

Services:

Following EU enlargement, the interest in services that had been previously expressed by Austria was submerged by EU and Commission interests. No real environmental issues in the services field were ever really identified although there was suggestions that such issues might exist in the transport and tourism service sectors.

Transparency/Participation:

The USA was the main *demandeur* on the question of participation of NGOs in the work in the CTE. There was greater support for enhanced transparency but decisions in the end were handled by the WTO General Council. This issue remains an ongoing challenge for the WTO given that lack of transparency and, in particular, a restrictive document derestriction policy, hamper the WTO's credibility in the larger international community, particularly with NGOs.

Other observations:

As pointed out by one delegation that played a constructive if cautious approach, the process developed by the Chair ran completely counter to normal WTO practise. Instead of developing conclusions and recommendations on the basis of the factual report, he successfully insisted on "concurrent engineering" and a parallel process. This parallel process was supported by developed countries and some developing countries as the only means by which to reach conclusions. However, he was not able to draw together the considerable efforts by many delegations to provide possible approaches for individual agenda items. At times, developing countries suspected that the Chair had his own separate agenda, which likely contributed to a number of the counter papers being presented. This perception also was reinforced by his presentation of findings in August and September, and again contributed to the counter draft of October 2. However, in the end, efforts by some developing countries to force a sequential approach to developing conclusions and recommendations did not succeed, given that other delegations shared the view of the Chair that the conclusions and recommendations section was on a different level than the factual section. This difference of views did mean considerable procedural wrangles and quite often tumultuous sessions, but did not derail the process. In the end, the Chair achieved more ambitious results than might otherwise have been possible.

This dynamic was complicated by the lack of cooperation between the Chair and Secretariat. It was clear to most delegations that the Chair had substantially rewritten the Secretariat draft negotiating text, and virtually all delegations stated the need at the September 12 meeting for the Chair and the Secretariat to work closely together. The role of the Secretariat in the informal drafting process of October 31 - November 1 reflects the professionalism and skill of the Secretariat in developing the basis for a consensus text.

The Chair was also not able to use informal drafting groups as effectively as possible, perhaps reflecting the fact that he may have felt "burnt" by his efforts in July to create small