



**Economic
Commission
for Africa**



**African
Development
Bank**



**United Nations
Development
Programme**



**Southern African
Development
Community**

Dist.
Limited

ECA/SA/WS/EPA/2005/
April 2005

Original: ENGLISH

**THE AD-HOC EXPERT GROUP MEETING AND WORKSHOP ON
ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS AND WTO ISSUES
FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA COUNTRIES**

Final Report and Recommendations

Jointly Organized by

The Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the African Development Bank (ADB) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC)

I. INTRODUCTION

The General Council of the World Trade Organization (WTO) adopted on 1 August 2004 a Decision on the “**Doha Work Programme**”, which delineates a number of “**Frameworks**” to be used in defining “**Modalities**” for negotiations in the current trade talks in the WTO. These agreed frameworks are the result of intense negotiations within the Membership of the WTO and a culmination of many months of uncertainty as to the future of Doha Development Programme and more importantly as to whether the stalled Cancun trade talks would at all be revived. The new accord reached in Geneva, therefore, breathed a new life into the global trading system.

The “July Package”, as it is generally known, provides frameworks for defining “modalities” for negotiations on agriculture; non-agricultural market access; as well as modalities for negotiations on trade facilitation; and recommendations for moving forward negotiations on trade in services. The Decision also contains proposals for further negotiations on a number of other issues, such as the developmental dimensions of the Doha Development Programme (special and differential treatment, implementation-related issues and concerns, technical assistance, and special issues of Least Developed Countries); the cotton sectoral initiative; and other issues, including rules, trade and environment, outstanding trade-related intellectual property rights (TRIPS) issues, and dispute settlement mechanism.

The ECA, UNDP, African Union (AU), ADB, and UNCTAD are contributing to this effort and undertook two high level brainstorming meeting (Accra 2003 and Tunis 2004) and detailed studies to assist African negotiators and officials to better tackle the current round of negotiations.

On 23 June 2000, the European Union and the 77 African, Pacific and Caribbean countries signed a new Partnership Agreement under the Cotonou Partnership Agreement. The Economic Partnership Agreements negotiations under the Cotonou Partnership Agreement between the European Union and the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries have since entered into their second phase. In Africa, negotiations have been launched between the EU and ECOWAS and also between the EU and the Eastern and Southern African states (ESA). Negotiations between the EU and some of the Southern African countries were launched in July 2004. Similarly negotiations between the Central African states have also been progressing with the EU under the aegis of CEMAC.

It is anticipated that different players will play various roles in ensuring that the outcome of these negotiations are beneficial to Africa. In this context, different organizations at the country, regional and international level are carrying out work based on an agreed upon road map. Towards this end 7 SADC countries (Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, Swaziland, Mozambique, Angola and Tanzania) constituted a negotiating configuration and have designated Botswana’s Minister of Trade and Industry to lead the negotiations for SADC at Ministerial level.

At the sub-regional level, the Regional Economic Communities' Secretariats are spearheading efforts to analyse impacts and negotiation positions. At the country level, the EU is facilitating EPAs impacts studies. The ECA, UNDP and UNCTAD are also contributing to this effort through detailed EPAs impact analysis studies and following them up with the organization of sub-regional workshops, such as the current one organized for the SADC countries.

II. PARTICIPATION

The following countries attended the Ad Hoc Expert Group Meeting on Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) and WTO negotiations, in Maputo, Mozambique: Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The following were the institutions that also participated at the EPAs Workshop: Pan Africa Women Organisation (PAWO), the African Union, Development Bank of South Africa, Institute of Southern African Studies (National University of Lesotho), University of Botswana, University of Yaounde II, Cameroon, DFID, European Commission, The World Bank, SADC, Namibia Chamber of Commerce and Industry, SA-Angola Chamber of Commerce, UNDP, UNECA, Zambia Trade Investment Enhancement (ZAMTIE), Economic Justice Network (South Africa), Eastern and Southern Africa Management Institute (ESAMI).

III. SUMMARY RECORD OF THE MEETING

III.1. Official Opening

UNECA-SA

In his opening statement, Mr Mzumara the Officer in Charge of ECA-SA welcomed the participants on behalf of Mr K.Y. Amoako, The Executive Secretary of ECA. He informed the meeting that the workshop is a result of collaboration between ECA, UNDP, UNCTAD, ADB and SADC. He highlighted the main objective of the meeting was to contribute to building and strengthening human, institutional and policy capacity in SADC countries for their effective participation in the multilateral and other international trade negotiations. He noted the negotiations that are currently taking place under the Doha work programme and those under Economic Partnership Agreements between the European Union (EU) and African countries. He also noted that SADC-EPA negotiations which were launched in July 2004, will be concluded by January 2008, a date that coincides with the planned completion of a SADC Free Trade Area (FTA). He briefly highlighted the programme of work for the workshop and expressed hope that the workshop will lead to better understanding of the process of multilateral negotiations and enhance the capacity of participants and member states to participate in WTO and EPAs.

UNDP

In her opening remarks, the United Nations Resident Representative in Mozambique, Ms Marylene Spezzati reminded participants that the workshop provided an opportunity to discuss trade issues in the proposed EPA between the European Union and SADC countries, share experiences, identify challenges, define strategies in the Economic Partnership Agreements and World Trade Organisation multilateral trade negotiations. She alluded to the challenges brought about by WTO rules and regulations and informed participants that these challenges had to be tackled within the context of the SADC Trade Protocol. In her view, SADC had an opportunity to shape relations with the EU by taking ownership of the EPA process so as to make EPAs a tool for development but the region had to first establish a true partnership within SADC before negotiations with the European Union. Ms Spezzati identified the important role of regional economic communities such as SADC and COMESA in articulating the views of individual countries in trade negotiations. She also noted that NEPAD initiatives provide an enabling environment for trade and investment in the sub-region.

She reminded participants that in order to address poor export performance, Africa had to work together on many issues including development of trade capacity, improved export competitiveness, better regulatory frameworks, enhanced market access addressing supply-side constraints, economic diversification and promotion of non-traditional exports with emphasis on value-adding.

MOZAMBIQUE

The Honourable Minister for Industry and Trade of the Republic of Mozambique, His Excellency, Mr Antonio Fernando officially opened the meeting by reminding participants that participation in the multilateral trading system was necessary for development of the African production system and for sustainable economic regional growth and development. Minister Fernando informed participants that Africa was currently involved two major trade negotiations processes, WTO and EPAs both which have important implications for the region. He informed participants that market access remains a concern to African economies as it was crucial and central to Africa's development. He informed participants of the three components of market access – customs and tariffs, non-tariff barriers related to technical rules, standards and sanitary and phyto-sanitary restrictions and quantity restrictions and various quotas. He expressed concern at tariff escalation applied to locally processed agricultural goods which hurt efforts to diversify economies and tariff peaks in products where African countries have comparative advantages. The Minister reiterated the interest of African countries in developing further the tariff reduction formulas envisaged in the July Package with a view to ensuring greater market access for African exports by lowering tariffs, abolishing tariff peaks and tariff escalation. He noted that the modalities resulting from the July Package should include a substantial degree of special and differential treatment to developing country economies and maintain advantages already gained through preferential treatment. Minister Fernando noted that greater regional integration was an important first step towards Africa's global integration and was important in negotiations – it enables countries to participate effectively in trade, overcome obstacles of narrow

markets and benefit from economies of scale and regional infrastructures. He concluded by mentioning that regional integration strengthens manufacturing and enhances diversification in the sub-region.

III.2. Status of WTO negotiations

(i) Summary of presentation

This first substantive session of the workshop was centred on presentation of modalities and the ongoing trade negotiation stakes at WTO. The Economic Commission for Africa made a presentation that was focused on the different negotiations themes and analyzed their potential impact on the development of African countries and especially the development of SADC.

The presentation delved as well to the issue of cotton. The presenter reminded the participants on the refusal by developed countries to treat the cotton issue separately from other agricultural issues. The presenter appraised the participants on the decision taken in March 2005 by the WTO's Dispute Settlement organ condemning the USA's subsidy to its cotton producers.

In the NAMA negotiations, stakes for the choice of a tariff reduction formula were brought to the fore, the issues of tariff peak and escalation, and the impact of preference erosion as well as problems that are specific to the textile sector.

(ii) Main observations by participants

The participants underlined the importance of trust in the multilateral negotiations processes, particularly the need to have trust with the leaders nominated to head development organizations that interact and participate in shaping policies in developing countries. Without this trust, the participants noted, it would be difficult for the African countries to get involved in the negotiations.

The participants underlined the important issue of export subsidies and domestic support that developed countries provide to their farmers. This practice it was emphasised distort the international market and have contributed to the collapse of world prices of agricultural products for which African countries have comparative advantages.

Additionally, the participants noted the rigidity of the agricultural sector in Africa and the need for significant improvement of productivity of African agriculture. There was consensus that a strategy aimed at raising agricultural productivity in Africa could help ensure agricultural development, reduction of poverty and improvement of the stand of African countries in negotiations.

The participants underlined the interests of the SADC countries on cotton, even though these countries were not directly associated with the cotton sector initiative by the Western and Central African countries at the WTO.

The participants underlined the ambiguities in the July Package on the industrial products, given that it notes that it notes that the contents of Annex B are subject to further negotiations. The participants highlighted the necessity of the African countries to define their own strategy.

Finally, participants revisited the question of the Singapore Issues, and recalled the reluctance of developing countries to have the four issues as part of the Doha Round of negotiations. The reasons for this reluctance were once more evoked, notably the cost of commitment on the four issues, and their favourable implications for foreign exporters needing to enter developing countries' markets. Yet, the participants emphasized the fact that trade facilitation is a crucial issue for the development of trade in SADC countries and the rest of Africa.

III.3. Special session on market access

(i) Summary of presentation

The presentation on market access issues was made by the Economic Commission for Africa. The agriculture and non-agriculture market access issues were covered in the presentation. The core issues raised by the presentation were:

a. Agricultural Markets Access

This presentation dealt with the potential impact of liberalization of access to agricultural market, in the framework of the ongoing negotiations at WTO. The underlying focus of the presentation was on technical ways aimed at helping African negotiators to identify priority options in current negotiations through the quantitative analysis of the impact of various conclusions resulting from negotiations especially the July Package.

This presentation was based on studies by the ECA that provide a quantitative estimate of the potential economic consequences of multilateral trade reform for Africa. These studies use a framework that incorporates issues of particular concern to Africa, such as preference erosion, loss of tariff revenue and the impact of OECD agricultural support programmes on African countries. The results from these studies, the presentation noted show that countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and to a lesser extent Southern Africa are vulnerable to partial agricultural trade reforms. Given that other regions derive positive gains even from partial global reforms in the trade of agricultural goods, the results underscore the need for development issues to be taken more seriously in the current round of multilateral trade negotiations.

The presentation then focused on the possible impacts of the July Package. Indeed, based on "July Package" and informed by the Kigali consensus that underscores the stand of the African Union in WTO negotiations; four scenarios were presented. The four scenarios are related to trade liberalization and assess how the "three pillars" in agriculture negotiations, namely market access, exports subsidy, and domestic support could be modified for the benefit of African economies.

The scenarios presented examined two formulas for tariff reduction, as well as making the first attempt to include “sensitive products” that are mentioned in the July Package. The first formula is inspired by Harbinson’s proposal while the second is much like that implied by the Derbez’s text which imposes stern reductions and harmonization of tariffs in developed countries. All the scenarios include envisaged reduction of domestic support as well as exports subsidy in line with the principles of the July Package.

Based on MacMap database, the presentation also showed the current conditions of access to markets by African agricultural exporters. It also detailed the tariff grids currently used for African agricultural exports. It then examined the way those rates will be modified by each of the four scenarios that had been defined. Clearly, African exports it was shown are confronted with tariff peaks in many agricultural products. The paper therefore, analyzed the potential impact of the liberalization scenarios on African economies.

The main conclusion which was drawn from the simulations and presented to the participants is that Africa would benefit from an ambitious liberalization of agriculture in a multilateral context, especially deep liberalisation in the developed countries markets. The presented showed the impacts for each of the scenarios on different variables like GDP, welfare, imports, real value-added as well as real wages of unskilled labour. These last two variables were suggested as global approximation of the measurement of the impact of liberalization on poverty reduction.

The paper presentation emphasised that tariff peaks should be strongly reduced in order to allow Africa to get better results. The main African beneficiaries apparently would be those that have the most competitive agricultural sectors (countries of Southern Africa plus Tunisia). Gains in these countries are usually greater than the losses sometimes incurred by the other African countries. The analysis per product indicated that Africa would gain much from tariff reductions on the products that are currently liable to tariff peaks. The most sectors where the gains are maximised at the level of the continent are namely, sugar, vegetable oils, oil grains, meat, and to a little extent rice, cattle and fibres.

b. Non Agricultural Market Access (NAMA)

The objective of the NAMA presentation, based on ECA’s studies was also to help Southern African countries to formulate concrete proposals in the area of NAMA. Consequently, presentation sought based on empirical work at the Commission, to identify the most appropriate formulas for African economies that could allow greater liberalization of markets of OECD countries but that at the same time would leave African countries the means of continuing industrial development and diversification of their economies.

The July Package it was noted in the presentation provides that an agreement should be reached on a formula that is essential to reduce tariff, reduce or eliminate tariff peaks, high duties or tariff progressivity. It also provides that negotiations should work on **non-linear formula**, applied line by line that will fully take into account the needs and special

interests of developing countries, and the least developed countries participating, including less than full reciprocity as far as reduction commitments are concerned.

The presentation suggested tariff reduction formulas which are coherent with the nature of commitments of the “July Package”. Four scenarios based on a Girard type formula were analyzed. Three of the scenarios (1, 3 and 4) can be seen as ambitious scenarios whereas one of them could be seen as conservative.

The ambitious scenarios differ in the way they take into account the S&D. For scenario 1, it tested S&D as negotiated in the July Package. Scenario 3 takes into account the same S&D treatment, but additionally integrates what is referred to as implicit S&D, i.e. a Girard coefficient B which is high for developing countries and weak (equals to 1) for developed countries. Concretely, a weak coefficient has a strong impact on tariffs reduction. This scenario, therefore, allows developing countries to have more policy space. Lastly, the 4th scenario integrates S&D as provided by July text but with the only difference that S&D was multiplied by 2. Effectively, the presenter noted, this excludes from every tariff reduction twice as much lines than normal S&D.

Analysis of new tariff structure obtained from various simulations reveals that the impact of negotiation should be significant for African industrial exporters. Scenarios that integrate a weak Girard coefficient help reduce significantly the tariffs applied by developed countries on African products. Reductions to be expected from a non-linear formula would help, in certain conditions, improve significantly markets access of developed countries for African exporters. Tariffs applied by developed countries would considerably diminish with the application of an **ambitious** formula (first, third or fourth scenario).

An ambitious formula, the presenter emphasised is the one that integrates a weak Girard coefficient for developed countries. The ECA presentation reiterated the fact that special and differentiated treatment can be both explicit (part of lines included in every tariff reduction), or implicit (A Girard coefficient superior to 1 is applied to Developing countries in such a way that reduction becomes less important). Either of these kinds of modalities could offer African developing countries better access to markets of developed countries by offering them freedom of actions for the conduct of their economic policy. In fact, in the event that the tariff reductions that developing countries would concede, would be less constraining, they would keep part of their tariffs which are, for most African countries, the main source of budget incomes. Application of an ambitious formula by developed countries would finally lead to cutting the tariff peaks and to significant reduction of the tariffs applied by those countries.

The results indicated that average reduction of tariffs is weak; conversely application of a linear formula is translated into a significant reduction of tariff peaks on the most taxed products of Africa (agribusiness industry, chemicals, sugar transformation, cotton, iron, metallic, minerals and energy products).

The simulations presented by the ECA underlined that the continent would gain more in welfare with scenarios of ambitious liberalization plus marked differentiated and special

treatment. In terms of impact, the simulations confirm that a liberalization scenario based on an “ambitious” non-linear formula type Girard could be a **second best** for the continent. It could help enhance the welfare and production of African countries, but would not contribute in boosting African exports.

(ii) Main observations by participants

1. Following the presentation on market access, the chair person (Mozambique) thanked the presenter for the detailed analysis.
2. Participants insisted on the following and made the comments here after:
 - ✓ Regarding industrialization, the situation of African countries and more particularly between them and other developing countries is enormously variable.
 - ✓ Ambitious formula led to deterioration of terms of trade, and this could be a problem in short term.
 - ✓ On the one side developing countries are often confronted with high tariffs and tariffs escalation on markets of developed countries. Consequently, it should be underlined that reciprocal treatment should not exist with regards to the elimination of tariffs.
 - ✓ Other concerns related to NAMA that need capacity building include dumping and anti-dumping, customs expertise, the integrated common agenda that has not yet brought all the expected fruits. It is important to have competition rules in order to limit the anticompetitive practices which could eliminate trade liberalization effect.
 - ✓ Even if LDCs were not concerned with tariffs reduction formulas, they were rather concerned with the themes of markets access.
 - ✓ An efficacious policy in matters of competition is necessary to support efficacious trade policy
 - ✓ Last, beyond technical dimension, there exists a political dimension of negotiation that needs to be deeply analyzed. The question of “policy space” should be reinforced, the participants noted.
 - ✓ The need to integrate the private sector in the analysis was highlighted.

III.4. Content of EPAs and presentation of the results of EPAs impact studies

(i) Summary of presentation

This presentation was made by the Economic Commission for Africa and was based on an ECA's study that quantifies the potential economic and social impacts of the trade liberalization aspects of the proposed EPAs. More precisely, the study seeks to provide a quantitative assessment of the likely implications of the implementation of the EPAs establishing Free Trade Areas (FTAs) between EU and the various Regional Economic Communities (RECs). The focus of the empirical analysis as presented was on the trade liberalization component of the EPAs. In particular, the study addresses the following questions. First, how are African countries likely to gain or lose as evidenced by the impacts on GDP, employment and other macroeconomic aggregates from bilateral trade liberalization between Africa and the EU as governed by the EPAs reciprocity principle? Second, what sectors in Africa are most likely to lose and what sectors gain in the EPA? Third, what are the welfare implications for the African countries from the EPAs? Fourth, how will the formation of EPAs affect trade expansion through trade creation and trade diversion effects? Fifth, what are the potential fiscal implications of the EPAs?

The key findings of the ECA's study as presented was that overall, trade creation exceeds trade diversion. However, the trade diversion is substantial and in particular intra-regional trade significantly undermined. Another finding is that substantial revenue shortfalls likely to result. This revenue shortfall will portend special challenges to the SADC countries where import revenues matter. First, there will be adjustment cost associated with tax policy and administration reforms. Second, potential negative impacts on fiscal spending are likely to result where spending cuts and reallocation have to be considered. Thirdly, for some of the SADC countries that will shift towards income taxes as a replacement tax for lost revenues, there will be growth implications associated with reliance on income taxes. Fourthly, equity questions are likely to emerge if there is a shift to regressive consumption taxes.

The other key findings that emerged from the study's presentation was that full reciprocity leads to a specialisation in primary commodities for the SSA countries. However, deeper regional integration without reciprocation on the part of the African countries provides space for diversification. It was clear that deeper regional integration have superior results than full reciprocity for SSA. In particular, it was also clear from the study that full reciprocity will also undermine the already low level of intra-Africa trade.

The main conclusions presented as emanating from the study were as follows:

- EPAs will portend significant adjustment costs: de-industrialisation; fiscal and BOP imbalances.
- Revenue shortfalls in particular will imply substantial adjustment costs in respect of tax policy and admin reforms.
- Consumers will benefit but such benefits outweighed by welfare losses associated to producers and the government.
- Full reciprocity especially without addressing sensitive EU products will be costly for SSA.

- Full reciprocity also will undermine the already low level of intra-Africa trade. This means that the reciprocity and deeper integration principles, which are key elements of the EPAs negotiations pull in different directions.
- In the long run, an FTA that first focus on unrestricted market access for SSA and eliminates sensitive sectors from the EU side is feasible.

(ii) Main observations by participants

Several questions and clarification points were raised by the participants during the discussion of the presentation. The key observations and questions by the participants were:

- (a) The study's consideration of full reciprocity without taking into account the fact that the SADC trade protocol foresees an FTA in 2008 was raised. It was noted by the participants that it would be useful the same analysis to be undertaken assuming that the SADC FTA will be in place. This will reduce the trade diversion effects presented by the study as occurring in Southern Africa.
- (b) The participants also observed that increasing regional integration would help to create supply capacities in the region.
- (c) The participants raised the question whether it was possible for the study to capture increased exports by LDCs in the region as a result of reduced supply constraints. It was proposed that sensitivity analysis by varying elasticities could help.
- (d) The participants also questioned the assumption in the study of full liberalisation.
- (e) It was also pointed out by the participants that it would be helpful if the revenue losses estimates were to include the tax compliance and collection efficiency rates.
- (f) The participants also emphasized the need for immediate work on addressing intra-African trade barriers through common harmonization work especially in COMESA and SADC.
- (g) The participants also noted that the question of the impacts of HIV/AIDS in the labour market in the region should be taken into account in making assumptions about labour supply.
- (h) The participants raised the question whether the ESA EPAs negotiations on Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) would best serve the region by going beyond the TRIPS Agreement; whether there should be a bilateral agreement with the EU which is less than the TRIPS Agreements; or whether there should be no

negotiations on IPRs, meaning that the WTO TRIPs Agreement would apply to the ESA EPA.

- (i) The participants also expressed concerns on how to deal with the issue of standards and quality with respect to trade with the European Union. How could the SADC countries implement the SPS and other related standards issues. It was recommended that the SADC countries will need to do sufficient home-work at the national level to identify the specific help needed on the SPS issue. Where is capacity building needed on SPS, and could this be considered as a regional public goods issue?
- (j) Concern was expressed by the participants that the recommendation from the study on the sequencing did not take into account that the regional integration programme in SADC is based on an agreed protocol. In the same vein, the EPAs agenda was questioned in that it pushes countries to accelerate regional integration as opposed to following the protocols set by RECs and in SADC area in particular.

III.5. EPAs and regional integration

(i) Summary of presentation

This presentation made by the Economic Commission for Africa, presented the results of a simulation representing full liberalisation of EU imports in SADC countries, using a partial equilibrium model, WITS-SMART. The paper is divided in four sub-divisions. The first section of the presentation gave the main trends on trade of SADC countries. Then the presenter described the simulation results on the level of EU imports. In a third section, the presenter turned to the simulation's results on intra-SADC trade. Finally, the presentation analyzed the results of the model on tariff revenues and welfare in the Southern-African countries.

The Economic Partnership Agreement between SADC and the European Union it was noted would induce a significant trade creation for the EU, estimated at USD 351 million. This increase will be associated with a trade diversion of USD 78 million, which is very significant in regard of the trade created, especially if compared to the level of trade diverted for the trade created in the other Regional Economic Commission. This trade diversion will not significantly affect the SADC countries, however but it will focus on the trade between SADC countries and South Africa (38% of the trade diverted), meaning that regional integration will suffer from the Southern African EPA unless mitigating measures were put in place.

As SADC is a sub-region more open than other African sub-regions, the impact of EPA on the revenues of the governments of this sub-region is less important than in the other sub-regions. Nonetheless, it is still significant, as the public revenues should go down by 1.6% after the EPA. In terms of welfare, the consumer surplus, which amounts to USD 26 millions, will not be noticeable.

Hence, the EPAs should have a less significant impact on the SADC economies than it should have on the other RECs economies. This is true for its negative effects, such as public revenues losses or trade diversion, as well as for its positive effects, such as trade and welfare creation. These tempered effects, largely explained by the high level of openness of the SADC economies, cannot hide the fact that a full reciprocal scenario would be harmful for the fiscal balance and the regional integration of the SADC economies, which are very sensitive issues for the future of this sub-region.

(ii) **Main observations by participants**

The participants noted that it could be interesting to look at the impact of the EPA inside the EU markets for African exports.

The question of producer surplus is not treated in the analysis and should be more details if the model allows it.

It could be useful to provide some new simulations with the introduction of the sensitive sectors and also with new scenarios, in particular, a scenario which do not suppose a full reciprocity.

Concerning the WITS SMART results, it could be more robust to run the model with an average of the last few years' data and not only on the most recent data in order to avoid some endogenous bias.

III.6. Presentation of findings of two books on trade by the World Bank

(i) **Summary of presentations**

This session focused on selected papers in forthcoming books by the World Bank. The abstracts of the papers presented, highlighting the core issues addressed are presented below:

Agricultural Trade Reform and the Doha Development Agenda by Kym Anderson and Will Martin

This presentation examined the extent to which various regions, and the world as a whole, could gain from multilateral trade reform over the next decade. The World Bank's LINKAGE model of the global economy is employed to examine the impact first of current trade barriers and agricultural subsidies, and then of possible outcomes from the WTO's Doha round. The results suggest moving to free global merchandise trade would boost real incomes in Sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia (and in Cairns Group countries) proportionately more than in other developing countries or high-income countries. Real returns to farm land and unskilled labour, and real net farm incomes, would rise substantially in those developing country regions, thereby alleviating poverty. A Doha partial liberalization could take the world some way towards those desirable outcomes, but more so the more agricultural subsidies are disciplined and applied tariffs are cut.

(ii) Main observations by participants

The Chairperson highlighted key areas in which participants could focus in their deliberations, in particular that i) agriculture constituted 4% of global trade and yet accounted for over 60% of costs of trade protection ii) market access should be an area of focus as opposed to subsidies iii) welfare gains that Africa could achieve through full liberalisation (increase in employment for unskilled labour).

Concern was raised in concluding that market access is of more importance than subsidies. It was noted that subsidies were important and discipline in their use must be enforced.

The gains from market access were lost through preference erosion in Doha. The challenges in supply capacity can be incorporated in the analysis through changing elasticities. The criterion for sensitive products was highlighted.

Participants were challenged to focus more on Doha than EPAs and making Doha its own development agenda.

Poverty Impacts of a WTO Agreement: Synthesis and Overview by Thomas W. Hertel and L. Alan Winters

This presentation reported on the findings from a major international research project investigating the poverty impacts of a potential Doha Development Agenda. It combines in a novel way the results from several strands of research. Firstly, it draws on an intensive analysis of the DDA Framework Agreement, with particularly close attention paid to potential reforms in agriculture. The scenarios are built up using newly available tariff line data and their implications for world markets are established using a global modelling framework. These world trade impacts, in turn, form the basis for thirteen country case studies of the national poverty impacts of these DDA scenarios. The focus countries include: Bangladesh, Brazil (2 studies), Cameroon, China (2 studies), Indonesia, Mexico, Mozambique, Philippines, Russia, Vietnam and Zambia. While the diversity of approaches taken in these studies limits the ability to draw broader conclusions, an additional study which provides a 15 country cross-section analysis is aimed at this objective. Finally, a global analysis provides estimates for the world as a whole.

A few of the main findings follow:

- The liberalization targets under the DDA have to be quite ambitious if the round is to have a measurable impact on world markets and hence poverty.
- Assuming an ambitious DDA, we find the near-term poverty impacts to be mixed; some countries experience small poverty rises and others more substantial poverty declines. On balance, poverty is reduced under this DDA, and this reduction is more pronounced in the longer run.

- Allowing minimal tariff cuts for just a small percentage of special and sensitive products reverses the results, with the ensuing DDA raising, rather than lowering, global poverty.
- Deeper cuts in developing country tariffs would make the DDA more poverty friendly.
- Key determinants of the national poverty impacts include: the incomplete transmission of world prices to rural households, barriers to the mobility of workers between sectors of the economy, as well as the incidence of national tax instruments used to replace lost tariff revenue.
- In order to generate significant poverty reductions in the near term, complementary domestic reforms are required to enable households to take advantage of new market opportunities made available through the DDA.
- Sustained long term poverty reductions depend on stimulating economic growth. Here, the impact of the DDA (and trade policy more generally) on productivity is critical. In order to fully realize their growth potential, trade reforms need to be far reaching, addressing barriers to services trade and investment in addition to merchandise tariffs.

(ii) Main observations by participants

The Chairperson summarised the key issues raised in the presentation including i) the mixed results in terms of impact of trade liberalisation ii) DDA impacts on poverty as compared to full liberalisation iii) the degree of price transmission, iv) welfare effects of trade liberalisation and the importance of disaggregation by household v) sectoral mobility.

Participants noted that the ACP and LDCs have had market access to the EU and this has not impacted on poverty and countries should look to economic governance.

The participants felt that focus on labour intensive industry and trade facilitation was important for developing countries.

The Doha Trade Round and Mozambique by Channing Arndt

This presentation considered the potential implications of the Doha Development Agenda, as well as other trade liberalization scenarios, for Mozambique. An applied general equilibrium model which accounts for high marketing margins and home consumption in the Mozambique economy, is linked to results from the GTAP model of global trade. In addition, a microsimulation module is employed to consider the subsequent implications of trade liberalization for poverty. The implications of trade liberalization, particularly the Doha scenarios, are found to be relatively small. Presuming that a more liberal trading regime will positively influence growth in Mozambique, an opportunity exists to put in place such a regime without imposing significant adjustment costs.

(ii) Main observations by participants

The participants express their concern that trade liberalization reinforces the agricultural specialization of the African countries, as shown in the case of Mozambique. They recall that openness is positive for the African countries, but requires comprehensive policies to cover all the negative sides of trade liberalization. Among these negative aspects, the issue of the tax revenues replacement was outlined as well as raw materials reverses processed goods and value added.

The WTO Doha Round, Cotton Sector Dynamics and Poverty Trends in Zambia by Jorge F. Balat and Guido G. Porto

This presentation focused on the dynamics of cotton sector in the Zambian economy. The Zambian cotton sector has gone through significant reforms during the 1990s. After a long period of parastatal control, a process of liberalization in cotton production and marketing began in 1994. These reforms were expected to benefit agricultural farmers. In Zambia, these are rural, often vulnerable, smallholders. This paper investigates the connection between the dynamics of the cotton sector and the dynamics of poverty and evaluates to what extent cotton can work as a vehicle for poverty alleviation. We find that cotton can indeed act as an effective mechanism for increased household welfare. We find income gains associated with cotton production as well as positive impacts on the long-run nutritional status of Zambian children. The impacts, however, are relatively small.

(ii) Main observations by participants

The participants insisted that cotton, as well as other crops like maize or tobacco, are major issues for many SADC countries. They outlined the fact that, due to poor market structures, and unsatisfactory price transmission, the returns of the industry is low in the region. They also underlined the role of the governance in the development of the supply of cotton by SADC countries. Cotton production has increased in countries like Zambia, which is thus diversifying its production from its original mineral specialization.

The participants noted that more recent data was available to strengthen the study.

The Poverty Impacts of Doha Trade Round and Role of Tax Policy: A Case Study of Cameroon by Christian Arnault Emini

This presentation considered the use of a CGE microsimulation model to assess the poverty impacts for Cameroon of the Doha round, as well as more ambitious world and domestic trade liberalisation, paying particular attention to the choice of replacement tax. Doha Agreements remove roughly 42,000 people from poverty in Cameroon. More ambitious world trade liberalisation brings down the number of poor by 308, 000 individuals. However, Cameroon's own liberalisation has strong adverse impacts, increasing the number of poor by over a million. Combined world and domestic liberalisation thus increases poverty, especially when lost tariff revenues are compensated by a consumption tax rather than VAT,

(ii) Main observations by participants

The participants reiterated that trade facilitation is important for less developed countries and efforts have been undertaken by COMESA and others.

With data from the household survey, female-headed households show competitive statistics in comparison to men.

Gains and losses are common, but what is important is that there should be net gains and policies to redistribute the gains through domestic reforms.

III.7. Special case of mining, agriculture, and fishing industries and minerals development

(i) Summary of presentation

The presentation looked at the special case of agriculture, fishery industry and mineral development and recognized that these sectors constitute the backbone of the GDP formation in the majority of economies in the SADC. They also provide livelihood to communities and play an important role for export earnings, employment and food supply as well as generation of government revenue. They also play an important role towards poverty reduction.

The presentation looked at the major problems affecting agricultural and fishery industry, mining and mineral development in the sub-region. It discussed constraints facing the sector such as poor market access; limited infrastructural development; sanitary and phyto-sanitary (SPS) regulations, lack of value addition; limited market information and sustainable development.

The presentation highlighted the EPAs negotiating strategies for SADC economies, which should target four objectives: (a) The importance of agriculture and fisheries for poverty eradication, (b) The reform of EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) that prevents SADC agricultural products from gaining access to the EU market, (c) The sustainability of minerals development framework and policies, and (d) improvements in the efficiency of food production.

The four objectives outlined, would aim at maximizing the process of trade and development related strategies. With this approach the EPAS will contribute to minimizing the impact of shocks on economy and increase the benefits from economic reforms especially in agriculture, fisheries and mining sector.

The presentation also recognised the efforts made by many SADC countries in conducting negotiations in the field of fisheries commitments. It stressed the need for the EPAs to focus on the improvement of private sector by promoting foreign direct investment with special emphasis on the export activities including assisting in regularizing the informal sector.

Finally, the paper highlighted that SADC countries should continuously deepen their strategies where they can have a more comparative advantage with particular attention to small-scale and artisanal fishers.

(ii) Main observations by participants

The discussion that followed after the presentation noted that it was important that SADC looked at trade within the region with the idea of addressing constraints to regional trade in agriculture, fisheries and the minerals industry. Current systems within the region frustrate efforts to increase trade among member states. With respect to the minerals industry, participants were informed of current processes towards harmonization of mining policies in the region so as to facilitate the regional flow of factors of production including labour and capital within the region.

Agriculture and Fisheries

With respect to agriculture and fisheries, the meeting emphasized the importance of development of capacity for value addition, developing mechanisms to maintain sustainable fish stocks, assistance in recording of fish harvests and trade, identify ways of reducing production costs for aquaculture and capacity building for artisanal and small scale fisheries.

Mining and minerals development

With respect to value addition, participants were informed of the importance of adding value to mineral products before export but were made aware of constraints faced in exporting mineral-based products to the EU due to tariff escalation. Value addition enables economies to benefit from vertical and horizontal linkages through development of inputs industries and transfer of technology.

The discussion on SYSMIN noted the need to develop a similar facility that could be used as a development tool to enable the region to benefit fully from minerals exploitation through growth in the productive base and in processing capacity.

The discussion on poverty reduction strategies noted the absence reference to the minerals industry in PRSP despite the role of the sector in poverty reduction directly and through its links with other sectors.

The discussion on ASM noted that the challenge was to improve outcomes from the sector through resolving constraints faced by the sector including skills, technology, information, markets and finance.

III.8. Coherence between EPAs and WTO negotiations

(i) Summary of presentation

The presentation by UNDP noted Sub-Saharan Africa countries are currently in a bewildering array of complex trade negotiations. Given the inherent weakness of these

countries, it is not self evident that the wide variety and the range of trade agreements with which they are confronted with will not impose on them contradictory implementation obligations.

The paper emphasised that an examination of the strategic objectives, modalities, negotiation format and the schedule of the regional integration agreement include African Economic Community (AEC), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) and the East African Community show incoherencies. The Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) with European Union (EU) and the Doha Development Agenda under the auspices of the World Trade Organization (WTO) presents some interesting challenges.

First coherency in objectives of RECs, EPA and DDA is not a major issue for many African countries. Second, coherency in mandates of RECs is also not a problem. However, comparing elements of EPA mandate with those of DDA revealed that though considerable overlaps exist, issues such as competition policies, trade and investment, government procurement and social standard that were excluded from DDA but included in EPA are likely to be associated with coherence problems. Fourth, strategies and modalities of the various trade negotiation platforms are, in board terms, not in conflict. An analysis of policy implications at regional level shows that adjustment time and cost for RECs in Africa should be sufficient for EPA. At national level, EPA is likely to impose substantial adjustment cost on them. In conclusion there is the need to address lack of capacity to participate in negotiations and to effectively integrate complex trade policy into national development strategies for African countries.

(ii) Main observations by participants

The participants concurred with the thrust of the presentation on coherency and emphasised that it was important that the countries as they negotiate note the need for coherency at the national, regional and international level.

The participants did however raise the question whether there were continental oversight institutions that would ensure the required coherency. Concern was raised as to whether the trade negotiations were being undertaken in a disjointed manner without continental institutions playing the role of ensuring that the objective of moving forward in coordinated way was achieved.

III.9. Core Recommendations

- (i) *In relation to the presentation on status of WTO negotiations the meeting made the following recommendations*
- It was recommended that the African countries' negotiators clearly take into account the extent to which the continents interests coincide with those of other developing countries.

- It was also recommended that the non-tariff barriers contribution to the market access constraints for African exports in developed countries be given the prominence it deserves vis-à-vis the tariff related market access questions.
- The meeting recommended that the special and differential treatment underpinned in the July Package with respect to coefficients in the formulas for tariff reduction and delineation of sensitive products be fully utilised for the benefit of African countries in the Doha Round both in the agriculture and non-agricultural goods negotiations.
- The meeting recommended that African countries in their negotiating positions emphasise the difficulties of harmonising agricultural trade policies between two unequal negotiating parties (developed versus developing countries).

(ii) In relation to the presentation of the special session on market access the meeting accepted the following recommendations

- The question of the formula both in the agriculture market access (AMA) and NAMA remains an important issue for the Southern African countries. UNECA, UNDP, World Bank and other regional and international institutions should continue to assist African countries during the modalities stage by procuring technical analyses.
- Concerning AMA, the question of sensitive products should be deeply analysed in order to identify for each country the list of sensitive products.
- Concerning the S&DT on AMA, Southern African countries need to identify these special products which could considerably differ between each country.
- Africa would gain much from tariff reductions on the products that are currently liable to tariff peaks and tariff progressivity. Negotiations emphasis should be on application of an ambitious formula by developed countries that would finally lead to cutting the tariff peaks and to significant reduction of the tariffs applied by those countries.
- Concerning NAMA, the question of implicit S&DT should be emphasised as a way that could procure more “policy space” for Southern African countries.

(iii) In relation to the presentation on the content of EPAs and presentation of the results of EPAs impact studies the meeting made the following recommendations

The following recommendations were arrived at based on the findings and the conclusions from the EPAs study by the ECA:

- Sequencing of the EPAs implementation will be critical

- Early implementation should first focus on removing intra-Africa trade barriers.
 - The focus should concurrently be on unrestricted market access into the EU to utilise supply capacities and diversity from free intra-Africa trade. This unrestricted market access should target non-tariff barriers and the technical barriers to trade.
 - Eventually, phased dismantlement of SSA tariffs on EU could be considered.
- Another key recommendation is that SADC countries and other sub-regions in Africa must hasten regional integration processes to build and consolidate supply capacity before opening up to EU. In effect, deeper regional integration especially across the multiple and overlapping RECs in the region is a pre-requisite to optimizing the gains from the EPAs.
 - It will be important for the SADC countries to coordinate EPAs with WTO negotiations (avoid WTO+ concessions to the EU).
 - In order to build a framework for an asymmetrical EPA, it will be important for the SADC countries to closely follow WTO negotiations on regional trade agreements (Article 24 needs revisiting w.r.t. asymmetry question). The re-interpretation of Article 24 of GATT using flexibilities provided in Article 5 of GATS would be necessary if the sequencing of the EPAs is going to be immunized against challenges from other WTO members.
 - There should be hastened harmonization and rationalization of SADC and COMESA with the aim of deepening regional integration to minimise trade diversion while improving supply capacities need to be hastened.
 - Competition policy in support of the regional trading arrangements and also in terms of trade with the EU need to be in place for EPAs benefits to be optimized.
 - Emphasis on improving supply capacities and also implementation capacities of the SPS need to be focused on in EPAs negotiations. At the national level, countries should identify the sectors where private sector can be supported to raise productivity.
 - With respected to the SPS, and the associated costs of their implementation, it was recommended that regional facilities be considered.
- (iv) *In relation to the presentation on the content of EPAs and presentation of the results of EPAs impact studies the meeting made the following recommendations*

- Propose the possibility of setting up a common fund to assist private companies on managing methods to bring them to world class standards. This could enable them to compete fairly with the EU World class companies.
- The possibility of monopolistic behaviours by EU companies call for a competition policy which could avoid anticompetitive practices and therefore could lead the African firms benefit more from the EPAs.
- The ESA and SADC EPA groupings, given their overlapping memberships should coordinate and harmonise their positions in the EPAs negotiations.

(v) *In relation to the presentation on the special case of mining, agriculture and fisheries industries and mineral development, the recommendations that emerged were as follows:*

- SADC should address internal trade-related constraints through harmonization to facilitate trade between its member states.
- A comprehensive negotiation strategy should be pursued with the EU to facilitate development of natural resources clusters, improve linkages between the natural resources sector and poverty reduction and growth efforts and build institutional and human capital including the local private sector (small, medium and artisanal). In addition, in negotiating with the EU, the following development and trade related issues have to be raised;
 - a. Capacity building and empowerment of small-scale and artisanal producers,
 - b. Value addition of local products,
 - c. Improved data collection, collation, processing and dissemination on production and market information
 - d. Updating and establishment of geo science information and data networks particularly of geological surveys
 - e. Mainstreaming mining into growth and poverty reduction strategies
 - f. Infrastructure development to address trade facilitation, and quality standards.
 - g. Promotion of production methods that are environmentally sustainable especially in fisheries, at both national and regional levels.
 - h. Seek development of a new mechanism similar to SYSMIN for utilisation as a development tool including enlarging the scope of the Centre for the Development of Enterprises (CDE).

- (vi) *In relation to the presentation on coherence between the EPA and WTO negotiations, the main recommendations were as follows:*
- (a) African countries at national and regional level should ensure that the positions they take at different levels of trade negotiations are harmonised.
 - (b) African countries should aim to have their trade policy position consistent with their national development strategies. Trade policies should be viewed as tools and means to an end rather than an end in themselves and hence must be informed by the national development strategies.
 - (c) Countries need to identify capacity building needs given that incoherency in negotiations positions is partly attributable to weak capacity on trade issues at the national level.

III.10. Closure of the Meeting

The meeting was officially adjourned at 2130 hours on 5 April 2005 after the consideration and endorsement of the experts' recommendations.

IV. ANNEXES

IV.I List of Participants

Countries

1. Mr.Cruz Leopoldina
Rua Dos Coqueiros
No. 37/39
Luanda
ANGOLA

Tel No.: 244 2 390779
Fax No:
E-mail:

2. Mr. Iyanda Bomolo
Head of Division – Civil Servant
Ministry of External Trade
B.P. 3095
Kinshasa
Democratic Republic of Congo

Tel No.: 243 98 230372
Fax No.:
E-mail: iyandabomolo@yahoo.fr

3. Mrs. Astrid Binda
First Secretary
Embassy of **D.R. Congo**, Lusaka
P.O. Box 31287
Lusaka 10101
ZAMBIA

Tel No.:
Fax No.:
E-mail: bindaastrid@yahoo.fr

4. Ms. Ralebitso Tebello
Senior Gender Officer
Ministry of Gender, Youth, Sports and Recreation
P.O. Box 729
Maseru
LESOTHO

Tel No.: 266 22 314763
Fax No.:
E-mail: ralebitsot@mgysr.gov.ls

5. Mrs. M. Motsamai
Director
Ministry of Trade & Industry, Cooperatives and Marketing
Box 747
Maseru
LESOTHO

Tel No.: 266 22313099
Fax No.: 266 22 310326
E-mail: industry@leo.co.ls

6. Mrs. N. Maphike
Trade Promotion Officer
Ministry of Trade
P.O. Box 747
Maseru
LESOTHO

Tel No.: 266 22322 138
Fax No.: 266 22 310326
E-mail: trade@lesoff.co.ls/nmaphike2000@yahoo.com

7. Mr. P. Kamwendo
Principal Secretary
Ministry of Economic Planning and Development
P.O. Box 30136
Lilongwe
MALAWI

Tel No.: 265 1 788888
Fax No.: 265 1 788247
E-mail: kamwendop@yahoo.com

8. Ms. Bupe Mulaga
Economist
Ministry of Economic Planning and Development
P.O. Box 30136
Lilongwe 3
MALAWI

Tel No.: 265 9 09551506

Fax No.: 265 1 788247/131
E-mail: kyaupi@yahoo.com, mulagab@mepd.gov.org

9. Ms. Gladys Chimpokosera
Principal Industrial Development Officer
Ministry of Trade & Private Sector Development
P.O. Box 30366
Lilongwe 3
MALAWI

Tel No: 265 1 770244
Fax No.: 265 1 770680
E-mail: gchimpokosera@hotmail.com, gi_la071@yahoo.com

10. Mr. A. Koodoruth
Second Secretary
Pope Hennessy St
Reservoir Lane, CPE
MAURITIUS

Tel No.: 230 201 3035
Fax No.:
E-mail: aKoodoruth@mail.gov.mu

11. Ms. P. Mohun
Senior Trade Policy Analyst
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade & Regional Cooperation
2nd Floor, Old Govt House
Port Louis
MAURITIUS

Tel No.: 230 2081662
Fax No.: 230 2126368
E-mail: pmohun@intnet.mu

12. Mr. Alexis Rawlinson
Economist, UTCOM-DRI
Ministry of Industry and Trade of Mozambique
Postal: C.P. 400
Praça 25 De Junho, 37, 8^o Andar
Maputo
MOZAMBIQUE

Tel No.: 258 82 8059650
Fax No.: 258 1 352669
E-mail: arawlinson@mic.gov.mz/alexisrawlinson@hotmail.com

13. Mr. E. Tame
Executive Director
Justica Economica
Av. AMI/CAR CABRA/865
Maputo
Mozambique
- Tel No.: 258 1 314129
Fax No.: 258 1 304860
E-mail: viriatot@zgzra.uem.mz
14. Mr. Jordao Perdigao
Senior Inspector
Ministry of Industry and Trade
Box
Maputo
Mozambique
- Tel No.: 258 1 352626
Fax No.: 2581 1 352669
E-mail: pjordao@mic.gov.mz
15. Mr. Isac Massamby
1st Secretary
Box
Maputo
Mozambique
- Tel No.: 258 82 784 786
Fax No.:
E-mail: isacmassamby@hotmail.com
16. Mr. S. Fernandes
Deputy Director
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Cooperation
Av. 10 de Nov. No. 620
Maputo
Mozambique
- Tel No.: 258 1 327001/8
Fax No.:
E-mail: fernandes@consadc.co.mz
17. Mr. Carlos Riquixo
Food Chemist
Ministry of Fisheries

Box
Maputo
Mozambique

Tel No.:
Fax No.:
E-mail:

18. Mr. J. Massingue

Agronomist
Ministry of Agriculture
Praça, Dos Herois, 1406
2nd Floor
Maputo
Mozambique

Tel No.: 258 1 460131
Fax No: 258 1 460296
E-mail: jaquelino@yahoo.com

19. Mr. Andrea Alfieri

GPSCA
Ministry of Agriculture
Box ...
Maputo
Mozambique

Tel No.:
Fax No.:
E-mail: andrea.alfieri@gpscaina.gov.mz

20. Mr. Gil Bires

Legal Adviser
Mozambique – CPI
Rua Da Imprensa No. 332
Maputo
Mozambique

Tel No.: 258 1 313310
Fax No.: 258 1 313325
E-mail: Gbires@cpi.co.mz

21. Mr. Chuquela F. Langa

Head of Commercial Policy Department
Box
Maputo

Mozambique

Tel No.:

Fax No.:

E-mail:

22. Mr. Xavier Cirera
Economist
Ministry of Industry and Trade
National Director of Industry
Maputo

Mozambique

Tel No: 258 82 2830800

Fax No.:

E-mail: xcirera@www.mic.gov.zm

23. Mr. Eugenio Come
2nd Secretary
Mozambique NAO-MINEC
Box
Maputo

Mozambique

Tel No.: 258 ---

Fax No.:

E-mail: eugeniocome@hotmail.com

24. Mr. Amilcar Arone
Economist
Ministry of Planning and Finance
Maputo

Mozambique

Tel No.: 258 1 499442

Fax No.: 258 1 492625

E-mail: amilcararone@hotmail.com

25. Mrs. Zelia. Machai
Sociologist
Ministry of Agriculture
Praça Dos Herois
1406

2nd Floor – Maputo

Mozambique

Tel No.: 258 1 40131
Fax No.: 460296
E-mail: zeliamz@yahoo.com

26. Mrs. L Dimene
Ministry of Industry and Trade
Praça 25 de Junho No. 300
Maputo
Mozambique

Tel No.: 258 1 352670
Fax No: 258 1 300664/5
E-mail: ldimene@mic@gov.mz

27. Ms. L. Kautwima
Foreign Relations Officer
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
P/Bag 13347
Windhoek
Namibia

Tel No.: 264 61 2822203
Fax No.:
E-mail: kautwimalibetine@hotmail.com

28. Mr. Alfred Ndabeni
Ministry of Trade and Industry
Private Bag 13340
Windhoek
Namibia

Tel No.: 264 61 2837111
Fax No.: 264 61 253865

29. Mrs. Nomusa Tibane
Principal Economist
Ministry of Economic Planning and Development
Box 602
Mbabane
Swaziland

L

Tel No.: 268 404 6697
Fax No.: 264 404 6697
E-mail: tibanenom@yahoo.com

30. Mrs. L. Sibandze
Senior Economist

Ministry of Economic Planning and Development
Box 602
Mbabane
Swaziland

Tel No.: 268 404 3765
Fax No.: 268 4042157
E-mail: lonkyp@africaonline.co.sz

31. Mr. Eliud Tawi Nyauhenga
Senior Economist
Ministry of Finance
P.O. Box 9111
Dar-es-Salaam
Tanzania

Tel No.: 255 22 2111725
Fax No.: 255 22 2116597
E-mail: enyauhenga@psu.go.tz

32. Ms. Janet Simwanza
Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry
P.O. Box 31968
Lusaka
Zambia

Tel No.: 260 1 226727
Fax No.: 260 1 226727
E-mail: jsimwanza@mcti.gov.zm/jansimz@yahoo.com

33. Ms. Namakau Akapelwa
Economist
Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry
P.O. Box 31968
Lusaka
Zambia

Tel No.: 260 1 226954
Fax No.: 260 1 226727
E-mail: nakapelwa@mcti.gov.zm

34. Ms. Monde F. Sitwala
Chief Economist
Ministry of Finance and National Planning
P.O. Box 50062
Lusaka

Zambia

Tel No.: 260 1 252107
Fax No.: 260 1 252107
E-mail: msitwala@nao.gov.zm

35. Mr. Stewart Nyakotyo
Desk Officer-Multilateral Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Box 4240
Harare
Zimbabwe

Tel No.: 263 4 727005/794681
Fax No.: 263 4 705061
E-mail: nyakotyo@yahoo.com

36. Ms. R. Chibanda
Economist
Ministry of Industry and International Trade
Box 7708
Causeway
Harare
Zimbabwe

Tel No.: 263 4 791823-7
Fax No.: 263 4 723765
E-mail: snyagweta@indandcom.co.zw

RECs/Institutions/Universities

1. Ms. Assetou Koité
Secretary General
Pan Africa Women Organisation (PAWO)
Rua Dos Coqueiros
NO. 37-39
Luanda
Angola

Tel No.: 244 2 390779
Fax No.: 244 2 338985
E-mail: panafpw@hotmail.com

2. Mr. Gaotlhobogwe Motlaleng
Lecturer Dept of Economics
Botswana University
P/Bag 0022
Gaborone
Botswana

Tel No.: 267 3552376
Fax No.: 267 71 868894
E-mail: Motlaleg@mopipi.ub.bw

3. Mrs. M. Mapetla
Head of Research Division
Institute of Southern African Studies/Lesotho
National University of Lesotho
P.O. Roma
Lesotho

Tel No.: 266 22340247
Fax No.: 266 22 34000
E-mail: m.mapetla@nul.ls

4. Prof. Kym Anderson
Lead Economist (Trade Policy)
World Bank
1818 H Street NW, Washington DC 20432
USA

Tel No.: 1 202 473 3387
Fax No.:
E-mail: kanderson@worldbank.org

5. Dr. C. Emini

University Professor
University of Yaounde II
B.P. 876
Yaounde
CAMEROON

Tel No.: 237 745 5252
Fax No.:
E-mail: cemini@ecn.ulaval.ca

6. Ms. K. Manek
Economist
UK Department of International Development
Box....
London
England

Tel No.: 44 (0) 207 023 0573
Fax No.:
E-mail: k-manek@dfid.gov.uk

7. Mr. Ramon Ynaraja
Trade Officer
EC Delegation in Mozambique
Av. Julius Nyerere 2820
P.O. Box 1306 Maputo
Mozambique

Tel No.: 258 84 4253220
Fax No.:
E-mail: ramon.ynaraja@cec.eu.int

8. Ms. R. Ritter@
Namibia Chamber of Commerce and Industry
P.O. Box 9412
Windhoek
Namibia

Tel No.: 264 61 220150
Fax No.:
E-mail: ritter@mwch.com.na

9. Mr. Jacob E. Mwale
Agribusiness Trade & Policy Analyst
P.O. Box 39398
Lusaka
Zambia

Tel No.: 260 1 256224
Fax No.:
E-mail: j-mwale@yahoo.com or mwale@zamtie.org.zm

10. Mr. Glynn Davies
Policy Analyst
Development Bank of Southern Africa
P.O. Box 1234
Halfway House
1685
South Africa

Tel No.: 2711 313 3167
Fax No.: 2711 313 3533
E-mail: glynnd@dbsa.org

11. Dr. Piet Viljoen
Programme Manager
Development Bank of Southern Africa
P.O. Box 1234
Halfway House
1685
South Africa

Tel No.: 27 11 3133201
Fax No.: 27 11 3133086
E-mail: pietr@dbsa.org

12. Ms. B. Morewagae
Ag. Chief Technical Advisor (EPA Unit)
SADC Secretariat
P/Bag 0095
Gaborone
Botswana

Tel No.: 267 3951863
Fax No.: 267 3972848
E-mail: bmorewagae@sadc.int

13. Dr. Tekere Moses
Adviser, Multilateral Trade Negotiations
SADC Secretariat
P/Bag 0095
Gaborone
Botswana

Tel No.: 267 71 650 944
Fax No.: 267 3972 848
E-mail: mtekere@sadc.int

14. Mr. Roger Ballard-Tremeer
Ambassador/Hon. Chief Executive
South Africa-Angola Chamber of Commerce
P.O. Box 325
Paulshof 2056
South Africa

Tel No.: 27 11 803 5045
Fax No: 27 824 347276 (Mobile)
E-mail: rogerbt@mweb.co.za

15. Mr. L.P. Sooli
Principle Consultant
ESAMI
P.O. Box 3030
Arusha
Tanzania

Tel No.: 255 272 508383
Fax No.:
E-mail: esamihq@esamihg.ac.tz

16. Mrs. Soanirinela Tsilimbiaza
Director, Trade and Industry
African Union
P.O. Box
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia

Tel No.: 251 1 517700 (Ext. 364) Direct. 251 1 510154
Fax No.:
E-mail: tsilimbias@afrika-union.org

17. Rev. Damon
Economic Justice Network
P.O. Box 2296
Cape Town
South Africa

Tel No.: 27 21 424 9563
Fax No.: 27 21 424 9564

E-mail: mpd@cjn.org.za

UNDP

1. Dr. W. Ogunkola
UNDP Consultant
Trade Policy Research and Training Programme (TPRTP/UNDP)
Department of Economics
University of Ibadan
Nigeria

Tel No.: 234 802 351-8576
Fax No.:
E-mail: waleogunkola@yahoo.com or eo.ogunkola@mail.ui.edu.ng

2. Mr. T.I. Chivore
Deputy Res. Rep.
UNDP, South Africa
351 Schoeman St.
Pretoria
South Africa

Tel No.: 27 12 354 8000
Tel No.:
E-mail: isaac.chivore@undp.org

3. Mrs. Hannah Gutema
Asst. Res. Rep. to AU and Liaison Office with ECA
P.O. Box
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia

Tel No.: 251 1 515919
Fax No.: 251 1 512599
E-mail: hanna.gutema@undp.org

4. Ms. M. Mashologu
Senior Policy Advisor
3rd Floor, UN House
UN Road
Maseru
Lesotho

Tel No.: 266 22313 790
Fax No.: 266 22310 042
E-mail: mandisa.mashologu@undp.org

5. Mr. Jabulane Dlamini

Economic/Governance Advisor
UNDP-Swaziland
Box 261
Mbabane
Swaziland

Tel No.: 268 404 2302/4
Fax No.:
E-mail: jabulane.dlamini@undp.org

6. Dr. Ngila Mwase
Senior Economic Advisor
UNDP-Maputo
Box 4595
Maputo
Mozambique

Tel No.: 258 82 327404
Fax No.:
E-mail: ngila.mwase@undp.org

7. Ms. Eunice Taibo
Programme Assistant
Economic and Policy Analysis Unit
Av. Kenneth Kaunda
No. 931
P.O. Box 4595
Maputo
Mozambique

Tel No.: 258 1 481 400
Fax No.: 258 1 491 691
E-mail: Eunice.taibo@undp.org

ECA Secretariat

1. Mr. Antonio Pedro
Senior Economic Affairs Officer
UNECA
P.O. Box 3005
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia

Tel No.: 251 1 443238
Fax No.:
E-mail: apedro@uneca.org

2. Dr. Wilfred. C. Lombe
Senior Economic Affairs Officer
UNECA
P.O. Box 3005
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia

Tel No.: 251 1 445481
Fax No.:
E-mail: wlombe@uneca.org

3. Mr. Bashir Conde
Economic Affairs Officer
TRID
UNECA
P.O. Box 3001
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia

Tel No.: 251 1 556629/261 1 443223
Fax No.: 251 1 513038
E-mail: cbashir@uneca.org

4. Mr. Stephen Karingi
Senior Economic Affairs Officer
UNECA
P.O. Box 3001
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia

Tel No.: 251 1 445443
Fax No.: 251 1 513038
E-mail: skaringi@uneca.org

5. Mr. Sadni-Jallab Mustapha
Economic Affairs Officer
TRID
UNECA
P.O. Box 3001
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia

Tel No.: 251 1 445212
Fax No.: 251 1 513038
E-mail: msadni-jallab@uneca.org

6. Mr. Romain Perez
Economic Affairs Officer
UNECA
P.O. Box 3001
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia

Tel No.:
Fax No.:
E-mail: rperez@uneca.org

7. Mr. Patrick Osakwe
Senior Economic Affairs Officer
TRID
UNECA
P.O. Box 3001
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia

Tel No.: 251 1 443409
Fax No.:
E-mail: posakwe@uneca.org

ECA/SA

1. Mr. D.W. Mzumara
Officer-in-Charge
ECA/SA
P.O. Box 30647
Lusaka
Zambia

Tel No.: 260 1 228502-5
Fax No.: 260 1 236949
E-mail: srdcsa.uneca@un.org

2. Mr. M.E. Dhliwayo
Senior Economic Affairs Officer
ECA/SA
P.O. Box 30647
Lusaka
Zambia

Tel No.: 260 1 228502-5

Fax No.: 260 1 236949
E-mail: srdcsa.uneca@un.org

3. Mr. G. Nahimana
Economic Affairs Officer
ECA/SA
P.O. Box 30647
Lusaka
Zambia

Tel No.: 260 1 228502-5
Fax No.: 260 1 236949
E-mail: srdcsa.uneca@un.org or gnahimana@uneca.org

4. Ms. Gladys Mutangadura
Economic Affairs Officer
ECA/SA
P.O. Box 30647
Lusaka
Zambia

Tel No.: 260 1 228502-5
Fax No.: 260 1 236949
E-mail: srdcsa.uneca@un.org

5. Mr. Oliver Maponga
Economic Affairs Officer
ECA/SA
P.O. Box 30647
Lusaka
Zambia

Tel No.: 260 1 228502-5
Fax No.: 260 1 236949
E-mail: srdcsa.uneca@un.org

6. Ms. Grace Kaonga
Secretary
ECA/SA
P.O. Box 30647
Lusaka
Zambia

Tel No.: 260 1 228502-5
Fax No.: 260 1 236949
E-mail: srdcsa.uneca@un.org

IV.2. Aide Memoire

Background

1. The General Council of the World Trade Organization (WTO) adopted on 1 August 2004 a Decision on the “**Doha Work Programme**”, which delineates a number of “**Frameworks**” to be used in defining “**Modalities**” for negotiations in the current trade talks in the WTO. These agreed frameworks are the result of intense negotiations within the Membership of the WTO and a culmination of many months of uncertainty as to the future of Doha Development Programme and more importantly as to whether the stalled Cancun trade talks would at all be revived. The new accord reached in Geneva, therefore, breathed a new life into the global trading system.
2. The “July Package”, as it is generally known, provides frameworks for defining “modalities” for negotiations on agriculture; non-agricultural market access; as well as modalities for negotiations on trade facilitation; and recommendations for moving forward negotiations on trade in services. The Decision also contains proposals for further negotiations on a number of other issues, such as the developmental dimensions of the Doha Development Programme (special and differential treatment, implementation-related issues and concerns, technical assistance, and special issues of Least Developed Countries); the cotton sectoral initiative; and other issues, including rules, trade and environment, outstanding trade-related intellectual property rights (TRIPS) issues, and dispute settlement mechanism.
3. The ECA, UNDP, African Union (AU), ADB, and UNCTAD are contributing to this effort and undertook two high level brainstorming meeting (Accra 2003 and Tunis 2004) and detailed studies to assist African negotiators and officials to better tackle the current round of negotiations.
4. On 23 June 2000, the European Union and the 77 African, Pacific and Caribbean countries signed a new Partnership Agreement under the Cotonou Partnership Agreement. The Economic Partnership Agreements negotiations under the Cotonou Partnership Agreement between the European Union and the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries have since entered into their second phase. In Africa, negotiations have been launched between the EU and ECOWAS and also between the EU and the Eastern and Southern African states (ESA). Negotiations between the EU and some of the Southern African countries were launched in July 2004. Similarly negotiations between the Central African states have also been progressing with the EU under the aegis of CEMAC.
5. It is anticipated that different players will play various roles in ensuring that the outcome of these negotiations are beneficial to Africa. In this context, different organizations at the country, regional and international level are carrying out work based on an agreed upon road map. Towards this end 7 SADC countries (Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, Swaziland, Mozambique, Angola and Tanzania)

constituted a negotiating configuration and have designated Botswana's Minister of Trade and Industry to lead the negotiations for SADC at Ministerial level.

6. At the sub-regional level, the Regional Economic Communities' Secretariats are spearheading efforts to analyse impacts and negotiation positions. At the country level, the EU is facilitating EPAs impacts studies. The ECA, UNDP and UNCTAD are also contributing to this effort through detailed EPAs impact analysis studies and following them up with the organization of sub-regional workshops, one of which will be organized for the SADC countries.

I. PARTNERSHIP

7. African countries are today engaged in two intense and challenging multilateral negotiations that will have far reaching effects on the future economic growth and development of the continent depending on their outcomes. The first of these are the negotiations taking place under the Doha Work Programme. In 2001 at Doha, WTO Ministers of Trade gave their negotiators an important new mandate. A major thrust of the Doha mandate was to ensure that development issues and the interests of poor developing countries especially the poorer ones are placed at the heart of the negotiations. Majority of African countries are least developed countries. The second on-going negotiations relate to the Cotonou Partnership Agreement between the European Union (EU) and the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries. The CPA between the EU and the ACP countries succeeds the expired Lomé Agreement, and it envisages the signing of Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) by December 2007 between the EU and the ACP countries. The African countries have grouped themselves into four groups: Western Africa; Central Africa; Southern Africa; and Eastern and Southern Africa. Each of these countries' groupings revolves around key regional economic communities (RECs) that are spearheading the EPAs negotiations with the EU and the overall coordination of the African Union (AU).
8. In the past, there has been multiplicity of initiatives to support African countries. There was clearly a lack of coordination. The result was a duplication of efforts and low efficiency in the delivery of support to the African countries. In the last one-year or so, some efforts were made to improve the coordination of the delivery of the support to African countries. This coordination has involved both the donor nations, which include the Governments of Canada (CIDA), the United Kingdom (DFID), Belgium, Sweden and Finland and the agencies such as those of the UN, and other actors involved in trade capacity building in Africa. In deed, in April 2004, a stakeholders meeting under the auspices of the African Trade Policy Centre (ATPC) of ECA that is supported by CIDA was held in Tunis. The implementation of the recommendations from that stakeholders meeting has been improved coordination and higher efficiency in the supporting mechanisms to the African countries.
9. Both the Doha Round and the EPAs negotiations are a vital part of the fight against poverty, and are too extensive for any single development agency to

ensure that Africa realises an optimal outcome from them. The recently launched United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) project on trade capacity building for poverty reduction and human development in Sub-Saharan Africa is a major step in moving forward the coordinated collaboration of institutions supporting Africa. The project brings together all actors involved in and concerned with trade issues in Africa, in a partnership that will take advantage of the skills and experiences of each of them. These organisations are the AU, UNECA, AERC, SATRN, TWN, SEATINI and UNCTAD. The inter-agency coherence and capacity building for sub-Sahara Africa through the project are key elements in successfully concluding the Doha Round and the EPAs negotiations, and any future trade negotiations and providing concrete support to help developing and least developed countries take part in the negotiations and maximise on the benefits of the multilateral trading system. The overall objective of the trade capacity programme is to contribute to building and strengthening human, institutional and policy capacity in Sub-Saharan African countries for their effective participation in the multilateral and other international trade negotiations, and for formulating and implementing trade and related policies to achieve poverty reduction and higher levels of human development.

10. As part of this collaboration between the institutions, several workshops, seminars and meetings have been held and others are planned, to help African countries with the opportunity to synchronise their negotiating positions in the Doha Round and the EPAs process. In the post-Cancun period, such meetings have included: *“Post-Cancun Expert Group Meeting for African Trade Negotiators and Officials”* jointly organised by the ECA and the AU in Accra, Ghana, in November 2003; *“Kigali Conference of African Ministers of Trade”*, organised by the AU in May 2004; *“G-90 Ministers of Trade Meeting”* held in Mauritius, in July 2004; and the *“The High-Level Brainstorming Meeting for African Trade Negotiators and Officials”* held in Tunis in November 2004 and jointly organised by the ECA, UNDP and AfDB. The Tunis meeting was a turning point in the way agencies should collaborate in helping African countries and was extremely useful in assisting African countries solidify and crystallize their negotiating issues and positions in the WTO. During the Tunis meeting, the UNDP was able to bring together the various stakeholders assisting African countries in trade capacity building at the launch of the Trade Capacity Building project for Sub-Saharan Africa. In this stakeholders launch of the project, the representatives of the various organisations present, involved in the project reiterated the positive benefits and efficiency to be realised through better coordination of the support and help advanced to the African countries in all trade aspects.
11. Various organisations have been undertaking studies in relation to the EPAs negotiations and the ECA, the UNDP, and the leading RECs in the various sub-regions in collaboration with AU, AERC, SATRN, TWN, SEATINI and UNCTAD are organising several technical meetings, of which this is one of them, where the findings of these studies will be presented and discussed. The planned meetings are in Ouagadougou for ECOWAS from March 3 to 8, Kigali for the Eastern African region from March 14 to 19, and Maputo for SADC member-

states from April 4 to 5. The meeting for Central Africa has already taken place in Pointe-Noire, Congo from 2 to 3 December 2004. A continental meeting is proposed for Nairobi in the second half of 2005 to ensure a common understanding of an approach to the issues at stake. The collaborating agencies it is expected will be able to make presentations of their research findings and that the African countries will have the opportunity to concretise their positions on their issues of interests, not only under Doha and the EPAs, but also in any trade issues.

II. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE WORKSHOP

12. The workshop objective is to bring together SADC countries officials, as well as experts from selected institutions to:

- Undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the outcome and implications of July Package for African countries with a particular emphasis on the Tunis roadmap (November 2004); assist countries in the region to develop and refine their strategies for further negotiations under the Doha Development Agenda; to identify key areas of importance to African countries in the various “modalities” to be negotiated, particularly for agriculture and non-agricultural market access and any other areas; to develop suggestions on modalities for agriculture and non-agricultural market access (NAMA) as well as for negotiations on trade facilitation, based on research provided by international, regional and sub-regional organizations as well as research networks
- Undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the outcome and implications of EPAs negotiations for SADC countries; to develop and refine the strategies for further negotiations, to identify key areas of importance to SADC countries in the various modalities to be negotiated, particularly for development issues, market access, agriculture, fisheries, mining, trade in services and trade related areas as well as to map out a strategy for future negotiations.
- Work out ways to ensure coherence, compatibility and consistency between the processes of negotiations under the EPAs and that under the Doha Work Programme (DWP). In particular, the African countries will have the opportunity to determine the possible implications of the EPAs on the regional integration initiatives in the continent.

13. Specifically, the workshop will contribute to ongoing negotiations through sharing the findings of impact analysis studies with a view to providing:

- WTO challenges for Southern African countries

- A quantification of the EPAs implications at the country level, the regional level and for each of the groupings currently undertaking negotiations with the EU such as ESA, SADC, CEMAC and ECOWAS;
 - Identify key areas where the SADC countries can negotiate to improve the Lome Conventions and Cotonou Agreement;
 - Identify methods to be used in assessing the impact of the EPAS
 - Review domestic policy responses to the EPAS in order to maximize its positive effects and take into account the various individual member States concerns to achieve the desired objectives;
 - Identify and assess priorities to be followed by substantive negotiations in order to provide a clear road map for negotiators;
14. An understanding of these issues requires in-depth economic assessment of each individual SADC country, at all levels, in order to ascertain what type of adjustments are possible within a given country's resources and capacities.
15. Furthermore, the workshop will provide an opportunity for examining the different aspects of EPAs in a comprehensive manner in order to maximize the positive effects and achieve the desired objectives. In this context the workshop will make reflections on the compatibility of regional trade policies and regional integration processes and undertake an assessment of capacity building requirements for conducting the EPAs negotiations. Finally the workshop will make recommendations aimed at creating a close link between the SADC countries as a whole with a view to supporting ongoing regional integration efforts and to uphold existing trade ties within the sub-region.

III. DATE AND VENUE OF THE WORKSHOP

16. The workshop will be organized from 4 to 5 April 2005 in Maputo, Mozambique.

IV.3. Programme of Work

4 April 2005

- 08:00-09:00 hrs: Registration of Participants.
- 09:00-09:45 hrs: Official opening ceremony (Agenda item 1).
- Remarks by the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)
 - Remarks by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

- Welcome address by the Honorable Minister of Trade, Republic of Mozambique

09:45-10:00 hrs:	Adoption of the Agenda and Organization of Work (Agenda item 2 and 3).
10:00-10:20 hrs:	TEA / COFFEE BREAK
10:20-10:50 hrs:	Status of WTO negotiations (Agenda item 4). Presenter: ECA
10:50-11:50 hrs:	Discussion.
11:50-12:20 hrs:	Special session on market access (Agenda item 4.2). Presenter: ECA
12:20-13:00 hrs:	Discussion.
13:00-14:30 hrs:	LUNCH BREAK
14:30-15:00 hrs:	Content of EPAs and presentation of the results of EPAS impact studies (Agenda item 4.4) Presenter: ECA
15:00-16:00 hrs:	Discussion
16:00-16:20 hrs:	TEA / COFFEE BREAK
16:20-16:50 hrs:	EPAs and regional integration (Agenda item 4.5) Presenter: ECA
16:50-17:50 hrs:	Discussion.
<u>5 April 2005</u>	
9:00-13:00 hrs:	Presentation of findings of two books on trade by the World Bank (Agenda item 4.3).
09:00-09:20 hrs:	(a) Global trade reform under the Doha Development Agenda.
09:20-09:40 hrs:	Discussion.

09:40-10:10 hrs:	(b) Implications for poverty: Overview of the main findings: insights and policy implications
10:10-10:30 hrs:	Discussion.
10:30-10:50hrs:	TEA/ COFFEE BREAK
10:50-11:10 hrs:	(c) Implications of the Doha Development Agenda for poverty in Cameroon
11:10-11:30 hrs:	Discussion.
11:30-11:50 hrs:	(d) The Doha Round, cotton sector dynamics and poverty trends in Zambia
11:50-12:10 hrs:	Discussion.
12:10-12:30 hrs:	(e) Implications of the Doha Round for Mozambique
12:30-13:00 hrs:	Discussion
13:00-14:30 hrs:	LUNCH BREAK
14:30-15:00 hrs:	Special case of mining, agriculture, and fishing industries and mineral development (Agenda item 4.6) Presenter: ECA- SRO and ECA-SDD
15:00-15:40 hrs:	Discussion
15:40-16:00hrs:	TEA/ COFFEE BREAK
16:00-16:30 hrs:	Coherence between EPAs and WTO negotiations Presenter: UNDP
16:30-17:30 hrs:	Discussion
19:00-19:30 hrs:	Adoption of recommendations (Agenda item 5)
<u>6 April 2005</u>	
09:00-9:30 hrs:	Any other Business (Agenda item 6)
09:30-10:30 hrs:	Closure of the Workshop (Agenda item 7)