

...to come this public dialogue
 ...is regrettable that for some time you chose to only publish your response on
 WTO website and not our original letter (until very recently). This means that many
 were not aware to what issues and concerns you were responding until our letter
 was put on the site. We hope that you would agree that a real public debate should
 include both sides of the story, not just yours. We hope that this response can now be put
 on the WTO website as well, in the interest of transparency.

We feel compelled to rectify some of what you present as "factual inaccuracies" in your
 response to us. We respond to your two main critiques and one additional point on WTO
 process. Your two main critiques to us are:

1) that the text is by Mexican Ambassador

...as you
 claim, that consensus would be required to delete any of the elements."

And finally:

3) you claim that it is understood that "the whole document is subject to change"
 ...



my

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

² From the "Note by the Chairman" in JOB(05)262/Rev.2
³ JOB(05)262/Rev.2
⁴ document TN/C/1

finally, we must address your claim that the whole text is in brackets until full agreement. This statement by you side-steps significant on-going problems of transparency and inclusion.

Let us remind you that the idea that the entire text is 'considered' to be in brackets until agreed has been

accepted by the chair "on his [or her] own responsibility" and

is understood

an texts emerging from green rooms that majority of the membership. This contributed these problems. In the run up to the Doha text and after the preparatory process in

delegations first vented their views. These did not represent the viewpoints of a majority to the famous Seattle Ministerial collapse. Doha and are documented by various papers from Doha through papers from Geneva. (See for example, WTO

and the Commission's internal procedures to ensure transparency in its work and to ensure that the Commission's work is carried out in a transparent manner.

Over the past few years, the Commission's work has shown that it has not led to either inclusiveness or transparency in its work. We have raised these concerns and proposed recommendations in an extensive memorandum to you in previous years, and you, in your capacity as EC trade commissioner, entitled *Memorandum On The Need To Improve Internal Transparency*.¹

29. Oxfam International
30. PAPDA (Plate-forme haïtienne de Plaidoyer pour un Développement Alternatif) Haïti
31. Public Citizen, US
32. Public Services International (PSI)
33. Roba dell'altro mondo (ROBA), Italy
34. Stop the Military Coalition, Philippines
35. Third World Alliance
36. Tradewatch, Italy
37. Unité de Recherche

© 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009