

Committee on Specific Commitments

REPORT OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23 AND 24 MAY 2000

Note by the Secretariat

1. The Committee on Specific Committee held a meeting on 23 and 24 May 2000. The agenda for the meeting was contained in document WTO/AIR/1302. The Chairman raised an item under other business concerning a request for observer status before the Committee, submitted by the Universal Postal Union.

2. The agenda was so agreed.

A. SCHEDULING GUIDELINES

3. The Chairman recalled that at the past two meetings the Committee had structured its discussions along a Note by the Chairman containing comments and drafting suggestions on the outstanding issues. In those discussions a number of priority issues that could reasonably be solved had been identified, while putting aside others which were either too difficult or too marginal to be addressed usefully. On some of the priority issues many delegations had found the compromise proposals by the Chairman to be acceptable, while on others they suggested alternative formulations.

4. He introduced an informal Note by the Secretariat (document Job No. 3086), containing a compilation of the drafting proposals made at previous meetings by the Chairman and by delegations on some outstanding issues in the revision of the Scheduling Guidelines. The Note was meant to help delegations in their discussion of the drafting proposals in the revision of the Scheduling Guidelines and did not bind delegations to any of the proposals made and reported in the document. He proposed that the Committee structure its discussions by taking up the drafting proposals made by the Chairman and by delegations on the on the priority issues identified at previous meetings and reported in document Job. No. 3086.

II. FOOTNOTES, HEADNOTES AND ATTACHMENTS

5. The Chairman recalled that on this point there were four drafting proposals by the Chairman concerning the question of the legally binding nature of the schedules, footnotes, headnotes and attachments. On paragraph 6 an alternative drafting proposal had been advanced by Switzerland, while on paragraph 7 an alternative drafting proposal had been advanced by the United States. At previous meetings many delegations had expressed doubts concerning paragraph 8.

6. The representatives of Australia, the European Communities, Hong Kong, China, India, Japan and New Zealand agreed with the Chairman's proposals on paragraphs 6 and 7, including the addition to paragraph 6 proposed by Switzerland, but did not support the amendment to paragraph 7, proposed by the United States. Australia also supported paragraph 8, provided that the wording "to secure clarity and legal certainty" was removed. The European Communities, Hong Kong, China and Japan

expressed doubts on paragraph 8. Hong Kong, China suggested that Members consider some alternative wording for paragraph 8.

7. The United States proposed some new language for paragraph 7, which would read “whenever footnotes are included in a Member’s schedule, they should state clearly whether they are for transparency purposes only or whether they are legally binding.” The US delegation also expressed doubts on paragraph 8, as it would have been confusing to structure headnotes along the four columns format. Argentina supported paragraph 6 and, on footnotes, argued that either they should all be legally binding or all for the purpose of transparency. Chile supported the proposals by the Chairman on paragraphs 6 and 7 and the amendment proposed by Switzerland and argued that it was desirable to avoid footnotes, whether they were legally binding or not. Turkey shared the same view, although it stressed the importance of transparency. Switzerland restated that everything that was in schedules should be considered as legally binding, and expressed serious doubts on the proposals made by the United States on paragraph 7. Norway agreed that everything in the schedules should be legally binding, but said that it was also important to focus on the issue of transparency. Its representative added that, regarding paragraph 8, across the columns scheduling in the form of headnotes might in some cases prove useful. The same point on headnotes was also made by the Republic of Korea.

8. Returning to the issue of footnotes, Hong Kong, China said that it was not necessary to avoid them, provided it was understood that, when they were used, they were legally binding like everything else in the schedules. The representative of Côte d’Ivoire said that footnotes were useful to specify entries in the columns and that they should be considered as legally binding even if they were for transparency purposes. Egypt argued that, in principle, footnotes should be avoided although in some cases they could prove to be helpful. However, where footnotes were used, they should be considered as legally binding. Uruguay supported paragraph 6 as proposed by the Chairman and emphasized that paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 should be in line with paragraph 6, and not undermine it. Mexico agreed that everything in the schedules was legally binding, and not for the purpose of transparency. However, paragraph 6 was not necessary, as this issue did not need any clarification.

9. Brazil supported paragraphs 6, 7, 8 and 9 as proposed by the Chairman with the Swiss addition to paragraph 6, but pointed out that the new language should not prejudice the useful role of footnotes in the schedules. Mauritius agreed that footnotes could bring some clarity, but said that they should be considered as legally binding and should not undermine a Member’s specific commitments. Guatemala supported the Chairman’s proposals on paragraphs 6 and 7, while on paragraph 8 expressing some doubts and asking for clarifications. Morocco expressed general support for the proposals by the Chairman on these issues and emphasized that everything in the schedules should be considered as legally binding while footnotes should be avoided. Argentina referred to paragraphs 9 and 10 of document S/CSC/W/19, which explained the rationale (clarity and legal security) for the Chairman’s suggestions on footnotes, headnotes and attachments.

10. The Chairman noted that the vast majority of delegations supported paragraph 6 on the legally binding nature of the schedules, including the addition proposed by Switzerland. On paragraph 7 he said that some delegations favoured footnotes also for transparency purposes, while others insisted that only footnotes with legally binding force should be allowed. On paragraph 8, he noted that many delegations expressed doubts on the proposed language, while no objections were raised on paragraph 9.

III. MEANING OF MARKET ACCESS RESTRICTIONS

11. Under this item a change to the drafting proposals by the Chairman had been advanced by the United States at the previous meeting. Australia supported the change, but asked the United States to explain why they wanted to replace the word “principle” with the word “standard”. The United States

replied that the use of the word “standard” was preferable to ensure consistency with paragraph 4 of the scheduling guidelines (MTN.GNS/W/164), which already referred to “national treatment standard”. The representative of Canada argued that the current scheduling guidelines were sufficiently clear on this issue and that the proposed language was repetitive and unnecessary. The Republic of Korea echoed the comments from Canada, while Hong Kong, China disagreed, arguing that the current language of the scheduling guidelines was not clear to a first time reader and the very purpose of the guidelines was clarification. Argentina agreed with Hong Kong, China that the proposed language dealt with a common mistake in schedules and served a useful classificatory purpose. Its representative proposed to substitute the current proposed text with the following language, taken from paragraph 19 of S/CSC/W/19: “For instance, if a limitation on the types of legal entity permitted in a given sector is applied both to nationals and to foreigners, it has to be scheduled.” The Chairman noted that Canada still had a reservation on this issue and proposed that Members revert to it at the next meeting of the Committee.

V. RELEVANT COLUMNS AND MODE FOR THE SCHEDULING OF NATIONALITY REQUIREMENTS

12. No drafting proposals had been made on this item at previous meetings and few Members made comments. The Chairman proposed that Members put aside this issue for the time being.

VII. ILLUSTRATIVE LIST OF NATIONAL TREATMENT LIMITATIONS

13. An illustrative list of national treatment restrictions, annexed to document Job No. 3086, had been prepared by the Secretariat. At past meetings, many delegations found the idea of having an illustrative list to be very useful, but asked for some improvements to it, including adding more examples and examples of a more general nature.

14. The representative of Canada said that his delegation was still studying the list and encouraged other delegations to give further thought to this matter. The representative of the United States pointed out that at the last meeting he had not said that there was a lack of clarity in the list, as had been reported. His delegation had no objections to the list, provided it was understood to be of a purely illustrative nature. Argentina agreed that the list should be of an illustrative nature. The Chairman suggested that the illustrative nature of the list could be better clarified by the Secretariat in its introduction.

IX. MEASURES INCONSISTENT WITH BOTH ARTICLES XVI AND XVII (ARTICLE XX:2)

15. The discussions held at the past meetings under this item covered also issues relating to point XIV, “meaning of no limitations”. The Chairman had proposed to add a sentence at the end of paragraph 11 of MTN.GNS/W/164. Switzerland had presented some alternative language to the Chairman’s drafting. It was the general view of Members that, while it was desirable to improve the guidelines on this point, any change should be consistent with Article XX of the GATS.

16. Switzerland argued that the Chairman’s proposal on this issue was in contradiction with Article XX:2 of the GATS. Canada agreed, but also had problems with the alternative proposal made by Switzerland. Its representative argued that it was not appropriate for the Committee on Specific Commitments to add obligations to Article XX:2 of the GATS by means of the scheduling guidelines. Japan pointed out that the scheduling guidelines were not to be applied retroactively and that, as guidelines, they were not legally binding. Thus, any change made to them could not affect existing commitments and entries in the schedules. Its representative said that the alternative proposal by Switzerland could constitute a solution to the problem. Uruguay said that both the Chairman’s proposal and the proposal by Switzerland were meant to clarify Article XX:2 and could not prevail over it. Australia found both proposals slightly confusing, but expressed a preference for the Chairman’s proposal, which it considered more liberalizing in nature. The European Communities,

Hong Kong, China and the Republic of Korea found that the proposals clarified a confusing situation arising from Article XX:2 and argued that the scheduling guidelines were the right instrument to address this issue.

17. The representative of the United States agreed that the proposals were useful to address a lack of clarity in the commitments, but questioned that the proposal by Switzerland was more compatible with Article XX:2 than the proposal by the Chairman. The representative of Argentina supported the proposal by the Chairman and argued that it was not inconsistent with Article XX:2, but rather clarified it, as it was useful to individuate discriminatory measures scheduled in the market access column. Moreover, with respect to existing commitments it was clear that the guidelines were prospective and not retroactive in nature. Mexico recalled that its proposal on this issue was to merge the market access and the national treatment columns. However, the representative expressed flexibility on the proposals by the Chairman and by Switzerland.

18. The representative of Guatemala supported the proposals by the Chairman and said that the scheduling guidelines should not be used to modify the Agreement, but to clarify some provisions. She also recalled that in document S/CSC/W/19 it was clearly stated that the scheduling guidelines would not constitute an authentic interpretation of the Agreement. Brazil said that it was understood that the scheduling guidelines would have no retroactive effects, and that his delegation was still examining the implications of both proposals. He added that it was important that Members also consider the implications for future commitments of any revisions to the guidelines. The Chairman noted that the vast majority of speakers agreed that the scheduling guidelines were a useful way of clarifying uncertainty created by Article XX:2 of the GATS. It was, however, the general view that any change to the guidelines in this respect would not be retroactive and should not be inconsistent with the text of Article XX:2.

XV. MODE 4 COMMITMENTS WITHOUT SPECIFIED DURATION

19. On this issue the Secretariat had originally suggested the deletion of paragraph 4 of MTN.GNS/W/164/Add.1. As an alternative to deletion, the Chairman had proposed to add a sentence at the end of paragraph 4. At previous meetings, the United States proposed a small change to this sentence and Hong Kong, China proposed some alternative text to replace the last two sentences of paragraph 4.

20. Egypt, India and Pakistan expressed a strong preference for keeping paragraph 4 of MTN.GNS/W/164/Add.1 and in this respect supported the proposal by the Chairman, provided that the word “shall” was not changed to “should”, as suggested at the previous meeting by the United States. These delegations also expressed some flexibility on the proposal made by Hong Kong, China, provided that paragraph 4 of MTN.GNS/W/164/Add.1 was not deleted. Japan expressed a preference for the alternative proposal made by Hong Kong, China. The representative of Mauritius said that in this case it would have been important to distinguish between natural persons as service suppliers and natural persons as employees of corporate entities which are service suppliers. Hong Kong, China said that the last two sentences of its alternative proposal (the text between square brackets in paragraph 26/Rev.1, document Job. No. 3086) could be deleted. The representative of the United States argued that changing “shall” to “should” was desirable to reflect the language of the scheduling guidelines, where the word should was normally used. He also said that the first part of paragraph 4 of MTN.GNS/W/164/Add.1 was no longer appropriate for the revised version of the scheduling guidelines.

21. Argentina expressed a preference for keeping paragraph 4 of MTN.GNS/W/164/Add.1 and said that changing “shall” to “should” was not a minor change, as it affected the whole paragraph. Its representative supported the Chairman proposals, while retaining the word “shall”. Côte d’Ivoire, Korea, Mauritius, Morocco and Philippines echoed the comments made by Argentina. Brazil asked to

keep paragraph 4 and reserved its position on the proposals by the Chairman. Australia expressed a preference for the proposal by the Chairman, which was more specific and contained a reference to the Annex on Movement of Natural Persons. The Chairman noted that the majority of delegations had spoken in favour of keeping paragraph 4 and adding the language proposed by the Chairman, while a smaller number of delegation had supported the proposal by Hong Kong, China. He suggested that Members revert to this item at the next meeting.

22. At the end of the discussion on the outstanding issues in the revision of the scheduling guidelines, the Chairman sought delegations' views on how to advance work in this area. He proposed that, once a common understanding was reached on the outstanding issues Members wished to include in the revised guidelines, it might be appropriate to insert these in the text of the guidelines and produce a first draft of the new guidelines for consideration by the Committee. This would be done on the assumption that nothing was agreed until everything was agreed. He noted that a single draft text would help delegations to consider all the issues involved in the revision of the guidelines together. It would also give them a chance to return to minor drafting issues relating to that part of the revised guidelines, on which a common understanding already existed. He proposed that, before asking the Secretariat to compile further material, Members revert to this issues in informal consultations to be held before the next Committee.

23. It was so agreed.

C. CLASSIFICATION ISSUES

24. The discussions on the classification of services sectors was held in informal mode. At the end of the informal dissuasions, the Chairman gave the following summary to the full formal Committee:

Energy services

25. Delegations had a very interesting and substantive discussion based on a proposal submitted by the delegation of the United States (S/CSC/W/27, dated 18 May 2000). An "illustrative list of energy services" had been submitted earlier by the European Communities (Job No. 4145, dated 14 July 1999). The US proposal was very well received by delegations, who pointed out that it was a useful idea to try to fill the gap with respect to the classification of energy services not yet covered by the W/120. Many delegations noted that in the CSC the work on energy should focus on classification issues, while other issues referred to in the US paper, such as "model schedule" and "reference paper" could be addressed in other contexts and at a later stage. It was noted that although the US paper contained a very interesting description of the market structure of the energy sector, in classifying energy services account should be taken of the differences in market structures between Members and also of the differences among the various energy sectors. In this respect a number of delegations said that to the extent possible it would be important to work on the basis of internationally agreed definitions, such as the CPC.

26. Some delegations said that the list of energy activities in "Attachment A" was too detailed and that any possible classification of this sector should be aimed at facilitating the undertaking of specific commitments in the schedules. It was noted that although the US paper did not refer to it yet, the "core" and "cluster" distinction might also be useful for the classification of energy services. One delegation said that in developing a classification for this sector, Members should keep in mind that in many countries the energy sector was still dominated by government enterprises.

27. The United States said that their paper was aimed at creating a comprehensive classification of energy services, while at the same time respecting existing commitments, as it was important to avoid any overlap between newly identified energy services and existing GATS commitments. Its

representative pointed out that the paper avoided the distinction between “core” and “cluster”, as the W/120 hardly identified any pre-existing “core” activities in the energy sector. Replying to questions from delegations the representative of the United States said that the reference to “model schedule” and “reference paper” in the proposal was only meant to give some perspective to the work done in the Committee, which would focus on the issue of classification.

28. Some Members expressed a preference for relying directly on the provisional CPC in classifying energy services rather than on the existing W/120 entries and the delegation of the US said that they would be also open to this suggestion. One delegation said that version 1 of the CPC constituted a substantial improvement in the classification of energy services with respect to the provisional CPC and that therefore it would have been useful to rely on the CPC version 1 in the classification of this sector.

29. Interest was also expressed by delegations on the issue of services relating to production and on the status of “manufacturing on a contract or fee basis” in the CPC. It was argued that the list of energy activities in Attachment B might contain a number of activities not subject to the GATS and that therefore Members should be careful about not bringing under the GATS activities that are already covered under other trade agreements. One delegation said that on a preliminary basis they could only support the inclusion in the classification of energy services of those activities which were not related to the production of energy goods. This delegation also noted that this was an issue closely linked to the general question of the relationship between GATT and GATS and that it should be addressed generally rather than on a sector by sector basis. It was agreed that the Secretariat would prepare a paper on the issue of “manufacturing on a contract or fee basis” for the next meeting of the Committee.

Environmental services

30. The discussion focused mainly on the classification of “core services”. The Chairman said that the papers by the European Communities (S/CSC/W/25, dated 28 September 1999) and Canada (Job No. 5542, dated 22 September 1999) appeared to identify two categories of “core” environmental services: (i) services included in the CPC and in the W/120 and; (ii) new services not listed in the W/120. He pointed out that with respect to the latter category, Members should consider carefully whether the relevant services were new “core” services or should be moved to the “cluster” section. He recalled that at the last meeting it had been suggested that the entries “wholesale and retail trade services of waste, scrap and other material for recycling” and “storage services” should be moved to the cluster section. It was also suggested that the entry “metal waste and scrap recycling services on a fee or contract basis” should be renamed as “early recycling services on a fee or contract basis”. At this meeting delegations repeated their comments made at the previous meeting and made further comments to the paper by the European Communities, which had been adopted as the basis for further discussions on this sectors. One delegation suggested moving the entry “public awareness programmes” from item 6(f) “protection of biodiversity and landscape” to item 6(g) “other environmental & ancillary services”, due to its broader characteristics. Another delegation suggested that in their new proposal, the EC and Canada might want to provide some examples of “other environmental protection services” under item 6(g).

31. Another issue discussed with regard to the EC proposal on environmental services was whether the “distribution of water through mains” should be regarded as an environmental service, covered by item 6B (water for human use and wastewater management). At this meeting one delegation said that although it was theoretically possible to include water distribution under environmental services, some doubts existed regarding the concordance with the CPC made in the EC paper. Another delegation made a general point regarding the classification of environmental services, noting that although the EC had based its proposal on the Eurostat-OECD classification system, there might be some discrepancies between the two.

32. On the issue of clusters, one Member made detailed comments on the EC proposal and suggested to sub-divide the general construction entry in page 7 between “construction services of infrastructures” and “construction services for pollution control facilities”. Under the new sub-divisions, the entry “septic system installation services” in the second column of the EC proposal would fall under “construction services for pollution control facilities”, while the entry “Construction services” in the second column would fall under “construction services of infrastructures”. Some Members said that they still had general concerns and reservations on the “clusters” approach. It was therefore the general view that the CSC would continue to consider proposals on “clusters” in the specific sectors, without pre-empting the outcome of the general debate on the “clusters” approach. The EC undertook to take account of all comments made by delegations in a new version of the paper they were preparing with Canada for the next meeting of the Committee. One delegation emphasised that at one point in time Members would have to consider the implications for existing commitments of changes to the classification.

33. At the end of the discussions on “core services” and “clusters” in the environment sector, the Chairman raised a general question concerning the structure of the EC proposal. He noted that the tables contained in the EC proposal were structured in four columns titled respectively: (1) classes and services, (2) examples/descriptions, (3) provisional CPC and (3) CPC version 1. Before drafting any proposals on new classification he said that it might be useful to clarify what entries would be retained in a possible new classification of environmental services. For example whether delegations would consider keeping references to “examples and description” (column two) next to “classes and services” (column one) or whether the new classification of environmental services would refer to the provisional CPC (column three), to Version 1 (column four) or to both.

Legal services

34. Japan submitted a new proposal (Job No. 3186, dated 23 May 2000), which elaborated on a proposal submitted earlier by the United States (Job No. 2157, dated 14 April 1999) and focused on the distinction between legal services relating to host country law and foreign legal consultancy services. Delegations engaged in a complex technical discussion of issues relating to the definition of legal services. Several delegations expressed an interest in amending the W/120 classification to reflect distinctions in the practice of law based on the difference in jurisdiction, although different views were expressed on the treatment to reserve to international law and the law of international business transactions. On international law Japan clarified that according to their proposal foreign legal consultants would be allowed to practice only international law which is in force in their home jurisdiction, thus, for example, a foreign legal consultant from a Member of the European Union would be allowed to practice European Community law in another WTO Member while a lawyer from the United States would be allowed to practice NAFTA law, but not vice-versa. Some uncertainty existed on whether reference to international law was meant to include public international as well as private international law.

35. It was noted that the two proposals, unlike the CPC and the W/120, attempted to classify legal services on the basis of jurisdiction, to reflect the approach taken by most Members who had scheduled commitments in legal services. One delegation expressed a preference for the existing classification in the W/120, which did not distinguish among legal services on the basis of jurisdiction, but offered flexibility in considering the approach proposed in the papers by the United States and Japan. Another delegation emphasised that even if Members were to identify a classification category for foreign legal consultants, lawyers should only be allowed to practice in the field of the law they are qualified for. It was the general view, however, that the possible identification of a classification category for foreign legal consultants did not prejudice in any way the right of Members to impose qualification requirements.

Postal and courier services

36. Delegations continued to exchange views on the basis of papers submitted earlier by Australia (Job No. 6077, dated 9 November 1998) and the European Communities (Job No. 4146, dated 14 July 1999) and on a proposal made orally by the United States at the previous meeting. Some delegations made detailed comments on the EU and US proposals and the discussion touched on key issues such as the identification of a separate sub-sector for express delivery services, the relationship between courier services and express services, the role of state monopolies in postal services, the distinction between basic and value added services and the relationship between express delivery services and air transport services.

37. One delegation said that express services and courier services had much in common (including the speed, the world-wide distribution network and some value added elements) and that it was necessary to identify the specific characteristics of express services to justify a separate classification. The same delegation asked the United States to clarify how the new classification of express delivery services would relate to air traffic rights, which were excluded from the scope of the GATS. Another delegation emphasised that a new classification in this sector should be based on objective distinctions among sub-sectors and not on distinctions between competitive and non-competitive segments of the market. The same delegation supported an open market approach to express delivery services, but warned against the risk that narrow classification be used to promote narrow commitments. Another delegation said that regarding the proposal to classify separately express delivery services, they had some concerns about the focus on value added services as in their view it was difficult to distinguish between basic and value added services in this area.

38. The United States replied that, having looked very closely at the CPC definition of courier services, it had found that this definition was far too narrow to include the activities involved in express delivery services, which constituted an industry in its own right. For this reason, the US proposed to create a new category for the classification of express delivery services. Electronic tracking was an example of a service activity involved in express delivery services, which needed to be classified under the GATS. On air traffic rights, the United States said there was no need to exclude them from the definition of activities involved in express delivery services, as the Annex on Air Transport Services already excluded air traffic rights from the scope of the GATS. Another delegation made specific comments on the categories identified in the proposal by the European Communities and suggested that, in order to improve clarity, categories 4 and 5 could be deleted and incorporated into categories 1, 2 and 3.

39. Although the discussion was very detailed, it was evident that more technical work was needed in this area.

Construction services

40. Delegations continued to work on a proposal by New Zealand on construction services (Job No. 5479, dated 22 September 1999), which aimed at identifying a new category for "integrated construction services", similar to the existing W/120 category on integrated engineering services. One delegation announced that it was also working on a proposal on the classification of construction services. New Zealand said that the proposal aimed at filling a gap in the classification of construction services identified in the exchange of information programme, namely the lack of an entry for multi-stage construction projects.

41. The discussion focused on the usefulness of creating a new category for the negotiation of specific commitments in this sector and on the structure envisaged for the new category in the revised classification. A question was raised on whether the entry for integrated construction services would be a combination of existing W/120 entries or whether it would include some new services. It

emerged from the discussion that what was proposed was to create a new “core service” rather than a cluster, which should help Members to undertake commitments on multistage projects.

42. One delegation supported the proposal by New Zealand on construction, but pointed out that the example of “integrated engineering services” had so far not been very successful in attracting specific commitments. Another delegation said that, as many Members had the same type of commitments and restrictions across existing construction sub-sectors, the creation of a single sector for multi-stage projects might result in the same commitments and restrictions. Some delegations supported the idea of referring to CPC version 1 in order to further define the category of integrated engineering services. One delegation argued that any new classification should also take account of domestic regulatory frameworks and, in particular, of how the granting of licenses was structured at the national level.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

43. The Chairman informed delegations that a request for observer status in the Committee on Specific Commitments had been received from the Universal Postal Union (UPU). The request was circulated to Members in document Job No. 3087. He pointed out that if Members were to grant observer status, this would only give the UPU access to the formal meetings of the Committee. He also recalled that, although consultations on the general issue of observership were pending in the General Council, it was for the Committee to take a decision based on the merit of this specific case.

44. Some delegations noted that the General Council was still working on guidelines for the granting of observer status and that for the time being the Committee could only consider granting observer status to its formal meetings on an *ad hoc* basis. India said that although it was open to receiving information from other organizations, it was concerned about creating precedents by granting *ad hoc* observer status to one organization. If other Members were willing to consider this request on an *ad hoc* basis, observership could only be granted to the formal sessions of the Committee and could not include the transmission of informal documents. Uruguay recalled that several requests for observer status were pending before the Services Council, including one from SELA, and that it was important that all requests were considered consistently. The Chairman pointed out that, as this item had been raised under other business, Members could not take a decision at this meeting of the Committee and proposed that the Committee revert to this item at its next meeting.
