

CSOs have a well-established role in a national context as monitors of public policy implementation who use the media to hold governments accountable for honouring their commitments. The extension of this role to the WTO is perfectly natural and should be accommodated and facilitated insofar as is possible. At the same time, this would not resolve all issues: those most suspicious would conclude that transparency in the formal proceedings of the WTO would simply shift the "real" decision making to other, less well-lit venues.

How much transparency governments worldwide would be willing to allow into the WTO is an open question. Steps to promote distribution of documents, to place more official information on websites, and to facilitate and encourage more debriefings are necessary at a minimum.

### *The case for improved analysis*

While the "democratic deficit" in the WTO, and the system of global governance more generally, was much discussed post-Seattle, the "analytical deficit" did not get as much attention. Yet arguably the lack of a compelling case for a new round was perhaps as much a factor in the ultimate demise of the Seattle Ministerial as any other. It should be noted that there are two facets to this argument: one is that the WTO members themselves were not convinced that the potential net benefits of a new round were too great to pass up; the second is that key constituencies such as business, as well as the general public, were equally unconvinced and thus did not provide the political support for the difficult decisions that ministers would inevitably have to make in "sensitive sectors." The analytical deficit thus reflects failure on both counts.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> The inadequacy of the analytical case supporting a new round of multilateral negotiations is detailed in Dan Ciuriak, "The 'Trade and...' Agenda: Are We at a Crossroads?" *Trade Policy Research 2001*, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 2001. This study shows that estimated gains