
Committee on Safeguards

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
HELD ON 2 MAY 2011**

Chairperson: Mr. Tobias Lorentzson

1. The Committee on Safeguards (the "Committee") held a regular meeting on 2 May 2011.
2. Regarding "Other Business", the representative of Turkey indicated that he wished to make a statement concerning an investigation by Ukraine. The representative of Egypt indicated that he wished to make a statement concerning an investigation by Jordan. The Chairperson stated that he wished to make a brief statement on clerical matters concerning notifications.
3. With this, the following agenda was adopted:
 - A. NATIONAL LEGISLATION 2
 1. **European Union – Review of New Legislative Notification 2**
 2. **Gabon – Review of New Legislative Notification 3**
 3. **Oman – Review of New Legislative Notification 3**
 - B. NOTIFICATIONS OF ACTIONS RELATED TO SAFEGUARD MEASURES 3
 1. **Dominican Republic – Certain Sports and Other Socks 3**
 2. **Ecuador – Windshields..... 4**
 3. **European Union – Wireless Wide Area Networking Modems 5**
 4. **India – N1, 3-Dimethyl Butyl-N Phenyl Paraphenylenediamine 5**
 5. **Indonesia – Cotton Yarn other than Sewing Thread..... 5**
 6. **Indonesia – Tarpaulins, Awnings and Sunblinds of Synthetic Fibres..... 7**
 7. **Indonesia – Stranded Wire, Ropes and Cables, Excluding Locked Coil, Flattened Strands and Non-Rotating Wire Ropes 7**
 8. **Indonesia – Certain Stranded Wire, Ropes and Cables 7**
 9. **Indonesia – Wire of Iron/Non-alloy Steel, Plated with Zinc 7**
 10. **Indonesia – Certain Wire of Iron Non-Alloy Steel (not plated/coated)..... 7**
 11. **Indonesia – Bleached and Unbleached Woven Fabric of Cotton 7**
 12. **Israel – Glass Wool and Rock Wool 8**
 13. **Kyrgyz Republic – Poultry Eggs 8**
 14. **Morocco – Machine-Made Carpets 8**
 15. **Thailand – Glass Block..... 8**

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 16. | Turkey – Polyethylene Terephthalate | 8 |
| 17. | Turkey – Spectacle Frames | 9 |
| 18. | Turkey – Travel Goods, Handbags and Similar Containers..... | 9 |
| 19. | Ukraine – Cooling and Refrigerating Equipment..... | 9 |
| 20. | Ukraine – Ferro-Manganese and Ferro-Silico-Manganese..... | 9 |
| 21. | Ukraine – Mineral or Chemical Fertilisers..... | 9 |
| 22. | Ukraine – Matches | 9 |
| 23. | Ukraine – Certain Products of Crude Oil Processing | 10 |
| C. | OTHER BUSINESS | 10 |
| 1. | Statement by Turkey | 10 |
| 2. | Statement by Egypt..... | 11 |
| 3. | Statement by the Chairperson | 11 |
| D. | DATE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING..... | 11 |
| E. | ELECTION OF OFFICERS | 12 |
| A. | NATIONAL LEGISLATION | |

4. The Chairperson stated that the first item on the Committee's agenda was the review of notifications of national safeguards legislation and/or regulations, in accordance with the procedures adopted by the Committee at its special meeting in April 1996.

5. Concerning the procedure for this meeting, the Chairperson stated that he would first give the floor to the Member whose legislation was being reviewed, to make any introductory statement that it wished. He would then invite that Member to present its answers to any written questions. In accordance with the procedures adopted by the Committee, a written version of those answers should also be provided after the meeting, unless it had already been provided. Members would also be given an opportunity to ask questions orally. After the meeting, there would be a period for the submission of additional written questions concerning any of the legislative notifications reviewed at this meeting.

6. The Chairperson stated that if Members wished to have written answers to questions, they had to ensure that all questions were presented in writing to the Member concerned, and to the Secretariat, no later than 23 May 2011. He stated that written answers to all questions submitted in writing by that deadline should be submitted to the Secretariat no later than 14 June 2011.

1. European Union – Review of New Legislative Notification

7. The Chairperson noted that the legislative notification from the European Union was contained in document G/SG/N/1/EEC/2. He noted that no written questions concerning this notification had been received.

8. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

2. Gabon – Review of New Legislative Notification

9. The Chairperson noted that the legislative notification from Gabon was contained in document G/SG/N/1/GAB/2. He noted that this was a nil notification, and that no written questions concerning this notification had been received.

10. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

3. Oman – Review of New Legislative Notification

11. The Chairperson noted that the legislative notification from Oman was contained in document G/SG/N/1/OMN/2. He noted that no written questions concerning this notification had been received.

12. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

13. The Chairperson reminded Members that the deadline for written questions concerning any legislation reviewed at this meeting was 23 May 2011. The deadline for written answers to all written questions, including questions submitted in writing prior to this meeting, was 14 June 2011. Concerning these deadlines, he reminded the Committee of the importance of providing written answers to written questions posed. The exchange of written questions and answers constituted the Committee's only record of the review of legislation. Thus, the Committee's records were left incomplete when written questions were not answered, or only answered long after the meeting where the review took place. He stated that, in order to help Members keep track of the questions posed and the responses submitted, any questions left unanswered would be indicated in the draft annotated agenda of the next Committee meeting.

14. Before proceeding to the next agenda item, the Chairperson informed the Committee that there were still 27 Members that had not yet made a legislative notification.¹ He stated that he would not read out the names of those Members, but wanted to note that this was one of the important obligations of the Safeguards Agreement. Members that did not yet have legislation need only submit a very simple "nil" notification. He stated that if delegations had any questions regarding the procedures for notifications, they should feel free to contact the Secretariat or the Chairperson.

B. NOTIFICATIONS OF ACTIONS RELATED TO SAFEGUARD MEASURES

15. The Chairperson noted that various notifications of actions related to safeguard measures had been received since the last meeting. In order to ensure that all of these notifications could be reviewed in the limited time available, the Chairperson suggested that the Committee address relevant safeguard investigations as separate agenda items, and review all of the notifications pertaining to each separate investigation at the same time.

1. Dominican Republic – Certain Sports and Other Socks

16. The Chairperson noted that the Dominican Republic had made two notifications regarding an investigation on certain sports and other socks in documents G/SG/N/8/DOM/2/Suppl.1–G/SG/N/10/DOM/2–G/SG/N/11/DOM/2/Suppl.1.

17. The representative of Panama stated that Panama had requested consultations with the Dominican Republic, and was waiting for a response.

¹ These Members were: Angola, Antigua & Barbuda, Belize, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, the Gambia, Grenada, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Saint Kitts & Nevis, Saint Vincent & Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, and Tonga.

18. The representative of the Dominican Republic stated that she would check.

19. The representative of Brazil referred to document G/SG/N/8/DOM/1/Suppl.2–G/SG/N/10/DOM/1–G/SG/N/11/DOM/1/Suppl.1, which related to an investigation on a different product, tubular fabric. She noted that in that document, Brazil was not listed as a developing country to which the measure did not apply by virtue of Article 9.1. In fact, Brazil had not exported the product during the period of investigation. By contrast, in the notification at issue here, Brazil was listed as a developing country to which the measure did not apply by virtue of Article 9.1. In addition, she noted that the second table indicated that the total share of developing countries' shares exceeded 9 per cent. Brazil wished to clarify what the criterion was that the Dominican Republic was using in terms of the 9.1 exclusion.

20. The representative of the Dominican Republic clarified that a three-year period was used, and stated that Brazil did not appear on the table if it was not exporting during that period.

2. Ecuador – Windshields

21. The Chairperson noted that Ecuador had made notifications regarding an investigation on windshields in documents G/SG/N/8/ECU/3–G/SG/N/10/ECU/4 and G/SG/N/8/ECU/3/Suppl.1–G/SG/N/10/ECU/4/Suppl.1–G/SG/N/11/ECU/1.

22. The representative of Colombia stated that Colombia had concerns regarding this item. In Colombia's views, Ecuador had not complied with the procedural requirements of the Agreement. In particular, Ecuador did not comply with Article 12. It did not provide adequate opportunity for consultations in line with Article 12. In this regard, he stated that Colombia would submit a request asking the Committee to act on the basis of Article 13.1(b) of the Agreement.²

23. The representative of Ecuador stated that Ecuador would consider that request, and would report back on this issue at the next regular Committee meeting. At the same time, he stressed that Ecuador had complied with the relevant procedures. Ecuador submitted the notification on 15 October 2010, and the measure was imposed only on 1 November 2010. And Ecuador did consult with Colombia twice.

24. The Chairperson clarified that he did not expect substantive discussion on this matter since this issue was raised only now, and went on to ask whether any Member wished to take the floor on this matter. He also clarified that his intention was, unless Members objected, to propose that the Committee hold a special meeting in due course to discuss this issue.

25. Having seen no flags up, the Chairperson stated that he would ask the incoming Chair to hold a special meeting in due course to discuss this issue, and that he would ask the incoming chair to make the necessary arrangements, and inform Members of the next steps.

26. The representative of Ecuador asked whether there was any precedence or procedure on this issue. He noted that Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedures of the Committee should be applicable. He stated that he would like to hear the views of the Secretariat as well.

27. The Chairperson stated that there was no precedence.

28. The Secretariat stated that Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedures concerned "Other Business".

² Subsequently submitted and circulated as document G/L/957–G/SG/93.

29. The representative of Ecuador clarified that he was talking about the possibility of holding a special meeting. He understood that there was no provision in the Rules of Procedures about special meetings. The relevant rule only provided that the Committee "shall meet not less than twice a year in regular session, and otherwise as appropriate". He asked what the provision was that provided for special meetings.

30. The Chairperson stated that, as read out by Ecuador, the provision read "not less than twice a year". He clarified that whatever one calls the meeting, what he was proposing was that the Committee discuss this issue at the next separate meeting. He stated that he would leave it to the incoming Chair to see in what way it could be done – whether it could be discussed before the regular meeting or otherwise. He stated that he would ask the incoming chair to consult with Members.

31. The representative of Ecuador thanked the Chairperson for the clarification, and stated that he had noted that together with Article 25 of the Rules of Procedures.

3. European Union – Wireless Wide Area Networking Modems

32. The Chairperson noted that the European Union had made a notification regarding an investigation on Wireless Wide Area Networking Modems in document G/SG/N/9/EEC/2.

33. The representative of China welcomed the termination of the investigation, but stated that considering the potential commercial impact, China urged Members to be prudent in deciding to open an investigation.

4. India – N1, 3-Dimethyl Butyl-N Phenyl Paraphenylenediamine

34. The Chairperson noted that India had made a notification regarding an investigation on N1, 3-Dimethyl Butyl-N Phenyl Paraphenylenediamine in document G/SG/N/6/IND/28.

35. The representative of the European Union stated that the European Union took issue with the initiation of this investigation, and urged India to terminate the proceedings. In the view of the European Union, there was no surge in imports, and no unforeseen development. There was also an issue with injury determination in relation to capacity utilization, share, and profits of domestic industry. The injury analysis period of 10 years was also far too long. In addition, the European Union was of the view that certain injury suffered by the domestic industry was due to dumping, which was already remedied by a separate remedy of anti-dumping duties.

36. The representative of the United States stated that the United States also had concerns with this notification. The United States was concerned about the ten-year analysis period used. He noted that India used more recent data in other notifications. He also noted that there appeared to be several indications of health within the domestic industry.

37. The representative of India asked the questions to be submitted in writing.

5. Indonesia – Cotton Yarn other than Sewing Thread

38. The Chairperson noted that Indonesia had made several notifications regarding an investigation on cotton yarn other than sewing thread in documents G/SG/N/8/IDN/4, G/SG/N/8/IDN/4/Suppl.1–G/SG/N/10/IDN/4, and G/SG/N/8/IDN/4/Suppl.2–G/SG/N/10/IDN/4/Suppl.1. Questions concerning this notification had been received from India in document G/SG/Q2/IDN/1.

39. The representative of Indonesia made three points in the general, not necessarily limited to this item. First, he stated that Indonesia handled all investigations in a fair and transparent manner. Of the seven notifications made to this meeting, two, including this item, related to a stage before an imposition. In particular, notwithstanding the title given to documents G/SG/N/8/IDN/4/Suppl.1–G/SG/N/10/IDN/4 and G/SG/N/8/IDN/4/Suppl.2–G/SG/N/10/IDN/4/Suppl.1, it was his delegation's understanding that these notifications regarding cotton yarn were made under Article 12.1(b), and not Article 12.1(c). He suspected that this may have created certain confusion. Second, he explained that recently, there was a significant number of applications from the domestic industry to initiate safeguard investigations. While it was true that there were five final measures recently imposed, he stressed that the government's findings in all of the investigations were based on an objective and accountable process. The domestic industry was now well aware of the remedies that were available to them. The government was in a delicate position. It had to ensure that the imposition of measures were in line with applicable rules, and therefore could not accept all the applications for investigations. Third, he reiterated that Indonesia's investigation proceedings would take into account the applicable rules and regulations as well as best practices. Indonesia was willing to discuss any matters with Members, and would offer the opportunity for consultations in light of the relevant multilateral framework.

40. Finally, he informed that the response to the questions from India had already been provided to India.

41. The representative of India stated that their capital was still looking at the Indonesian replies, and would revert later.

42. The Chairperson requested Indonesia to submit the response so that it could be circulated to all Members.³ In relation to Indonesia's statement that the notification was intended to be made under Article 12.1(b) and not Article 12.1(c), the Secretariat explained that there was an established practice of how to provide titles of certain notifications, and so the title of a document would not necessarily be the same as the one given by the notifying Member. However, the content of the notification was exactly the same as notified.

43. The representative of Japan registered Japan's general concern that some notifications, not limited to the ones from Indonesia, were late, and thus there was insufficient time for the exporters to submit comments. She stated that, for example, Indonesia's investigation regarding "certain wire of iron/non-alloy steel, plated with zinc" was submitted on 3 February 2010, while the actual initiation date was 21 January 2010. As correctly indicated in document G/SG/N/8/IDN/7, in this investigation, only the domestic industries submitted comments. It was regrettable that exporters with substantial interests were deprived the opportunity to comment, due to late notifications. The notification of imposition was also late in this investigation. Japan noted that Thailand's initiation notification regarding glass block and Ukraine's notification regarding certain products of crude oil processing, both of which were on the agenda, were also late. Japan urged Members to make immediate notifications in order that interested parties had sufficient time to comment.

44. The representative of the United States echoed the concerns raised by Japan and India regarding the general need for timely notification, and pointed out the short registration periods and compressed deadlines that often accompanied safeguard investigations.

45. The representative of Canada pointed out that the safeguard instrument was unique in the sense that it was applied on otherwise "fair" trade, and urged Members to carefully abide by the rules, including timely notifications.

³ Subsequently circulated in document G/SG/Q2/IDN/2.

46. The representative of Indonesia asked that questions be submitted in writing.

6. Indonesia – Tarpaulins, Awnings and Sunblinds of Synthetic Fibres

47. The Chairperson noted that Indonesia had made a notification regarding an investigation on tarpaulins, awnings and sunblinds of synthetic fibres in document G/SG/N/6/IDN/13.

48. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

7. Indonesia – Stranded Wire, Ropes and Cables, Excluding Locked Coil, Flattened Strands and Non-Rotating Wire Ropes

49. The Chairperson noted that Indonesia had made a notification regarding an investigation on stranded wire, ropes and cables, excluding locked coil, flattened strands and non-rotating wire ropes in document G/SG/N/8/IDN/5-G/SG/N/10/IDN/5-G/SG/N/11/IDN/4.

50. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

8. Indonesia – Certain Stranded Wire, Ropes and Cables

51. The Chairperson noted that Indonesia had made a notification regarding an investigation on certain stranded wire, ropes and cables in document G/SG/N/8/IDN/6-G/SG/N/10/IDN/6-G/SG/N/11/IDN/5.

52. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

9. Indonesia – Wire of Iron/Non-alloy Steel, Plated with Zinc

53. The Chairperson noted that Indonesia had made a notification regarding an investigation on wire of iron/non-alloy steel, plated with zinc in document G/SG/N/8/IDN/7-G/SG/N/10/IDN/7-G/SG/N/11/IDN/6.

54. The representative of Indonesia noted that Japan's earlier general comments included comments specifically on this item, and requested that any question be submitted in writing.

10. Indonesia – Certain Wire of Iron Non-Alloy Steel (not plated/coated)

55. The Chairperson noted that Indonesia had made a notification regarding an investigation on certain wire of iron non-alloy steel in document G/SG/N/8/IDN/8-G/SG/N/10/IDN/8-G/SG/N/11/IDN/7.

56. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

11. Indonesia – Bleached and Unbleached Woven Fabric of Cotton

57. The Chairperson noted that Indonesia had made a notification regarding an investigation on bleached and unbleached woven fabric of cotton in document G/SG/N/8/IDN/9-G/SG/N/10/IDN/9-G/SG/N/11/IDN/8.

58. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

12. Israel – Glass Wool and Rock Wool

59. The Chairperson noted that Israel had made a notification regarding an investigation on glass wool and rock wool in document G/SG/N/6/ISR/2.

60. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

13. Kyrgyz Republic – Poultry Eggs

61. The Chairperson noted that Kyrgyz Republic had made a notification regarding an investigation on poultry eggs in document G/SG/N/6/KGZ/3.

62. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

14. Morocco – Machine-Made Carpets

63. The Chairperson noted that Morocco had made a notification regarding an investigation on machine-made carpets in document G/SG/N/9/MAR/3.

64. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

15. Thailand – Glass Block

65. The Chairperson noted that Thailand had made a notification regarding an investigation on glass block in documents G/SG/N/6/THA/1 and G/SG/N/7/THA/1–G/SG/N/8/THA/1–G/SG/N/11/THA/1 & Suppl.1.

66. The representative of the European Union stated that the European Union took issue with the provisional measure. In the view of the European Union, the provisional measure was not warranted. There were no critical circumstances justifying the imposition of a provisional measure, nor was there any reference to unforeseen developments. In addition, he stated that the investigating authority failed to demonstrate serious injury and that the notification did not contain any meaningful information. He noted that Thailand was also imposing anti-dumping duties on the same product, and the European Union was concerned that Thailand would proceed with an impermissible double-remedy.

67. The representative of Indonesia stated he agreed with the European Union that the notification had to include sufficient data.

68. The representative of Thailand requested that questions be submitted in writing.

16. Turkey – Polyethylene Terephthalate

69. The Chairperson noted that Turkey had made a notification regarding an investigation on polyethylene terephthalate in document G/SG/N/6/TUR/16.

70. The representative of the European Union stated that the European Union was generally concerned about the recent extensive use of safeguards by Turkey. Safeguards were instruments to be used exceptionally. For this product, in the view of the European Union, there was no recent, sudden, sharp or significant increase of imports while domestic production remained unchanged, and nor was there serious injury.

71. The representative of Indonesia stated that he agreed with the points made by the European Union.

72. The representative of Turkey stated that it was well understood that safeguards should be used exceptionally, and that Turkey was indeed using it exceptionally. He stressed that all of the safeguard duty rates were lower than the bound rate, which was rather low. He further explained that Turkey had a customs union with the European Union, which had a certain effect on Turkey's way of proceeding. He also stressed the fact that Turkey was a developing country. For this specific investigation, he requested that questions be submitted in writing.

17. Turkey – Spectacle Frames

73. The Chairperson noted that Turkey had made a notification regarding an investigation on spectacle frames in document G/SG/N/7/TUR/8–G/SG/N/11/TUR/14–G/SG/N/14/TUR/5.

74. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

18. Turkey – Travel Goods, Handbags and Similar Containers

75. The Chairperson noted that Turkey had made a notification regarding an investigation on travel goods, handbags and similar containers G/SG/N/7/TUR/9–G/SG/N/11/TUR/15–G/SG/N/14/TUR/6.

76. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

19. Ukraine – Cooling and Refrigerating Equipment

77. The Chairperson noted that Ukraine had made two notifications regarding an investigation on cooling and refrigerating equipment in documents G/SG/N/6/UKR/7/Suppl.1 and G/SG/N/9/UKR/4.

78. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

20. Ukraine – Ferro-Manganese and Ferro-Silico-Manganese

79. The Chairperson noted that Ukraine had made a notification regarding an investigation on ferro-manganese and ferro-silico-manganese in document G/SG/N/6/UKR/6/Suppl.1.

80. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

21. Ukraine – Mineral or Chemical Fertilisers

81. The Chairperson noted that Ukraine had made two notifications regarding an investigation on mineral or chemical fertilisers in documents G/SG/N/6/UKR/5/Suppl.1 and G/SG/N/9/UKR/3.

82. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

22. Ukraine – Matches

83. The Chairperson noted that Ukraine had made a notification regarding an investigation on matches in document G/SG/N/8/UKR/2/Suppl.1–G/SG/N/10/UKR/2/Suppl.1.

84. There were no comments or questions regarding this notification.

23. Ukraine – Certain Products of Crude Oil Processing

85. The Chairperson noted that Ukraine had made a notification regarding an investigation on certain products of crude oil processing in document G/SG/N/6/UKR/8.

86. The representative of Turkey noted that the notification was circulated nearly two and a half months after the actual initiation, which was on 29 January 2011. Turkey asked Ukraine to make timely notifications, and urged all Members to do so as well.

87. The representative of Ukraine explained that the notification was sent to the Central Registry of Notifications on 10 March 2011, but was actually circulated only on 13 April 2011.

88. The Chairperson stated that he understood that there had been some mistake, and asked the Secretariat to clarify. The Secretariat acknowledged that the notification was originally received by the Central Registry of Notifications on 10 March 2011, and that it was somehow lost in the system. It was only on 12 April that the Rules Division was made aware of the notification, hence the delay in circulating the document.

89. The representative of the European Union made several points. First, the product scope of this investigation was too wide. In the view of the European Union, certain products needed to be analysed separately. Second, certain products included in the investigation were not like products, and should be excluded from the investigation. Thirdly, there was no surge of imports. Finally, the decrease of domestic production was not caused by imports, and there was no causal link between imports and injury.

90. The representative of Ukraine requested that questions be submitted in writing.

91. The Chairperson thanked all delegations for their statements, questions and answers concerning the various notifications of actions related to safeguard measures. He reminded delegations once again that any questions for which written responses were requested should be submitted to the Member concerned and to the Secretariat no later than 23 May 2011. He also reminded delegations that written responses to questions, including questions submitted in writing prior to this meeting, should be submitted to the Secretariat no later than 14 June 2011. As with the legislative notifications, if there were any questions left unanswered, they would be indicated in the draft annotated agenda of the next Committee meeting.

92. The Committee took note of the statements made.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Statement by Turkey

93. The representative of Turkey referred to a notification made by Ukraine in document G/SG/N/6/UKR/4, circulated on 4 September 2009, concerning an initiation of an investigation on float glass. Notification of the imposition of the provisional measure on this product was circulated on 4 December 2009 in document G/SG/N/7/UKR/1. While Turkey understood that Ukraine imposed a final measure with a duration of 10 days on 23 October 2010, that final measure was not notified. Turkey requested an update of this investigation.

94. The representative of Ukraine asked that the question be posed in writing.

2. Statement by Egypt

95. The representative of Egypt referred to a notification made by Jordan in document G/SG/N/10/JOR/7/Suppl.2–G/SG/N/11/JOR/3/Suppl.2, circulated in September 2010, concerning the imposition of a final measure on ceramic tiles. He noted that there were two similar notifications preceding this imposition notification, the first one being notified in document G/SG/N/8/JOR/7–G/SG/N/10/JOR/7–G/SG/N/11/JOR/3, circulated in July 2009, and the second one being notified in document G/SG/N/10/JOR/7/Suppl.1–G/SG/N/11/JOR/3/Suppl.1, circulated in March 2010. The investigation was initiated in 2008. This turn of events resulted in a gap of 20 months between the end of the investigation and the time of the ultimate decision. In addition, the period of investigation was 2003-2008. In Egypt's view, this was not in line with the disciplines of the Agreement. There were other problems with the findings as well. First, the increase of imports was not recent, sudden, sharp or significant enough. There were no unforeseen developments, and no causal link. Egypt was also of the view that the level of the duty was questionable, since the final duty was three times higher than that which was originally proposed. In addition, Jordan had not provided sufficient information which Egypt had requested in various consultations. The representative of Egypt further noted that the latest notification indicated that the measure would be "reviewed after six months of its implementation", which meant that the review should have been done in March 2011. He asked what the current situation was.

96. The representative of Jordan stated that the measure was in compliance with the Agreement, and that timely notifications had also been made. Prior consultations with Egypt had taken place, and the relevant questions had been answered. As for the review, he explained that it was on-going, and that a notification would be made as soon as there was a result. With regard to the outstanding questions, he asked that these be posed in writing.

3. Statement by the Chairperson

97. The Chairperson made a statement on certain administrative matters concerning notifications. He first reminded Members that the new format of notifications adopted in 2009 was found in document G/SG/1/Rev.1–G/SG/N/6/Rev.1–G/SG/89. Second, he strongly encouraged Members to submit electronic versions of their notifications to assist the Secretariat in the timely circulation of documents. He added that he was pleased to report that Members were increasingly submitting their notifications in electronic form. Third, he encouraged Members to submit, together with their notifications, an electronic version of the publicly available document containing the relevant decisions made by the competent authority. The "publicly available document" did not need to be in the WTO official language. This would allow the notifying Member to provide detailed information without having to produce a long WTO notification. Finally, he asked Members to ensure, as far as possible, that their notifications did not contain typographical and other errors, since that might cause delays in the translation and eventual circulation of the documents. He clarified that neither the secretary of the Committee, nor the translators were in a position to edit the text of notifications.

98. The Committee took note of the statements made.

D. DATE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING

99. The Chairperson suggested that the Committee meet in the week of 24 October 2011. He stated that the exact date would be confirmed in due course.

100. The Committee so decided.

E. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

101. The Chairperson stated that the chairperson of the Council for Trade in Goods had carried out informal consultations on the nomination of chairpersons for the different bodies operating under the auspices of the Council for Trade in Goods. The proposed nominations were taken note of by the Council for Trade in Goods. He stated that concerning this Committee, the chairperson of the Council for Trade in Goods proposed the nomination of Ms Lillian Saili Bwalya of Zambia. He therefore proposed that the Committee elect Ms Saili Bwalya as Chairperson.

102. The Committee so decided.

103. Regarding the position of Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, the Chairperson stated that he had conducted consultations with a number of Members, and on the basis of those consultations he proposed that the Committee elect Ms Tomoko Ota of Japan as Vice-Chair of the Committee.

104. The Committee so decided.
