

**Meeting to Review Comments/Observations Received on
Proposed Recommendation – Consultation Approaches**
September 23, 2014; October 24, 2014

Attendees

Bismark Sitorus
Gordon Cragge
Jari Salo
Josephine Baiamonte
Lance Thompson
Paloma Bernal Turnes
Salaheen?
Tom Butterly

Overview/Summary

- Two conference calls were held in furtherance of this discussion: September 23, 2014 and October 24, 2014
- Only two official commenters submitted input during the public review of proposed recommendation on Consultation Approaches- Tom Butterly and Mitusru Ishigaki.
- Josephine took the action to propose new language based on the recommendations that were approved.
- Josephine agreed to provide a revised DRAFT before the second week of October for the group's review.

Discussion

Recommendations by Tom Butterly:

- Tom provided very positive comments on the discussion of the three operational layers; he believes this is one of the most significant contributions of the paper. Tom recommended that we include text in that discussion that mentions the usefulness of having all three layers participate in meetings on some occasions. Additionally, he suggested we add a vertical two way arrow on the diagram. Tom also provided some recommended text regarding the role of the three layers.
 - All recommendations were approved and the document will be updated accordingly.
- Tom also recommended a relabeling of two of the three layers. The second layer, currently labelled “tactical” should be changed to “operational” and the third layer, currently labelled “operational,” should be changed to “technical.” This is more in keeping with the activities under each layer.
 - This recommendation was approved by the group.

- A request was made by Tom to add more text on the discussion of the “tool kit.”
 - Josephine took an action to add additional language explaining this concept.
- A repository of case studies was also recommended
 - It was agreed that this was something that could be added later on

Recommendations by Mitsuru Ishigaki

- Mitsuru recommended a relabeling of two of the three layers. In particular, “operational level” should be renamed to “strategic level” and “strategic level” should be renamed to “operational level.”
 - The group concurred that this recommendation would not be accepted as the three levels have already been relabelled per Tom’s recommendation.
- Mitsuru expressed concern with moving this concept forward as an independent recommendation.
 - Several members of the recommendation work group provided the following comments on why they would like to keep this as an independent recommendation :
 - If Consultation approaches becomes an annex of another work, such as Recommendation 4, there is a risk that the meaning of the recommendation will be lost.
 - The recommendation is intended to stress the availability of different approaches to trade consultation ; the key concept of the document is the flexibility of approaches. This is distinguishable from Recommendation 4 which addresses how to organise a specific type of fora for consultation.
 - Currently many governments are tackling the issue of Single Window and data harmonization. Trade consultative measures is at the heart of these discussions, without which, these efforts cannot succeed. In this regard, it is essential that governments understand the criticality of trade consultative measures and the various tools that are available to them.
 - The draft recommendation as proposed has a very clear recommended practice which is in line with former Trade Facilitation recommendations. It is not clear what other type of deliverable could propose the same type of guidance at this level.
- Mitsuru recommended that within the title of Recommendation 4, National Trade Facilitation “Organs” should be “Bodies”
 - This is currently under consideration; Lance will follow up.