

the next number will be? Realistically, farmers will get their money, even after an ambitious, successful conclusion to the Round; it is a question of which "box" the money falls into and just how trade-distorting the support will be. Ultimately, the Doha Round may not be a "big" result based on *ex ante* expectations and hopes; but, it was suggested, when we look back, it will in fact be seen as a big result.

What was needed to move things forward was to connect the various elements of the negotiation—services, NAMA, agriculture and other elements—in order that the trade-offs could better be framed. In this regard, the Hong Kong Ministerial had established a useful common deadline of July 31st 2006 for progress on agriculture and NAMA and for the first real services offers. Further, it was noted, the plurilateral approach that has been adopted for services is happily also a sectoral approach; this can drive a constructive dynamic and lead to a different kind of negotiation based on sectoral specifics.

To summarize, in response to the question "Is the Round doable?", the discussion yielded an answer that might best be characterized as "The Round is not undoable."

Development: the Major Conundrum in the Round

Without a doubt, development has been the most contentious and ultimately confused aspect of the Round. Some saw this as a congenital defect in the framing of the Doha Development Agenda (DDA); according to this view, the Round had been misconstrued from day one.

Some of the confusion reflects the fact that it was, as one observer put it, "a masterpiece of constructive ambiguity".

However, it cannot be ignored that the choice in Dubai in November 2001 had been to have a development round or not to have a round at all. The Round was launched on the basis that it would provide a response to the North-South divide that had emerged from the outcome of the Uruguay Round—regardless of whether the emergence of this divide was an unintended consequence or a reflection of the power imbalance in the negotiations, a point on which views differed. The problem lies there-