EU, we have already raised our concern in this issue, domestic industry complain do not relate to import in Morocco, there is no under cutting calculation, we ask Morocco to remove ungranted measures which in any case cannot solve the problem.
* Morocco, we disclosed our domestic concerns during the public hearing, our domestic industry suffers due to large amount of imports, which has remarkably increased in last 2 years and has substituted domestic products.

Item 2.18, South Africa

* South Africa, the investigations are ongoing, we gathered information, we also received some questions on our notification and we will provide answers soon.
* USA, the delegation mentioned that South Africa has notified the investigation on 4th- April- 2016, and 15 days before that the investigation was initiated and carried on, this is not in accordance to Art. 12.1 of the agreement.
* Turkey, the delegation said that since his country is a developing country and the share is less than 3% of imports so requested to be excluded from the measure.
* Japan, expressed serious concern in this issue.
* Brazil, Concern and welling to discuss bilaterally the technical points.
* EU, the delegation noted the following elements in this case:
1. Transparency, there is no meaningful summary of the measure
2. Imports, the origin of imports are not clarified, and the measure is taken based on global imports statistic.
3. There is no enough information on the injury
* Korea, raised concern in this regard
* South Africa, the delegation asked to submit the concerns in written.

Item 2.19, Thailand

* India, raised concern in this issue, the delegation said that the measure was imposed for 3 years although a safeguard measure should be temporary and now it is renewed for 3 years more which is not justifiable.

Item 2.20 Thailand

Item 2.21, Tunisia

* EU, the delegation said that Tunisia has imposed 3 safeguard measures on the bases of very weak ground, there is no evidence of benefit and loss, no identification of products and applied to the extent more than necessary.
* Turkey, we attended the public hearing and we are concerned that the measure does not consist with Art 9 of the agreement.
* Tunisia, asked for written comments to convey them for the capital.

Item 2.22, Turkey

* Korea, welcomed termination with no safeguard measure imposed.
* EU, thanked turkey for termination and the notification
* Chinese Taipei, Thanked for the termination of the measure
* Turkey, we stared the investigation based on receiving application from domestic industry and since there was no evidence we terminate on 1th march 2016 with no measure imposed.

**Item 2.22 Ukraine motor vehicles** No questions posted in this regard

**Item 2.24, Vietnam semi finished and certain finished products**

* Vietnam, the delegation said that after accomplishment of necessary investigation his country has imposed safeguard measures on certain productive effective from 7th, March, 2016
* Japan, the imposed measures do not meet the requirement of art. 19 of GATT. There is no negative impact and no linkage proved.
* EU, the delegation noted that Vietnam is a modest user of the measure, she noted that the imports coming from certain Asian country have affected trade in there, so she suggested Vietnam to impose country specific measure like Anti dumping.
* China, the delegation noted some following elements
1. The measure imposed is not transparent, thus do not meet the requirements of Art, 12.1, 12.2, 12.4 of the agreement
2. Opportunity for consultation was not given
* Vietnam, did not agree with china and the Chinese delegation asked the date of consultation if it was given, the delegation of Vietnam without permission of chair turned on his microphone and replied Chinese in a very unusual manner, which was criticized by the chair.
* **Item 2.25, Vietnam notification, no** discussion on the issue

**Item 3, entitled notification footnote 2, Art 2,**

* USA, as per Art 9.1, special treatments are determined such as share of developing countries less than 3% or aggregate share 9%, can’t be subject to safeguard measures, some country respect transparency and notifies the list of developing countries exclude of the measure but some do not take it serious at all, since 2009, 7 members has never notified the list of developing countries excluded from the measure and 6 of these 7 countries are themselves developing countries, the USA delegation mentioned that these 7 members constitute 33% of the measures imposed, so why these members feel they do not notified the list? And what should members and WTO do to encourage them to respect their notification obligation?

Following the statement the members such as Japan, Ukraine, Australia, EU, Chinese Taipei, Mexico, Norway, China, Brazil, Indonesia, took the floor and expressed their concern in this regard.

* India, the delegation said that , she heard this concern for the first time in this committee and asked the members to submit their comments in written, so that she can hand it o her capital.
* Peru, asked USA to share the context of its proposal in this regard with all members.
* Brazil, expressed its proposal, for the first time a member proposed establishment of a working party under the committee of safeguards, although such working group is there for Anti dumping but there is no such group for other trade remedies, the model which is proposed is like the one in anti dumping and the delegation asked the members to submit their comments in this regard.
* Russia, the delegation said the his country supports the establishment of a working party for the implementation of SG agreement and it should not cause any more restrictions or any revoke from the obligations.
* South Africa, Canada, Turkey supported the proposal
* Chinese Taipei asked about the goals of the working group, how it will work and what will be the impact?
* Egypt, USA, Korea, Australia, Mexico and Norway supported the proposal and asked time for more discussion and to find some approaches.
* India, the delegation said that she will convey this proposal to her capital, she asked for written version of the proposal and further stated that SG is different in nature than the two other measures, and added that already members are able to raise their concerns under this committee, so what will be the value addition of establishing such working group.
* Chile, EU, Philippines, Mexico, Japan and Peru, confirmed that they are willing for further discussion in this regard.
* Brazil, said that as per this proposal twice a year delegations come from capitals to discuss technical issues and he asked the chair to set an informal session to discuss on the issue further. To be able to draft and circulate a draft proposal for further discuss in October meeting.
* USA, Indonesia and India supported the idea to discuss the issue in an informal meeting.
* The chairperson summarized the views and suggests that the next chair person to work on the issue.

**Item 4. Additional or certain information**

2 proposals under this item agenda was discussed as following:

* Australia, proposed to include annual report, which can be very useful for transparency proposes.
* USA, Argentina, Chinese Taipei, Mexico, Norway, Switzerland, Japan, Korea, China, Canada supported the idea.
* India, the delegation did not support the proposal and said that in point of her view it creates unnecessary notification obligation and complicates the annual review.
* EU and Singapore accepted the proposal and confirmed they are open for any discussions.
* Australia the delegation said that they are very disappointed because India has not changed their position, we are asking the date of notifications to be mentioned in the annual report, we don’t have any intent to make the annual report more complicated she asked Indian delegation to convey their proposal to the Indian capital.
* India suggested discussing this issue bilaterally with the Australian delegation.
* USA, proposal was as follows,

Art 12.5, Art 8.1 context was developed and was presented as a proposal by USA, the delegation asked to put the issue on the agenda to discuss on next regular meeting in October 2016.

It was supported by Argentina, Australia, EU, Norway, Chinese Taipei, Korea, Japan, China, Canada, Turkey, Brazil and Singapore, but Indian delegation has mentioned that the proposal is under analyze by the authorities in the capital and they will get back with some results.

**Item 7: Discussion group on safeguard proceeding**

* USA remind members that the discussion group is open to all membership and welcomed them to join the group meeting after the regular meeting session.

**Item 8 : Other Business**

* EU, raised concern on investigation initiated by Tunisia, and claimed that there is no serious injury and no casual link in this case.
* USA, noted Kazakhstan notification of legislation on safeguards, the delegation mentioned that they appreciate the seriousness of Kazakhstan in fulfilling their notification obligations. And suggested to review the notification in the October meeting.
* Russia raised concern on Aluminum products investigation initiated by USA, which restrict imports, and asked whether it is withdrawn or not.
* USA, the delegation confirmed that the investigation, which Russia raised, the concern was withdrawn one week ago.

At the end of the meeting the date of next regular meeting set in week 24 of October this year, and in regard to the selection of the chair since the consultations are ongoing under CTG, the chaired ensured that members would be informed on the results and appointment of new chair.

***Date: 11 May 2016 at 15:00 in S1***

***Council for Trade on Goods meeting***

CTG meeting took place on ***11-May-2016 at 15:00 in S1***, after the welcoming remark by the chairman; the floor was given to Chile's ambassador who is the outgoing chair of CTG to report on his consultation in regard to the appointment of the offices. The outgoing chair delivered a very comprehensive statement on his consultation with different groups and how they have selected the list in accordance to the guidelines. The full statement of the outgoing chair will be available on JOBs series. After his speech the current chair announced the list of appointed chairs for the subsidiary bodies as follows:

1. Market access Norway,

2. Agriculture Canada,

3. SPS Chile

4. TBT Singapore

5.TRIMs Switzerland

6. Anti-Dumping Australia,

7. Custom valuation Egypt

8. Rules of Origin Chinese Taipei

9. Import Licensing Finland

10. SCM Korea

11. Safeguards Chine

12. SOE Colombia

The list was adopted as there was no objection in the room, following that Oman asked for the floor and the statement was as following:

**- Oman,**

The delegation objected the principle of rotation as per para 1.1 of the guideline, he also criticized the appointment procedure in his wordy speech, he added that transparency is not respected in the appointment process at all, he emphasized that the chance should be given for those members who have never chair a body and he particularly said the Oman has not much interest to chair TBT but the main reason of our non-consensus was to up a voice against this unfair practice and it has been in place for many years so finally someone had to object this unfair process.

He stated that the problems in appointing the chairs is not new he referred to same examples in the past, such as General council of March 2015 the minute is available in document WT/GC/M/101 and the general council in March 2008 that the minute is available in document WT/GC/M/156 where members have raised concern and disappoints on the process of selecting chairs.

**Sri lanka and Ecuador**, also raised concern in regard to the appointment of Chairs for the subsidiary bodies,

**EU** recognizes that this time the selection was very difficult and required more patients and he emphasized on the importance of regional groups.

**Morocco,** on behalf of African group expressed disappointment on the process of election as year and year it goes to be less transparent and unfair. He argued that only one chair was given to African countries while it is 4 to Asian.

**Chile,** the outgoing chair, made 3 points,

1. It is important not to confuse lack of clarity of guidelines with lack of transparency in the process; the chair has to follow the guidelines at any case.

2. Outcome of the consultation should be in line with the guidelines

3. If a regional group cannot make a decision and leaves it to the chair so they should trust chair and secondly respect the decision of the chair.

**USA and Canada** thanked chair for his efforts and instructions and associated with Chile and EU.

**-Qatar**, supported Oman statement on principle of rotation,

And finally Australia, Colombia, Singapore and Mexico appreciated the outgoing and currents chair s efforts and consultation while respecting the guidelines.

***Date: 12 May 2016***

***Time: 10:00 a.m.-13:00 p.m. - morning session***

***15:00 p.m. 16:30 p.m. – afternoon session***

***Venue: Room CR***

***GENERAL COUNCIL***

The chairperson started his speech by welcoming new ambassadors and expressing farewell to the leaving ones. Then he mentioned on the item related to election of member to the WTO Pension Plan Management Board (document WT/GC/W/715 circulated on 4 May 2016) that the members can need more time to comment therefore, it was agreed to revert this item for the consideration during next meeting of General Council (CG).

Under OTHER BUSINESS, the following was included:

* Report of chairperson on the appointment of subsidiary bodies of Council for Trade in Goods
* Oman's statement on the accession of Iran
* Korea's statement on the workshop on e-commerce planned for July 2016 by MIKTA – 5 countries – Mexico, Korea, Indonesia, Turkey and Australia
* 2 statement of chairperson on the date and venue of 11th Ministerial Conference and revised administrative measures.

The chairperson adopted the agenda. According to the Airgram WTO/AIR/GC/7 circulated to the Members on 02 May 2016 the following items were proposed for the agenda:

REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE TRADE NEGOTIATIONS COMMITTEE

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BALI AND NAIROBI OUTCOMES – STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

WORK PROGRAMME ON SMALL ECONOMIES – REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DEDICATED SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET, FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION - REPORT ON MEETINGS OF MARCH AND APRIL 2016 (WT/BFA/153 AND WT/BFA/154)

WTO PENSION PLAN MANAGEMENT BOARD – ELECTION OF A MEMBER AND OF AN ALTERNATE – PROPOSAL BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL (WT/GC/W/715)

OTHER BUSINESS

**1. REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE TRADE NEGOTIATIONS COMMITTEE**

Director-General Roberto Azevêdo referred to his statement made on the meeting of all WTO members today (9 May) to discuss advancing negotiations within the Organization with the aim of moving towards identifying potential outcomes for the WTO’s 11th Ministerial Conference and reiterated that the reflections should become actions in order to move forward. That meeting touched on the implementation of the outcomes of the 9th and 10th Ministerial Conferences, which were held in Bali and Nairobi, respectively. The statement of DG will be included in the minutes of GC.

The members taking the floor thanked the DG for his comprehensive report on the consultations held with members for monitoring of post-Nairobi process negotiations, as well as Chairperson of the General Council for his report on the implementation of the Bali and Nairobi outcomes. Also the members welcome the newly appointed ambassadors of Malawi, Moldova and Surinam (was not present at the GC) as well as wished all success to the leaving ambassadors, e.g. of Argentina and Lesotho. The chairperson asked the members to inform the WTO Secretariat in advance about the leaving ambassadors in order to be able to thank them for their co-operation during CG meetings.

The statement made by members in regard to the first item can be grouped as follows:

* Nevertheless, 5 months passed after successful Nairobi MC, but unfortunately, there is no positive progress in the negotiations process. To base the work program of next MC 11 on the existing Doha agenda (Saudi Arabia, Kenya, Cuba, Qatar)
* The negotiations should keep their multilateral character as it helps to achieve mutually beneficial solutions (Bolivia, Cameron)
* Adding or not adding new issues to agenda (para. 34 of Nairobi MD), to continue the negotiations on remained issues (Venezuela, Cuba) or there is a capability to discuss new issues due to evolving technological developments (Chile)
* Enhancement of participation of private sector in the WTO Public Forum by making it more inclusive (Bolivia, Venezuela)
* Development – special and differential treatment related matters – to discuss this issue separately or within other matters (para 44. Doha Declaration and para. 31 of Nairobi Declaration), LDCs priorities – cotton, duty free and quota free access (Benin on behalf of LDCs Group, Cameron, Uganda, Nigeria, Rwanda on behalf of ACP – African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States, Ecuador, Cuba, Qatar, Nepal, Turkey, Pakistan, Lesotho, Tunisia, Morocco, Tanzania, Tunisia, Sierra Leone, Australia on behalf of New Zealand)
* Fisheries subsidies - (Benin on behalf of LDCs Group, Rwanda, Kenya)
* Special Safeguard (SSG) (Rwanda, Kenya)
* Agriculture negotiations, mainly domestic support, cotton (Mali on behalf of Cotton 4 – c 4 countries – Burkina Faso, Mali, Benin, Chad, export competition and public stockholding for food security purposes (almost all members)
* NAMA negotiations (Turkey's priority)
* Services negotiations (Turkey's priority)
* Rules negotiations (LDCs)

**2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BALI AND NAIROBI OUTCOMES – STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN**

The chairperson made a statement mentioning that this item will be kept on the agenda for the next meeting too. He stressed the following issues:

* TRIPS-non-violation and situation complaints – further consultation
* Working Program on e-commerce – further consultations
* Aid for Trade – 2016-2017 Work Program –Promoting connectivity – CTD will discuss this issue on session on 26 May 2016 and also this issue will be addressed at the WTO-World Bank Joint Forum on Poverty planned for 26 May 2016
* Agriculture – export competition, export credits, export subsidies, international food aid related info will be provided. The next meeting of the Committee on Agriculture will take place on 07 June 2016.
* Review of provisions related to food aid, NFIDC related matters
* Public stockholding for food security purposes – the Committee on Agriculture discussed this during dedicated session held this week (9-14 May 2016)
* Follow up of TRQ administration
* LDCs – services waiver, notification of preferences and transparency related issues
* Duty free and quota free access – LDCs Group will submit to the WTO Secretariat a study in this field; CTD chairperson will work with members on this when the proposal will be received by LDCs Group
* Monitoring of special and differential treatment –no proposals at this stage; to discuss this at the next meeting of GC to be held in July 2016
* Trade facilitation – category A submissions are currently 83; 79 ratifications instruments; category B and C submissions are growing
* Para 28 and 29 of Nairobi Declaration on the role of CRTA and check further with members making proposals under para 29 of Nairobi declaration

Moldova's new ambassador took floor and informed about the latest developments in regard to the ratification of TFA and submission of Category A notifications. ITA expansion accession will be initiated soon.

Montenegro mentioned that TFA ratification instruments were deposited on 10 May 2016.

Brazil, Canadá, Argentina, Paraguay, Benin recalling para. 29 of Nairobi Declaration mentioned that the committees dealing with trade remedies have to improve their operation and notification issue is crucial (USA, EU, New Zealand, Japan).

**3. WORK PROGRAMME ON SMALL ECONOMIES – REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DEDICATED SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT**

CTD reports usually during its dedicated session on the work done in regard to SMEs involvement in the global value chains. The CTD had a dedicated session on small economies on 09 March 2016. The CTD will discuss at its next dedicated session the issue of access of SMEs to services, such as IT and tourism services and business process outsourcing. On this issue Guatemala and US took floor and mentioned that the work in this regard will be continued to help the SME's involvement in GVCs and reduce their costs.

**4. COMMITTEE ON BUDGET, FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION - REPORT ON MEETINGS OF MARCH AND APRIL 2016 (WT/BFA/153 AND WT/BFA/154)**

The issues related to the annual contributions of members and observers, technical assistance costs, diversity report, including in regard to internship, financial and technical (cyber) risks, IT Steering Committee's operation etc. was discussed. The chairperson approved the reports of this Committee.

**6. OTHER BUSINESS**

* **Report of chairperson on the appointment of subsidiary bodies of Council for Trade in Goods**

The chairperson of Council for Trade in Goods mentioned that the further consultations will be needed with members to clarify the application of rotation principle as there were challenges to get a consensus on the appointment of chairperson of subsidiary bodies. Oman took floor and asked for inclusion its statement from Goods Council meeting held on 11 May 2016 into the minutes of current GC.

Chinese Taipei recalled WT/L/510 and said that there was no clarity how to implement it and further clarification of related guidelines on appointment was needed.

Korea also made similar point and stressed that from Asian Group no country chaired Agriculture Committee for more than 15 years.

* **Oman's statement on the accession of Iran**

Oman made a statement on the accession of Iran stressing the importance of such an economy as Iran to become a WTO member and asked for support to appoint the chairperson of its WG which was established in 2005 but was dormant over 10 years. Oman made this statement on behalf of supporters as Bolivia, Russia, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkey, Cuba, Uruguay, and Zimbabwe etc.

Majority of members like EU, US, Uganda, Lesotho, Switzerland, Benin, Colombia, Mexico, Sri-Lanka, New Zealand, Montenegro, Korea, Nigeria, China, Norway expressed their support to Iran on this issue whereas Saudi Arabia, Qatar, UAE, Jordan, Kuwait, Bahrain, Yemen mentioned that at this stage it is premature to discuss this issue and that they need more time to consider this, further consultation were needed to reflect on this.

* **Korea's statement on the 1 day workshop on e-commerce planned for July 2016 by MIKTA – 5 countries – Mexico, Korea, Indonesia, Turkey and Australia**

Korea noted that MIKTA is an innovative partnership and flexible platform, which includes 5 countries. The experts from MIKTA countries, as well as international organizations will be invited to attend this event. The WTO members will be invited to this workshop in a due course.

* 2 statement of chairperson on the date and venue of 11th Ministerial Conference and revised administrative measures.

On the date and venue of the next 11th MC the chairperson referred to the Article 4 of Marrakesh Agreement, as MCs shall be organized once in every 2 years. Next one will be in 2017. At this stage no proposals were from members, therefore the chairperson asked them to send their proposals, if any in few weeks; if no proposal will be received then the chairperson would start the discussion. Also he asked members to contribute to the Trust Fund to help LDCs to participate at the next MC.

Next GC was scheduled for July 2016.

***Date: 11 May 2016***

***Venue: Room W***

**TRADE POLICY REVIEW BODY OF ALBANIA**

The second trade policy review of Albania was conducted on 11 and 13 May 2016.

The meeting on 11 May was composed of the following parts:

Speech of the Head of Albanian Delegation, Deputy Minister of Economic Tourism, Trade and Entrepreneurship

1. Remarks of Discussant, Mr. Peter C. Matt (Liechtenstein) (H.E. Mr. Peter C. Matt (Liechtenstein) acted as discussant instead of H.E. Mr. Esteban Conejos (Philippines)).
2. Members' statements
3. Concluding remarks of chairperson

**1. Speech of Head of Albanian Delegation, Deputy Minister of Economic Development,** **Tourism, Trade and Entrepreneurship.**

Deputy Minister of Albania covered in his speech almost all fields on which the WTO Members raised concerns. Since the First TPR in 2010 progress can be reported in all aspects of trade policy. Albanian Government is very committed to facilitate trade in order to maximize the benefits deriving from the tariff liberalization. The Albanian Parliament ratifies the TFA and preparations for public awareness and capacity building to allow smooth implementation are in progress. In addition, Albania is actively participating in the negotiations to facilitate trade within CEFTA. He mentioned that Albania has FTAs with EU, Western Balkan (CEFTA 2006), EFTA States and Turkey. Deputy Minister noted that WTO membership preserved a stable trade regime for Albania contributing to a positive trend of foreign trade during 2010-2015 beside 2015 that had a decrease. The performance of export during 2010- 2015 has contributed in shrinking the trade deficit by 4.8% in 2015 compared to 2010. Albanian's economy is moderately free and overall ranking for 2016 (65.9 points) is above the global average and compared with the other Western Balkans countries, it is ranked as the second freer economy.

Real GDP increased by 2.7% in the first three quarters of 2015, supported mainly by improved activity in the construction and industrial sectors. The expected growth for 2015 is 2.75% with the objective to go over 4% in 2017-2018. Further Deputy Minister addressed that Albania is undertaking many structural reforms to boost economic growth and increase competitiveness. The administrative and territorial reform and the justice system reform are among the most radical reforms undertaken during the reporting period. In addition, the battle against informality, started from September 2015, coupled with sound and prudential fiscal policy and safeguarding macroeconomic measures are fuelling the economic activity growth. In 2014 the Council of the EU agreed to grant Albania the candidate statusrecommending further development of reforms to open negotiations.

**2. Remarks of Discussant**

Firstly Discussant mentioned that this is the first ever participation on TPRB as a Discussant and he further mentioned the following positive points of Albanian trade regime:

Adoption of new Customs Code in 2014

New Strategy of the Agriculture sector for period of 2014-2020

Business and investment development strategy for 2014-2020

Second freer economy among the West Balkan countries

One of the fastest GDP growths among the East Europe countries 6% before the crisis

CPI inflation rate is 3%, average CPI inflation rate during 2010-2015 is 2,4%

No trade remedies since its accession to the WTO

Deep transition from centrally planned economy

Using RTA to enhance export diversification

Services sector share to GDP is 42,3%

Undertaken administrative and territorial reforms

TFA ratification

Single Window adoption in 2009

Establishment of the National Committee for Trade Policy Coordination and Facilitation

Among others he mentioned the following main concerns:

* Judicial system reform on its early stage
* Manufacture share to GDP is only 5,3%
* IPR issues – particularly existence of counterfeiting products

**3. Members' statements**

12 members, the EU, the US, Brazil, Canada, Argentina, Turkey, China, Moldova, Montenegro, Chinese Taipei, Singapore and Georgia took floor.

**EU** noted that trade turnover between two countries constituted 3,7bln USD and expressed its appreciation in regards to TFA ratification by Albania, adoption of the new IPR legislation, but commented on high rate of unemployment, which is 17%.

**US** mentioned that average GDP growth per capita during 2010-2014 made up 7%. Albania rank in DB report comparing to 2015 (68th place) decreased and ranked 97 in 2016. Encouraged to join ITA expansion.

**Brazil** noted that 47,9% of the total employment made in agriculture sector and welcomed establishment of the National Trade Facilitation Committee.

**Argentina** welcomed delegation of Albania and mentioned that FDI share dropped by 8% compare in 2014.

**Turkey** recalled that Albania is the 4th trade partner of Turkey with total trade turnover of 450 mln. USD in 2013, which is decreased by 19% in 2014 and asked answers for, submitted questions.

**China** noted that we are the second trade partner of Albania behind of the EU and stressed on low productivity in agriculture, high level of unemployment, high account deficit, application and customs clearance procedures issues which need to be solved. It was mentioned that the category A provisions has been submitted in 2014.

**Moldova** new Ambassador expressed its appreciation in regards to 4 visits he had to Albania and especially he mentioned his visit to Berati area of Albania, which is good sound of FDI attractiveness. Concerned that no extension made since the first TPR in regard to RTAs.

**Montenegro** Albania accounts for 1,6% and 4,2% of Montenegro`s imports and exports accordingly and noted on recent EU membership which is 2014.

**Chinese Taipei** expressed its appreciation on reforms made in Albania since accession to the WTO as well as since the first TPR and noted that the level of trade between countries could be increased further.

**Singapore** stated that in general term applied tariffs are low but some lines exceed bound rate and asked to bring them in line with the WTO obligations.

**4. Chairperson's remarks**

Chairperson mentioned that Albania since its membership to the WTO in 2000 has shown steady growth in its economy and one of the active members of the WTO. A new customs code was adopted on 31 July 2014; certain sections of the code containing provisions on, inter alia, authorized economic operators, simplified procedures, and exemption from import duties have entered into force. Albania's overall simple average MFN tariff declined to 4.2% in 2015 (compared with 5.2% in 2009), with the highest applied rate of 15%. The average applied tariff on agricultural products at 8.7% is higher than on non-agricultural products (3.0%). Its average bound tariff is 6.7%. Tariff quotas are applied to some imports from Turkey and the EU under preferential tariffs. Albania is a signatory to the Information Technology Agreement. Albania has taken no anti-dumping, countervailing, or safeguard measures since its accession to the WTO in September 2000. Albania showed commitment reached for the first time in 2014 the best ranking, 68th place, in the WB Doing Business Report 2015. WB Doing Business report 2016 ranked Albania at the 97th place out of 189 economies, having deterioration in the ranking mainly due to the temporary negative impact of the administrative and territorial reform and the new platform for construction permits, taking the control over the territory to impede illegal construction to emerge further.