RESTRICTED

G/LIC/M/44

27 April 2017

(17-2315) Page: 1/17

Committee on Import Licensing

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3 NOVEMBER 2016

CHAIRPERSON: MR. TAPIO PYYSALO (FINLAND)

The Committee on Import Licensing held its forty-fifth meeting on 3 November 2016 under the chairmanship of Mr. Tapio Pyysalo (Finland). The agenda proposed for the meeting was circulated in document WTO/AIR/LIC/4.

The Russian Federation requested that the issue of Ukraine's market access restrictions on foreign printed products be placed on the agenda under "Other Business". The European Union requested the issue of "Outstanding Replies from Morocco" also to be placed on the agenda under "Other Business". The agenda was adopted with these additions.

Table of contents

1 MEMBERS' COMPLIANCE WITH NOTIFICATION OBLIGATIONS – DEVELOPMENTS SINCE THE LAST MEETING

1.1. The Chairperson informed the Committee that a total of 55 notifications had been received and listed for consideration since the last meeting, including: 18 notifications under Article 1.4(a) and/or 8.2(b); 12 under Article 5; and 25 notifications under Article 7.3. Two recent notifications under Article 7.3 (from Singapore and the United States) and a few recent notifications under Article 5.5 from the Philippines would be considered at the next formal Committee meeting.

1.2. As of 3 November 2016, 16 Members had not yet submitted any notifications under any provision of the Agreement; 29 Members had not yet submitted any N/1 notifications concerning their laws and regulations as well as the sources of information under Articles 1.4(a) and 8.2(b); and 25 Members had never submitted replies to the questionnaire under Article 7.3. For the sake of transparency, he urged those Members to submit their notifications as soon as possible.

1.3. On a positive note, he congratulated Afghanistan and Seychelles for submitting their first notifications to this Committee under Article 1.4(a) and/or Article 8.2(b) (documents G/LIC/N/1/AFG/1 and G/LIC/N/1/SYC/1), and El Salvador and Kazakhstan for their first N/3 notifications under Article 7.3 (documents G/LIC/N/3/SLV/1 and G/LIC/N/3/KAZ/1).

1.4. He informed the Committee that the overall notification compliance rate was still not encouraging. With regard to Members' replies to the annual questionnaire, from 21 October 2015 to 21 October 2016, only 35 Members had submitted their replies and, of those, 20 submissions were for the current year, while the rest were delayed notifications relating to previous years. This situation was summarized in Annex III of the Committee's report to the CTG (document G/LIC/W/46).

1.5. In this context, he brought Members' attention to the following: (1) Members that did not apply import licensing procedures or had no laws or regulations relevant to the Agreement were nevertheless required to notify the Committee of this fact; (2) Article 5.1 required Members that instituted import licensing procedures or changes in these procedures to notify the Committee of such procedures or changes within 60 days of publication; (3) Article 7.3 of the Agreement obliged all Members to complete the Questionnaire on Import Licensing Procedures on a yearly basis and to submit the completed questionnaire to the Committee by 30 September each year. He urged Members to respect these timelines in the fulfilment of their notification obligations.

1.6. On improving transparency and streamlining notification procedures under the Agreement, the Chairman highlighted that, under the able leadership of previous Chairpersons, and with the support of the Secretariat, efforts had been made to identify the underlying reasons behind low notification compliance under this Agreement. He was encouraged to see that more and more Members were actively involved in the effort to find solutions, as demonstrated in the informal session earlier that day. Three informal meetings in total had been held to discuss this issue since

he took office in May, and the Chair indicated that he would report on those meetings under agenda item 10.

1.7. The Committee took note of the Chairman's statement.

2 WRITTEN QUESTIONS AND REPLIES FROM MEMBERS ON SPECIFIC TRADE CONCERNS

2.1. The Chairman indicated that there was only one document (G/LIC/Q/MEX/2) for review under this agenda item: replies from Mexico to the United States on questions regarding its licensing regime on certain steel products. He also noted that on 2 November the United States had submitted written questions to Indonesia on its import regimes on cellphones, handheld computers, and tablets; these questions would be circulated shortly.

2.1 Replies from Mexico to the United States (G/LIC/Q/MEX/2)

2.2. The representative of Mexico thanked the United States for its interest in Mexico's import licensing regime. He hoped that, with the replies contained in document G/LIC/Q/MEX/2 circulated on 28 June, the concerns of the US and other Members had been addressed. He reiterated that Mexico's automatic import licensing regime was in compliance with the relevant provisions of the Agreement, and Article 2 in particular. Mexico hoped that, with these replies, the item would no longer appear on the agenda.

2.3. The representative of the United States thanked Mexico for its replies. He indicated that the US would nevertheless comment on the issue again as it continued to have concerns over Mexico's licensing system.

2.4. The Committee took note of the statements made.

3 NOTIFICATIONS

3.1 Notifications under Articles 1.4(a)/8.2(b) of the Agreement

3.1. The following N/1 notifications from 12 Members were reviewed: Afghanistan (G/LIC/N/1/AFG/1); Bolivia, Plurinational State of (G/LIC/N/1/BOL/3 and G/LIC/N/1/BOL/4); Brazil (G/LIC/N/1/BRA/7 and G/LIC/N/1/BRA/7/Corr.1); Ecuador (G/LIC/N/1/ECU/6); European Union (G/LIC/N/1/EU/8 and G/LIC/N/1/EU/9); Macao, China (G/LIC/N/1/MAC/6); Paraguay (G/LIC/N/1/PRY/7); Philippines (G/LIC/N/1/PHL/5); Russian Federation (G/LIC/N/1/RUS/12, G/LIC/N/1/RUS/13, G/LIC/N/1/RUS/14, G/LIC/N/1/RUS/15, and G/LIC/N/1/RUS/16); Seychelles (G/LIC/N/1/SYC/1); the Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu (G/LIC/N/1/TPKM/11); and Thailand (G/LIC/N/1/THA/2).

3.1.1 Bolivia, Plurinational State of (G/LIC/N/1/BOL/3 and G/LIC/N/1/BOL/4)

3.2. The representative of the European Union thanked Bolivia for the submission of these two notifications. With reference to notification G/LIC/N/1/BOL/3, the EU noted that it was linked to notification G/LIC/N/2/BOL/2 and submitted in accordance with Article 5 of the ILA. The EU understood that these notifications related to measures put in place in Supreme Decree No. 2752/2016, which required prior authorization for the importation of certain goods, and which entered into force in July 2016. On notification G/LIC/N/1/BOL/4, the EU understood that it related to the measure put in place in Supreme Decree No. 2865/2016, which required prior authorization for the importation of certain goods, notably certain dry-cleaning machines. She noted that the EU was of the view that the procedures were not described in sufficient detail in these notifications. Furthermore, the EU regretted that Bolivia had not submitted an annual import licencing notification since 2000. For these reasons, the EU asked Bolivia to provide details of the procedures and, in particular, to clarify the purpose and intended length of the measures. In addition, the EU asked when Bolivia intended to submit its annual notification so as to provide a detailed explanation of all import procedures currently in place.

3.3. The representative of the Plurinational State of Bolivia responded that he had taken note of the comments made by the EU, and requested the EU to provide its questions in writing so that they could be sent to Capital for due consideration.

3.1.2 Brazil (G/LIC/N/1/BRA/7)

3.4. The representative of the European Union thanked Brazil for the submission of this notification. She understood that Brazil had submitted notification G/LIC/N/1/BRA/7 and G/LIC/N/1/BRA/7/Corr.1 in accordance with Articles 1.4 and 8.2 of the ILA, which did not refer to a specific product but rather the general import procedure systems in place. Considering that it seemed to be closely linked to Brazil's notification submitted under Article 5 of the ILA, and circulated as document G/LIC/N/2/BRA/7, as well as Brazil's annual notification, circulated as document G/LIC/N/3/BRA/11, the EU would raise its questions to Brazil under agenda Item 3:III.

3.1.3 European Union (G/LIC/N/1/EU/8 and G/LIC/N/1/EU/9)

3.5. The representative of the Russian Federation thanked the EU for the submission of these two notifications and indicated that it would make a statement on these measures under agenda Item 4.

3.6. The Committee took note of the submissions and statements made.

3.2 Notifications under Article 5 of the Agreement

3.7. The following N/2 notifications from 8 Members were reviewed: Argentina (G/LIC/N/2/ARG/27/Add.1, G/LIC/N/2/ARG/27/Add.2, and G/LIC/N/2/ARG/27/Add.3); Bolivia, Plurinational State of (G/LIC/N/2/BOL/1 and G/LIC/N/2/BOL/2); Brazil (G/LIC/N/2/BRA/7); El Salvador (G/LIC/N/2/SLV/1); European Union (G/LIC/N/2/EU/8 and G/LIC/N/2/EU/9); Hong Kong, China (G/LIC/N/2/HKG/7); Malaysia (G/LIC/N/2/MYS/7); and Paraguay (G/LIC/N/2/PRY/6).

3.2.1 Bolivia, Plurinational State of (G/LIC/N/2/BOL/1 and G/LIC/N/2/BOL/2)

3.8. The representative of the European Union thanked Bolivia for the submission of these notifications. The EU would like to receive further detailed information on the import procedures contained in document G/LIC/N/2/BOL/1, which related to measures put in place in Supreme Decree No. 2600/2015 requiring prior authorization for importation of gaming machines. The EU requested Bolivia to present the detail of these procedures and to clarify the intended length of the measure.

3.2.2 Malaysia (G/LIC/N/2/MYS/7)

3.9. The representative of the European Union thanked Malaysia for the submission of this notification and, in particular, for the abolishment of the import licensing requirement for these products. The EU sought clarification on whether or not the abolishment was permanent, and whether they also envisaged abolishing the import licensing requirement for other products.

3.10. The representative of Malaysia thanked the EU and requested that it submit its questions in written form so as to allow Malaysia to formulate more concrete responses.

3.11. The Committee took note of the statements made.

3.3 Notifications under Article 7.3 of the Agreement

3.12. The following N/3 notifications were reviewed at the meeting: Brazil (G/LIC/N/3/BRA/11); Cameroon (G/LIC/N/3/CMR/6); Canada (G/LIC/N/3/CAN/15); Cuba (G/LIC/N/3/CUB/8); El Salvador (G/LIC/N/3/SLV/1); European Union (G/LIC/N/3/EU/5); Honduras (G/LIC/N/3/HND/10); Hong Kong, China (G/LIC/N/3/HKG/20); India (G/LIC/N/3/IND/16); Japan (G/LIC/N/3/JPN/15); Jordan (G/LIC/N/3/JOR/3); Kazakhstan (G/LIC/N/3/KAZ/1 and G/LIC/N/3/KAZ/1/Corr.1); Kuwait (G/LIC/N/3/KWT/6); Liechtenstein (G/LIC/N/3/LIE/9); Macao, China (G/LIC/N/3/MAC/19 and G/LIC/N/3/MAC/19/Corr.1); Mauritius (G/LIC/N/3/MUS/6); Mexico (G/LIC/N/3/MEX/5); Panama (G/LIC/N/3/PAN/7); Philippines (G/LIC/N/3/PHL/12); Russian Federation (G/LIC/N/3/RUS/3); Seychelles (G/LIC/N/3/SYC/2); Switzerland (G/LIC/N/3/CHE/12); the Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu (G/LIC/N/3/TPKM/7);

Turkey (G/LIC/N/3/TUR/15); and Ukraine (G/LIC/N/3/UKR/9). Comments were made on the following notifications:

3.3.1 Brazil (G/LIC/N/3/BRA/11)

3.13. The representative of the European Union thanked Brazil for the submission of its annual notification. She noted that this notification did not comply with the requirements set out in the questionnaire and contained in document G/LIC/3 (Annex). The annual notification should give a brief presentation of each system as a whole and, with respect to each system, reply to the questions as relevant. She argued that Brazil had limited itself to referring to the SISCOMEX without really giving a detailed description of the procedures for each product. Therefore, the EU wished to receive the following clarifications:

- Could Brazil provide a complete description of the procedures in place per each single product subject to import licensing requirements?

- Could Brazil provide the list of tariff lines covered under automatic and non-automatic import licensing?

- Could Brazil provide more detailed justification as to why so many tariff lines were covered by automatic and non-automatic import licensing?

3.14. In particular, according to the information available it seemed that, for importation of products corresponding to more than 5,000 tariff lines, an import licence would be necessary. In this respect:

- First, could Brazil clarify whether or not this information was correct?

- Second, could Brazil explain how this was justified, taking also into account that in its annual notification Brazil had declared that, as a rule, the Brazilian import regime did not require licensing?

- Third, could Brazil clarify the reasons for such an extensive use of import licensing?

3.15. As the products were not clearly defined, the EU reiterated its concerns on the procedures in place for importation of nitrocellulose and asked Brazil for further clarification. In particular, the EU noted that Brazil's notification included a reference to the Ministry of Industry, where a table was provided for import procedures (http://www.mdic.gov.br/comercio-exterior/importacao/tratamento-administrativo-de-importacao). According to that table, it seemed that the importation of nitrocellulose was subject to an automatic import licence. The EU requested Brazil to confirm that the import of products under NCM 3912.20 (nitrocellulose) was covered by automatic import licences? And, if so, the EU wished Brazil to clarify in detail the procedures for the importation of these products, given that EU companies had still experienced problems in the importation of this product onto the Brazilian market. As already stated on several occasions in this Committee, the EU maintained its view that Brazil had in place non-automatic import licensing procedures for nitrocellulose for industrial purposes. This represented a *de facto* unjustified ban. The EU considered it regrettable that the import procedures of industrial nitrocellulose had not changed and urged Brazil to amend its legislation.

3.16. In response, the representative of Brazil pointed out that the EU's intervention contained a number of elements that had not been the object of prior written questions and to which he could therefore not immediately respond. He made a preliminary comment but wished to receive the EU's questions in writing.

3.17. He was aware that his explanation had not convinced the EU to withdraw the issue of nitrocellulose from the agenda. At this point, he could only make reference to the previous clarifications provided by Brazil in this Committee, and at the CTG, and he requested the Secretariat to include those remarks in the record of this meeting, particularly the remarks that were offered to the Committee at its meeting in April.[1]

[1] See document G/LIC/M/43, paragraphs 5.6-5.8.

3.18. With regard to the information on the SISCOMEX website, he recalled that the licensing measure for nitrocellulose had been characterized as an automatic licensing procedure and believed that the information previously provided had been correct. Nevertheless, he agreed to check and clarify the relevant information as soon as possible and, if necessary, would request a correction to be made to the system.

3.19. On the EU's assessment that Brazil's N/3 notification was not in compliance with the requirements of the Agreement, he disagreed. He believed that Brazil had provided sufficient detail and sources of information, both to the Secretariat and to the Committee, to allow Members to verify Brazil's licensing procedures. He referred to the N/3 notification that made reference to the SISCOMEX website and claimed that this was fully consistent in a digital era. He indicated that Brazil was willing to provide any necessary clarification or to engage with Members bilaterally if the EU and other interested Members had any problem with the information currently provided in the system.

3.20. With regard to the remaining questions, he indicated that he had taken note of the points raised and would verify these with Brasilia, namely the issue of automatic/non-automatic licensing measures, applied to which products, and the number of lines covered by automatic licensing procedures. He explained that there was a list on the SISCOMEX website indicating which tariff lines were subject to automatic and which to non-automatic licensing. He agreed to forward the EU's concerns to capital with a request for feedback. Regarding the issue of more than 5000 lines possibly subject to licensing, he regarded this too as an issue to be verified in Brasilia.

3.21. Finally, he informed the Committee that Brazil had begun an inter-agency process to review the legislation in light of Brazil's international commitments in the fields of environmental security and others that might imply a QR in trade in goods. The outcome of this process might result in adjustments to Brazilian notifications regarding both QR and import licensing measures.

3.3.2 Turkey (G/LIC/N/3/TUR/15)

3.22. The representative of Malaysia thanked the Turkish delegation for its notification. He understood that Turkey also imposed a surveillance licensing regime on solar products under HS8541.40, through Circular No. 2015/9, which seemed to not have been included in this recent notification. Malaysia would like to understand the rationale for this non-inclusion. He pointed out that, in this context, Malaysia would submit additional written questions and looked forward to receiving Turkey's replies.

3.23. The representative of Turkey thanked Malaysia for its questions and indicated that they would be happy to answer Malaysia's questions once received in writing.

3.24. The Committee took note of the statements made.

4 EUROPEAN UNION – STEEL IMPORT LICENSING SYSTEM - STATEMENT BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

4.1. The Chairperson informed the Committee that this item had been included in the agenda at the request of the Russian Federation in a communication dated 18 October 2016.

4.2. The representative of the Russian Federation explained that they had requested this agenda item because of commercial concerns over the system of prior surveillance of imports of iron and steel products adopted by the European Union on 28 April this year by Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 2016/670, which was notified on 31 May 2016 in documents G/LIC/N/1/EU/8 and G/LIC/N/2/EU/8.

4.3. He noted that, although the European Union had declared that the system merely constituted automatic import licensing, Russian steel exporters had reported on several significant obstacles encountered since the introduction of the measure.

4.4. First, his government had been informed that the authorities of the European Union member States frequently required submission of original versions of contracts and other commercial documents with genuine signatures and stamps. Without such papers, a surveillance document

was not granted. He argued that such requirements incurred significant additional logistic and time costs for traders. An importer had sometimes to address authorities in EU member States in order to receive the necessary approval documents.

4.5. Second, in some cases submission of an application for surveillance documents had to be made only upon readiness of the goods for delivery, which impeded prompt shipment. This was a consequence of the requirement to provide the exact TARIC (customs classification) codes upon application for a licence, which normally should be declared by the producer only at the end of the production cycle, once the chemical composition of the steel had become clear.

4.6. Third, the EU's overall licensing time-frames created obstacles to trade. The delivery of steel from Russian plants to European consumers generally took less than 2-3 days, especially by road. With the new licensing regime, the approval of requests for licences in some cases took longer than the time required for delivery of the products. In his view, this situation was advantageous to domestic EU suppliers who could ship goods without passing the surveillance procedure and thus more quickly. In addition to this was the requirement to submit original documents as "commercial evidence", as well as the detailed TARIC codes. Taken together, the overall impact of the licensing procedure on delivery time was significant.

4.7. He further informed the Committee that the Russian Federation had recently raised this issue under the Committee on Safeguards as their stakeholders were deeply concerned about a possible repetition of a 2002 precedent when, after introduction of a similar licensing procedure, a safeguard investigation covering a large number of steel products was launched in the EU at the same time that preliminary duties were imposed. It had caused a significant disruption to trade. He noted that the preamble to Regulation (EU) No. 2016/670 unequivocally pointed to the possible repetition of such a scenario.

4.8. He also noted that, at the Committee on Safeguards, the European Union had stated that the information collected through licensing procedures was not and never had been intended for use in trade defence investigations. Only official statistics were used in investigations. In this regard, the Russian delegate questioned the additional value of such a monitoring of steel imports, which was really burdensome for traders and which, according to the European Union, did not help in trade defence procedures targeting steel imports.

4.9. In conclusion, he clarified that his delegation had only outlined the principal issues. The full list of questions covering the Russian Federation's concerns in respect of the conformity of the steel import licensing system in the EU to the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures had been submitted to the WTO Secretariat and the Russian Federation were looking forward to receiving a response from the European Union.

4.10. The representative of China echoed and shared the concerns of the Russian Federation. China believed that the EU measures created an unnecessary burden to trade. In addition, her delegation had several specific concerns on surveillance measures. In this regard, she asked the EU to clarify: (1) whether the measures complied with the uniform, impartial, and reasonable implementation principle contained in GATT Article 10; and (2) whether the measures complied with Article 2.2 of the Licensing Agreement. To this end, she noted that China wished to receive more information regarding specific regulations and practices in the implementation of EU measures on prior surveillance of imports of certain iron and steel products.

4.11. The representative of Brazil thanked the Russian Federation for raising this issue. Brazil had an interest in this issue and would like to hear the EU's clarification of it. Brazil was concerned about the bilateral trade impact of potentially restrictive trade measures, such as those that might derive from the licensing system in question, which was particularly challenging to the steel sector.

4.12. In response, the representative of the European Union thanked the Russian Federation, China, and Brazil for their interest in these procedures. She noted that, in compliance with the provisions of the Import Licensing Agreement, the EU had informed WTO Members about this measure in two notifications circulated last May. One notification had been submitted in accordance with Article 5.1–5.4 of the Agreement and circulated as document G/LIC/N/2/EU/8; the other notification had been submitted in accordance with Article 8.2(b) of the Agreement and circulated as document G/LIC/N/1/EU/8.

4.13. The prior surveillance scheme put in place by the EU was applicable to the importation of certain iron and steel products, for transactions whose net weight exceeded 2,500 kg. As detailed in their notifications, the system applied to imports of any origin except the European Economic Area – Norway, Iceland, and Liechtenstein. Furthermore, the EU annual notification, recently circulated as document G/LIC/N/3/EU/5, contained all relevant information on procedures currently in place. In particular, it specified that:

- Its purpose was to collect information about the intention to import from all non-EU member countries. Those statistics were updated on a monthly basis and were publicly available at: http://trade.ec.europa.eu/sigl/info_steel.htm.

- The issuing of the licences was fully automatic for any quantity and any price and was not targeted at products with certain specific origins. Consequently, the system did not disrupt or impede normal trade.

- According to the Regulation, the surveillance document to accompany steel products required by the Regulation could be obtained in the licensing offices of any EU member State. The full list of EU member State authorities was contained in the Annex of the Regulation.

- The surveillance documents were:

    - Issued automatically upon request from an importer;
    - For any quantity and price;
    - Valid for 4 months + 4 months possible extension;
    - Valid throughout the EU, regardless of the issuing EU member State.

4.14. Regarding specific concerns raised by the Russian Federation, she provided some preliminary replies and noted that detailed replies would be submitted in writing.

- On the first point raised by the Russian Federation, the EU noted that implementation of the Regulation was in the hands of the national authorities of the EU member States. The Regulation asked for commercial evidence that included, for example, a copy of the contract. The list of possible supporting documents listed in the regulation was not exhaustive.

- On the second point, the EU confirmed that the TARIC code had to be inserted in the request. All documents presented for customs clearance had to have the same information, i.e. TARIC code, including the surveillance document.

- On the third point, as already mentioned, the licences were valid for 4 months and could be requested well in advance. Therefore, they should not be the cause of any delay with regard to shipment of the goods.

4.15. Concerning the last point raised by the Russian Federation, she argued that it fell primarily under the competence of the Committee on Safeguards. She nevertheless noted that the legal basis was the same and that the necessary legal conditions to apply a safeguard measure were clearly set out in that regulation. Whether or not a safeguard was applied depended on current market situation.

4.16. The Committee took note of the statements made.

5 INDONESIA – IMPORT LICENSING REGIME FOR CELLPHONES, HANDHELD COMPUTERS AND TABLETS - STATEMENT BY THE UNITED STATES

5.1. The Chairperson informed the Committee that this item had been included in the agenda at the request of the United States in a communication dated 20 October 2016.

5.2. The representative of the United States stated that US concerns were ongoing with regard to Indonesia's import licensing regime and, in particular, Indonesia's import licensing requirements for cell phones, handheld computers, and tablets.

5.3. He understood that, since the last meeting of the Committee, the Ministry of Trade had issued a revision to the import licensing requirements for these products. As his delegation had already noted, the US had hoped that the revision would address many of the concerns that they had raised in this Committee and elsewhere. Unfortunately, this did not appear to have been the case. In this regard, the US had a number of questions regarding these new requirements, which were recently submitted in writing.

5.4. He argued that, as they understood the changes included in the latest revision, the intent was to ensure that the relevant import licensing measures were consistent with Indonesia's local content requirements for 4G LTE products. While Indonesia had said in the past that these measures were for consumer protection, it appeared that the purpose was in fact to increase manufacturing in Indonesia by linking the issuance of import licenses to a requirement to invest in the Indonesian domestic industry. This understanding was reinforced by Indonesia's notification to this Committee of Ministry of Communication and Information Technology Regulation 27/2015 in document G/LIC/N/2/IDN/31.

5.5. In general, the US continued to question the purpose of the requirements and procedures for importation of cell phones, handheld computers, and tablets. Specifically:

- What was the rationale for establishing separate requirements for 3G and 4G LTE products?

- What was the justification for limiting importers of 4G LTE products only to those that held producer importer identity numbers?

- What was the difference between the "recommendation" for 3G devices and the "industry investment recommendation" for 4G LTE devices? And how do these differences relate to Ministry of Industry Regulation No. 68/2016?

5.6. He noted that these and other questions were part of their written submission and hoped that Indonesia would respond expeditiously given that these requirements were already in force.

5.7. While appreciating that Indonesia had notified some of these measures to this Committee, he asked Indonesia to notify all of the associated measures, including but not limited to Ministry of Trade Regulation No. 41/2016 and Ministry of Industry Regulations No. 108/2012 and No. 68/2016.

5.8. The US representative reiterated that the industry concerned was a very important one to the United States and the global economy. The issues that the US had raised today, and on multiple previous occasions, were serious. In their view, the import licensing requirements at issue would distort trade and investment in an important and rapidly developing sector, and potentially undermined efforts to enhance market access opportunities for high technology products, as set out in the WTO Information Technology Agreement.

5.9. In this regard, the US continued to urge Indonesia to reconsider the new requirements found in the latest legal measures implementing revisions to the latest import licensing requirements for cell phones, handheld computers, and tablets.

5.10. The representative of the European Union echoed US concerns and reiterated the EU's interest in understanding the provisions set out in Regulation No. 27/2015. In particular, she asked Indonesia to clarify the linkages between Regulation No. 27 and Regulations 38 and 108. In addition, she asked Indonesia why this regulation had not been included in the annual notification (2015) submitted in accordance with Article 7.3 of the Import Licensing Agreement.

5.11. The representative of Chinese Taipei stated that his delegation shared the same concerns as those raised by the United States, particularly with regard to smartphones. He indicated that, in July 2015, the Ministry of Communications and Information Technology of Indonesia had issued a regulation entitled Technical Requirement of Telecommunications Devices based on LTE Standard Technology. According to their understanding, Indonesia's measure required that smartphone importers had to comply with local content requirements to obtain the right to import. The measure also required that, in order to obtain an import licence, smartphone companies had to purchase a certain number of Indonesian-produced components and packaging based on value to

meet its domestic content requirements. He noted that, since Indonesia was one of its major trading and investment partners in Southeast Asia, Chinese Taipei had a substantial interest in this regard. His delegation urged Indonesia to provide a detailed clarification of the measures in question and to bring them into conformity with WTO rules.

5.12. In response, the representative of Indonesia thanked the US, the EU, and Chinese Taipei for their questions. He indicated that the regulation was new and requested the Members concerned to submit their questions in writing so as then to receive a written response from Indonesia.

5.13. The Committee took note of the statements made.

6 INDIA – IMPORT LICENSING REQUIREMENT FOR BORIC ACID – STATEMENT BY THE UNITED STATES

6.1. The Chairperson informed the Committee that this item had been included in the agenda at the request of the United States in a communication dated 20 October 2016.

6.2. The representative of the United States stated that the US had for some time been concerned by India's import licensing requirements for boric acid, particularly with respect to the burdensome end-use certificates necessary for importation. He recalled that his delegation had in fact been raising this issue in the Committee since 2008, and that the issue had been on their bilateral agenda for longer still.

6.3. He noted that US concerns began in 2006, when India's Ministry of Commerce and Industry issued a new rule stating that "Imports of Boric Acid for non-insecticidal purposes will be subject to an import permit issued by the Central Insecticide Board & Registration Committee under the Ministry of Agriculture."

6.4. Prior to this change, there was no import permit requirement for boric acid. However, India's implementation of the change had had the effect of limiting importation of non-insecticidal boric acid by Indian importers by requiring the importer to provide the precise end-use of the product prior to importation. The information provided was subject to a formal government review process and only a specific quantity of boric acid could be approved for import under each transaction.

6.5. He explained that the Central Insecticide Board and Registration Committee only meets monthly, and often did not have an opportunity to review import requests. A review of their minutes for the past ten months showed only three months where import requests were reviewed and approved. This completely impeded the ability of importers in India to meet the "just in time" supply chain requirements for non-insecticidal boric acid. No such restrictions were placed on domestic suppliers of non-insecticidal boric acid.

6.6. In addition to the lengthy time-frame for obtaining an approval, quantities were also restricted. Indian importers had expressed to the US their frustration that they must also supply information on their past consumption of boric acid, broken down by imports and domestic sources, when seeking approval to import. New approvals for imported boric acid were based only on past import levels, not on total consumption. It appeared to be an arbitrary quantitative restriction.

6.7. He continued that the US had received varying responses from the Indian government when presented with these facts. During its TPR, India cited the Insecticides Act of 1968 as the legislative authority for import licensing of boric acid. However, import permits were not required on boric acid until 2006. Then, in 2011, India's Central Board of Excise and Customs stated that Section 38 of the Insecticide Act 1968 exempts insecticides with a non-insecticidal use from import permit requirements. However, CBEC had later clarified that import permits were still required for non-insecticidal boric acid.

6.8. The US delegation requested India to explain why boric acid, which had a toxicity level roughly equivalent to that of table salt, was the only insecticide that required an import permit for non-insecticidal use, considering its low toxicity level compared to other insecticides that were not required to obtain an import permit. In addition, his delegation also requested India to explain why boric acid was the only insecticide for which there were import quantity restrictions.

6.9. He also noted that the approval process, applied only to imports of boric acid, was vigorously enforced. However, according to government officials and Indian importers, there was no similar oversight for sale of domestic boric acid. Domestic manufacturers of boric acid did not have to seek approval from a government Ministry to sell their product, and producers did not have to specify the end-use of the boric acid prior to its sale. Domestic producers could sell to any buyer and do so without quantitative limits.

6.10. Finally, he indicated that the US had continued to request that India amend Schedule–I (Imports) of the ITC (HS) Classifications of Export and Import Items to eliminate the requirement that imports of boric acid for non-insecticidal purposes be subject to import permit.

6.11. In response, the representative of India thanked the delegation of the United States for its continued interest in the matter of India's import policy on 'boric acid'. He stated that it was on the record that India had already responded to all written questions posed by interested delegations. These replies were contained in WTO documents G/LIC/Q/IND/12, G/LIC/Q/IND/14, G/LIC/Q/IND/16, and G/LIC/Q/IND/22. In his view, these responses properly explained the policy objectives of the measure as well as issues relating to its implementation. As a result, in the meeting of this Committee held on 29 October 2012, the delegation of the United States had expressed their desire to take up the matter with India bilaterally. Since then, the two capitals had engaged in a bilateral discussion of the issue.

6.12. He informed the Committee that the last bilateral meeting between the US and India had taken place in October 2016. In that meeting, India had responded to all the issues raised by the US and also supplied the documents requested. India had also explained that boric acid was considered an insecticide, as per the Insecticides Act, and that the law applied to all. Domestic manufacturers also had to provide details of end-use and these had to be verified by the Registration Committee. Finally, he observed that India had hoped that the bilateral discussions would have helped to address US concerns on this subject.

6.13. The Committee took note of the statements made.

7 BANGLADESH – IMPORT LICENSING PROCEDURES – STATEMENT BY THE UNITED STATES

7.1. The Chairperson informed the Committee that this item had been included in the agenda at the request of the United States in a communication dated 20 October 2016.

7.2. The representative of the United States noted that the Secretariat had circulated their most recent questions to Bangladesh on 21 February 2014, in document G/LIC/Q/BGD/5, and that his delegation was still awaiting a reply from Bangladesh. He recalled that the US had been raising this issue for quite some time, with this Committee and in other fora.

7.3. The representative of Switzerland associated his delegation with the concerns and questions raised by the United States. He noted that Switzerland was especially concerned about problems with pharmaceutical imports into Bangladesh. Importers were required to submit import "indents" and to get approval by the "Standing Committee for Import of Pharmaceuticals" of the Directorate-General of Drug Administration of Bangladesh. According to their information, approvals were not issued as they should have been; entire applications were sometimes rejected or only partially approved.

7.4. He argued that the result was low predictability and delays as well as uncertainties for domestic patients with critical diseases in need of the products in question. He highlighted that a 1994 directive of the Bangladesh Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and a 1998 directive of the Prime Minister stated that "medicines which are adequately manufactured in Bangladesh cannot be imported". It appeared that these directives were still in force and that the import prohibitions at issue were based on them. Switzerland was concerned that these directives were possibly inconsistent with GATT and the Import Licensing Agreement. He therefore asked Bangladesh to undertake any necessary reform of these measures so as to bring them into conformity with these agreements, and also to provide his delegation with any update in this regard.

7.5. The representative of the European Union also wished for the EU to be associated with the concerns and questions raised by the US. She recalled that at the last meeting of this Committee, Bangladesh had informed Members that its notification was under preparation and would soon be submitted. The EU regretted not yet having seen such a notification as it would have helped Members to develop a better understanding of the procedure in place. On the basis of the information available, the EU considered that these import requirements for pharmaceuticals were not in compliance with Article 1.2 of the Import Licensing Agreement. The EU therefore wished Bangladesh to take the necessary steps to remove them.

7.6. In response, the representative of Bangladesh expressed thanks to the delegations of the US, EU, and Switzerland, for their continued interest in the ILPs of Bangladesh. He confirmed that his delegation had indicated that they were intending to submit replies to their annual questionnaire. He indicated that his capital was working on it and hopefully they would soon submit it. Regarding the 1998 directives, he noted that it had been clarified in Capital that import of pharmaceutical products into Bangladesh was guided by the Import Policy Order and Bangladesh draft policy. These policies maintained the provisions of the 1998 directives referred to in an earlier intervention. As in other countries, sale of any medicine in Bangladesh, either to import or for domestic production, required a registration; accordingly, any drug or medicine registered by the Director-General of Drug Administration was eligible for importation into Bangladesh. A standing Committee for imports, as mentioned by Switzerland, considered imports of pharmaceuticals and granted approval for importation of drugs and medicine; such approval was also required on locally produced products. He noted that the approval of medicines for import was given regardless of whether or not a similar product was on the market, and any foreign company could apply for registration and sell their products. His delegation was available to discuss the matter with interested delegations and to clarify any outstanding issue.

7.7. The Committee took note of the statements made.

8 MEXICO – STEEL IMPORT LICENSING PROGRAM – STATEMENT BY THE UNITED STATES

8.1. The Chairperson informed the Committee that this item had been included in the agenda at the request of the United States in a communication dated 20 October 2016.

8.2. The representative of the United States thanked Mexico for its recent response to their latest questions (G/LIC/Q/MEX/2) and for its continued cooperation in addressing US concerns about Mexico's import licensing requirement for steel products. However, the United States continued to have concerns, in particular with reported delays in receiving approvals for import licences, as well as reports of unpublished documentation requirements.

8.3. His delegation had understood that, on 27 July 2016, Mexico had entered into an agreement with the National Iron and Steel Industry Chamber (CANACERO) to identify and conduct joint actions to combat illicit steel imports and/or exports, but no information about how this agreement would work had as yet been published.

8.4. In addition, he understood that CANACERO observers would be authorized to conduct on-site inspections of steel imports. In this regard, his delegation was interested in knowing the role of CANACERO observers under the Mexican steel import licencing system, and how the Government of Mexico would ensure that the proprietary information on licences was protected from unauthorized disclosure. When would the Government of Mexico publish the parts of this agreement relevant to exporters and Mexican importers so as to allow them to better understand the licensing system? The United States hoped to continue their bilateral communications with Mexico to resolve these issues.

8.5. In response, the representative of Mexico thanked the US for their renewed interest in this issue. With regard to delays in granting licences, he pointed out that Mexico's procedures were in conformity with Article 2(b) of the Agreement and the authority got a maximum of 10 working days to issue the licence and there were no exceptions. Therefore, Mexico believed that they were already in compliance with the agreement. With regard to the agreement with CANACERO, he stated that it was not an official agreement. He assured Members that Mexico would notify any kind of agreement, as required by the Import Licensing Agreement. In this regard, he noted that, if Mexico had not submitted a notification, it was because there was no agreement to notify.

However, Mexico would certainly notify Members of any new piece of legislation or any new agreement.

8.6. The Committee took note of the statements made.

9 VIET NAM – DISTILLED SPIRITS AND COMPLETENESS QUESTION (G/LIC/Q/VNM/5 AND G/LIC/Q/VNM/6) – STATEMENT BY THE UNITED STATES

9.1. The Chairperson informed the Committee that this item had been included in the agenda at the request of the United States in a communication dated 20 October 2016.

9.2. The representative of the United States noted that the US remained interested in receiving information regarding the broader product categories that appeared to be subject to import licensing requirements based on Viet Nam's trade policy review. Specifically, his delegation continued to be concerned about the import licensing requirements for distilled spirits, as provided for in Decree 94 and as revised in the new draft Decree of 28 August 2016.

9.3. He pointed out that the United States was still reviewing the text of the most recent decree. From their preliminary review, it appeared that the new decree was an improvement for traders over Decree No. 94 in that it removed the quota for distribution, wholesale, and retail licences based on number of inhabitants, and removed certain restrictions on licences. However, the US understood that the new decree still contained restrictions on distribution licences which remained a significant source of concern for US industry; the burdensome process that required substantial detailed information from importers for new and updated distribution licences, and that was not required for licences granted to producers of alcohol, was a particular cause for concern.

9.4. The United States appreciated the opportunity for a continued dialogue on this issue and looked forward to receiving a complete written response to the questions circulated in documents G/LIC/Q/VNM/6 and G/LIC/Q/VNM/5 (as well as document G/TBT/N/VNM/86 in the TBT context). He also noted that the United States had held productive bilateral discussions on these topics with Viet Nam and recognized the capacity issues that Viet Nam faced. However, his delegation continued to encourage Viet Nam to devote time and resources to meeting these important obligations.

9.5. In response, the representative of Viet Nam thanked the US for its questions and indicated that he had taken note and would forward the US concerns to Capital.

9.6. The Committee took note of the statements made.

10 IMPROVING TRANSPARENCY IN NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES OF THE AGREEMENT – REPORT OF THE CHAIR ON THE INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS HELD ON 2 JUNE, 17 OCTOBER, AND 3 NOVEMBER 2016

10.1. The Chairperson reported to the Committee that, since the last Committee meeting, three informal consultations had been held, on 2 June, 17 October, and 3 November 2016, respectively. The Chair's report is reproduced below:

10.2. "On 2 June, we continued the discussion on the low notification compliance rate by addressing notification procedures, organizing national and regional workshops and updating notification guidelines. The Secretariat made a presentation on "Format and procedure of notifications under the Agreement on Import Licensing". The presentation and the discussion paper were circulated in document RD/LIC/7 and 8. In the convening fax, I identified the following issues for Members to discuss as a priority in the Committee: (1) identification of overlapping notification requirements; (2) clarification of elements to be notified under the Agreement; (3) the types of notifications and their content? (4) the appropriate template for each type of notification and (5) improvements to the annual questionnaire. In the discussion, most Members were supportive to continue the exercise to enhance transparency and supporting the establishment of a simpler and more logical notification system. Many Members were in favour of an electronic database for notifications and two Members volunteered to pilot the database. On the notification templates, many Members believed that there seemed to be duplicative templates that could be merged while a few others suggested that we should rather make use of the current templates and believed that

Members should be cautious about jumping to conclusions. Some Members suggested having a zero draft of the notification templates to enhance the understanding of duplications. One Member insisted on clarifying the idea of having a database before having further discussions on the notification template. There was some support, but also caution towards organizing national and regional workshops and not much discussion on updating the notification guidelines. Recent discussions have focused mostly on improving notification procedures. I believe these are extremely important questions and encourage Members to continue to exchange views on these in detail.

10.3. At the informal meeting on 17 October, the Secretariat gave a presentation on a discussion paper titled "Some ideas on how to address the issue of overlapping notification requirements in the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures", which was circulated as room document RD/LIC/9. In the presentation, the Secretariat further elaborated on overlapping notification requirements and proposed a new notification template for notifications under Article 1.4(a), Article 5 and Article 8.2(b). In essence, this new template merged the two forms referred to as N/1 and N/2. To clarify the linkage between the new template and respective provision requirements, as well as compare it with the existing templates, an Explanatory Note was also included in Annex 2 of the document.

10.4. Regarding the proposed new template, some Members found it much clearer and easier to comply with. A number of Members raised technical questions on specific issues. Nevertheless, most Members endorsed the direction of the review exercise and expressed willingness to continue the technical work on the proposed template. One Member did not support merging N/1 and N/2 forms and suggested working on those existing templates instead, to solve the overlapping issue. Another Member sought clarifications on the linkage between improving notification templates with the establishment of an import licensing database. At the end of the meeting, I had the impression that most Members were willing to continue the discussion on issues already clarified so far, and at the same time, remained open to look at any other concrete alternative idea which might be proposed in the meantime.

10.5. At the informal meeting on 3 November, the Secretariat provided answers to the questions raised by Members at the previous meeting. The European Union made a presentation on how the new notification template would work, using one previous EU notification as an example. Members have not yet agreed on how notification templates could be improved and the technical work is ongoing."

10.6. The representative of India thanked the Chairman for the report. He also thanked the Secretariat for their contributions, and the delegation of the EU for their presentation. However, his delegation had a different view, which he wished to place on record. He recalled that India had not supported a merging of the two notification formats as it would disturb the fine balance of rights and obligations under the Import Licensing Agreement. There was no change in India's stand. India did not endorse the idea of merging the two formats, N/1 and N/2.

10.7. India believed that the three notification requirements provided under Articles 1.4(a), 5, and 8.2(b) were quite different from each other, and hence should not be merged. He argued that the causes of action in the three requirements were different, as was evident from the text of the Agreement: (i) Article 1.4(a) came into play when rules on procedures for submission of licensing applications were framed or modified; (ii) Article 8.2(b) was invoked when there were any changes in laws and regulations relevant to the Agreement; (iii) Article 5 was invoked when there was institution of import licensing. Thus, the triggers in the three requirements were quite different, and the negotiators had used different terms in different Articles.

10.8. In addition, he took the view that the requirement in Article 1.4(a) was basically a publication requirement and not a notification requirement. The main requirement in Article 1.4(a) was to publish the rules concerning procedures for submission of applications. What was to be notified here was only the source of publication, with a copy of the publication also in question to be made available to the Secretariat. Likewise, Article 8.2(b) was not primarily a notification requirement. It only asked that the Committee be informed of any changes in relevant laws and regulations. As these two Articles, i.e. Article 1.4(a) and Article 8.2(b) did not request the notification of detailed information, the Committee had devised a simple form (N/1).

10.9. On the other hand, Article 5 was the main notification requirement. It asked for comprehensive information, including individual products subject to licensing, administrative bodies to be approached, contact points for information on eligibility, and whether the licensing was automatic or non-automatic, and so on. Therefore, Article 5 required a more comprehensive notification as compared to Articles 1.4(a) and 8.2(b). Accordingly, a different form (N/2) had been developed.

10.10. Thus, he was of the view that a merging of the two forms was neither desirable nor supported by the Agreement. By grouping all the information in one single form, a Member would have to provide all the listed information of Article 5 even when it sought to notify, for example, just a simple change in legislation under paragraph 8.2(b). Merging would thus lead to confusion. This was something to which India would not agree. However, he pointed out that India remained open to looking again at existing systems, like that provided in document G/LIC/22, and how to improve them further.

10.11. The representative of Chinese Taipei thanked the Chairman for convening the informal consultations and for providing the detailed report. His delegation also thanked the Secretariat and the EU for the excellent work they had done and for the discussion. Chinese Taipei shared the view of most Members on the importance of this exercise for enhancing transparency in the Committee. He expressed their full support to the simplified and streamlined formats of notification which had been detailed in Annex 1 of discussion paper RD/LIC/9. His delegation firmly believed that the draft formats prepared by the Secretariat not only could enhance the transparency in this Committee, but also significantly reduce the burden of notification for national administrations, as shown in the presentation by the EU. Therefore, he encouraged Members with concerns to display flexibility, and looked forward to the adoption of the draft formats in this Committee at the earliest opportunity.

10.12. The representative of Ecuador indicated that with regard to the report of the meeting of 17 October, it was not just India but also Ecuador that had delivered a statement indicating that Ecuador was not in agreement with these new notifications. She clarified that Ecuador felt that this was a task for Members and that, with regard to transparency, they believed that capacity-building was also important for developing countries and LDCs in order to assist them to comply with their notification obligations.

10.13. The Committee took note of the Chair's report and statements made.

11 ELEVENTH BIENNIAL REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATION OF THE AGREEMENT UNDER ARTICLE 7.1 (G/LIC/W/47)

11.1. The Chairman recalled that Article 7.1 of the Agreement provided that the Committee shall review as necessary, but at least once every two years, the implementation and operation of the Agreement, and that the last biennial review was held in October 2014. He referred to the draft biennial report for 2015-2016 prepared by the Secretariat under its own responsibility (document G/LIC/W/47) and sought the views and comments of Members.

11.2. The representative of Brazil made reference to paragraph 2.18 of the document. He stated that during the discussions his delegation had raised the issue of the proper sequencing of the actions necessary to address the problems in question. In addition, he believed that reference to the document would be sufficient, and that his delegation doubted the value of having the chart also here. That said, the presentation made by the Secretariat (including the chart) had been useful to the membership.

11.3. The representative of South Africa made a statement on the chart to which Brazil referred. She pointed out that her delegation had found the chart very useful for Members, and especially for those officials/delegates who were unable to attend the meeting at which the process was explained. It provided a very clear and useful explanation of the paragraph in question.

11.4. The representative of Brazil observed that the chart and the document would not disappear from the repository of information accessible to Members. He agreed with South Africa that this chart was a useful tool with which Members could advance discussion on the subject; nevertheless, he still believed that it did not need to be there. There might be issues with some

aspects of the chart, as mentioned in previous meetings, and its inclusion might also suggest agreement on some issues when in fact there was none.

11.5. The representative of Switzerland stated that he was not opposed to the chart, and indeed that his delegation considered this type of information useful. Therefore, he hoped that if delegations had additional issues these could be raised earlier so as to facilitate prompt consultations.

11.6. The representative of Chile asked if the report would be prepared by the Chair and requested that, if this were the case, perhaps comments could be included in the report as additional contributions, if acceptable to Members.

11.7. The representative of Brazil, taking into account other Members' interests in keeping the chart for transparency, suggested to add a sentence above the chart, clarifying that the chart was an input provided by the Secretariat to the membership as a basis for discussion.

11.8. The Committee adopted the report (G/LIC/W/47) as amended.

12 DRAFT REPORT (2016) OF THE COMMITTEE TO THE COUNCIL FOR TRADE IN GOODS (G/LIC/W/46)

12.1. The Chairman noted that the Committee was required to submit an annual report on its activities to the Council for Trade in Goods (CTG), under Article 7.4 of the Agreement. A draft report (2016) of the Committee (G/LIC/W/46) was prepared for the Committee's consideration.

12.2. The representative of Brazil provided a few wording suggestions on paragraph 11 and the Committee adopted the draft report as amended.

13 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

13.1. The Chairman informed Members that he planned to hold the next formal meeting in late April or early May 2017, on the understanding that additional meetings might be convened as necessary. Members would be informed well in advance on the timing of the formal meeting.

13.2. The Committee took note.

14 OTHER BUSINESS

14.1 Statement by the European Union on Morocco's notification

14.1. The representative of the European Union reminded Morocco that on 8 April 2016 the EU had submitted detailed questions seeking clarification of the following issues:

- First, on the note to importers No. 3/2015 and No. 4/2015 for the importation of certain arms and gear wheels;

- Second, on the provisions contained in chapters II and III of the Law No. 91/2014 on external trade as this law introduced new conditions for the importation of certain goods.

14.2. She reiterated the EU's interest in receiving replies from Morocco to its questions. In addition, she pointed out that Morocco had not submitted any notification since 2009. Her delegation called on Morocco to submit its notifications again.

14.2 Statement of the Russian Federation on certain Ukrainian import measures

14.3. The representative of the Russian Federation stated that, according to information publicly available, on 20 October 2016 Ukraine's Parliament had adopted a draft Act introducing an import ban on certain printed products, books, magazines, etc. In this respect, Russia requested Ukraine to clarify the following:

- When Ukraine intended to introduce such restrictions?

- What was the rationale behind such restrictions?

- How would these import restrictions be administered? Would respective imports be subject to import licensing procedures?

- Would imports of all types of printed products be banned or would the restrictions be applied only to printed products conforming to certain criteria?

- Would these criteria be based on the content of the printed materials?

- If yes, which body would be responsible for determination of whether or not the content fell under such criteria, and on what basis?

- Would these criteria be based on the territory of origin of such books or printed materials?

14.4. He looked forward to receiving replies to these questions and called upon Ukraine to adhere to the relevant WTO rules when adopting measures affecting the market access of foreign goods.

14.5. In response, the representative of Ukraine thanked Russia for its statement. He indicated that he could provide only some preliminary answers as the draft law in question had not yet been adopted, and a number of amendments or additional proposals had been submitted for consideration. On the substance of the draft law, based on the text *per se*, the law prescribed treatment of certain printed products of an extreme nature to be applied equally to both imported and domestic printed products. In this light, he doubted that this Committee was the appropriate forum for the discussion of the issue raised by Russia.

14.6. The representative of the Russian Federation thanked Ukraine for its answer and expressed its intention to submit its questions bilaterally. Nevertheless, the Russian Federation looked forward to receiving Ukraine's replies.