# SPECIAL AND DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT

## THE GREATER CARIBBEAN IN TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

ASSOCIATION OF CARIBBEAN STATES
PORT OF SPAIN, 14-15 JULY 2003

## Focus of this Presentation

- Nature of Special & Differential Treatment provisions in the WTO Agreements
- Problems with the existing S&D provisions
- Doha work programme on S&D
- Current status

### Introduction

- GATT established in 1947
- No formal recognition of any difference between the contracting parties (CP's)
- Fundamental principle of GATT was that all rights and obligations should be applied uniformly to all CP's
- Even though 11 out of the original 23 CP's would today be classified as developing countries, they participated as equal partners

## S&D treatment in the UR

- A number of basic conceptual premises related to S&D treatment emerged during the UR, namely that
  - dc's are intrinsically disadvantaged in their participation in international trade
  - any multilateral agreement must take this into account when specifying dc's rights and obligations
  - trade policies that maximise sustainable development in one country may not necessarily do so in another
  - it is in the interest of developed countries to assist dc's in their integration into the MTS

## S&D treatment in the UR

- These underlying conceptual premises resulted in the following kinds of S&D provisions in the UR
  - provisions aimed at increasing trade opportunities (12)
  - provisions which call upon WTO Members to safeguard the interest of dc's (49)
  - provisions offering flexibility of commitments (30)
  - Transitional time periods (18)
  - provisions related to technical assistance (14)
  - provisions in favour of least developed countries (22)

## Some concerns with S&D

A number of developing countries have said that the existing S&D treatment provisions have a number of shortcomings because they are mainly in the form of

- > provisions employing discretionary language
- 'best endeavour clauses'
- de facto non-binding, but yet mandatory provisions and only a few are
- mandatory and binding provisions

## Examples of S&D

#### I. Provisions employing purely discretionary language

"contracting parties <u>may</u> accord differential and more favourable treatment to developing countries" (Enabling Clause para1)

#### II. Best Endeavour Clauses

- "Members <u>agree to facilitate</u> the provisions of technical assistance to other Members, especially developing country Members" (Article 9 of SPS)
- > key words: urged, to the extent possible, if conditions allow etc.

## Examples of S&D

- III. De facto non-binding, mandatory provisions
  - developed countries shall to the <u>fullest extent</u> <u>possible</u> accord high priority to the reduction and elimination of barriers (GATT XXXVII:1)
  - Members **shall** <u>take account</u> of the <u>special</u> <u>needs</u> of developing country members in preparation and application of new SPS measures (Article 10.1 SPS agreement
  - IV. Mandatory provisions

## The Doha Declaration

- Ministers at Doha, recognising that problems existed with respect to S&D treatment set out a work programme in para 44 of the declaration,
  - reaffirms that SDT is an integral part of the WTO
  - notes that there are concerns about the implementation of S&D provisions
  - directs that <u>all</u> S&D provisions should be reviewed to strengthen them and to make them more <u>precise</u>, <u>effective</u> and <u>operational</u>, and
  - also links this work to the decision taken on 'Implementation related Issues and concerns'

## The Doha Declaration

- The decision on <u>Implementation related Issues and</u> concerns' mandates the CTD
  - to identify the S&D provisions which should be made mandatory and the implications of this
  - to examine <u>additional</u> ways to make SDT more effective
  - to report to the GC with recommendations by July 2002
  - to consider how SDT could be incorporated into the architecture of WTO rules.

- The first phase of this work programme has seen a very large number of Agreement specific proposals being submitted by dc's, including by the African group and the LDC's.
- Some Members have also raised a number of systemic issues including those related to principles and objectives of SDT, utilisation, graduation, universal vs. differentiated treatment.

- In its report to the General Council in July 2002 the CTD detailed the above status and sought some more time to complete the mandated work.
- The GC agreed and asked the CTD to complete its work by December 2002, later extended to February 2003.
- Satisfactory progress still not having been made, the CTD in its report in February 2003 recommended that the GC provide a clarification on the means to give effect to the Doha mandate.

- The Chairman of the General Council, who was then asked to hold consultations, put forward an approach based on two fundamental premises:
  - all proposals would be addressed without prejudice to the outcome, and that
  - an informal categorization of the proposals was necessary to make the work more efficient.
- Accordingly, he divided all the 88 Agreementspecific proposals divided into three categories.

- Category I includes the 38 proposals on which it seems that a positive outcome could be possible.
- Category II is comprised of 37 proposals made in areas that are currently under negotiation, or are otherwise being considered by other WTO bodies.
- Category III is comprised of 10 proposals on which there appears to be a wide divergence of views.

- The Chairman of the GC is holding consultations to address the proposals in category I.
- This is on the understanding that Members would engage substantively in this work, and be willing, if necessary, to consider changing the existing balance of rights and obligations.
- At the same time, the proposals in category II have been referred to the relevant negotiating or technical bodies