Paragraph 8 of MTN.GNG/NG13/4, which summarizes the Australian response to questions from the United States delegation about elements in the Australian proposal, should read as follows:

8. The representative of Australia said that normally "interested parties" would be taken to mean those contracting parties which had made presentations to a panel. The idea was to provide the greatest scope for achieving an objective decision on a panel report. The Australian representative was not aware of any dispute which had involved so many contracting parties as to preclude a well-informed decision. Australia considered that a mandatory conciliation process would help in bringing the disputing parties together and encourage settlements. It did not regard a three-month period as being too long but was prepared to consider a shorter conciliation phase. Australia was still giving thought to the question of retaliation procedures. In any event, it preferred to concentrate on the other phases of the process as retaliation reduced rather than created opportunities for trade.