

**AGREEMENT BETWEEN JAPAN AND SINGAPORE  
FOR A NEW-AGE ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP**

Questions and Replies

The following communication, dated 7 April 2004, is being circulated at the request of the Delegation of Singapore.

This document reproduces the questions addressed to the Parties and the responses submitted. The questions and replies set out below are organized in accordance with document WT/REG140/3 (Goods aspects) and WT/REG140/4 (Services aspects).

---

GOODS ASPECT

**II. TRADE PROVISIONS**

**1. Import Restrictions**

**1.1 Duties And Charges**

**1. Japan's schedule for eliminating tariffs on the products of Singapore is contained in Annex I of the agreement. Of the 96 chapters in Japan's tariff schedule:**

- **52 chapters are completely covered in the Annex, with the tariff on all products of Singapore having been eliminated as of November 30, 2002;**
- **4 chapters do not appear at all: Chapters 19 (preparations of cereals); 20 (preparations of vegetables); 42 (articles of leather); and 64 (footwear); and**
- **40 chapters appear in part, having specific carve-outs or omissions; most tariff lines that do appear had their tariffs eliminated for products from Singapore as of November 30, 2002, while a few tariff lines will have their tariffs phased out by 2010.**

**Of the chapters that partly appear in Japan's Annex, significant omissions include tariff lines for: fresh or frozen fish (Chapter 3); vegetables (Chapter 7); rice, wheat and barley (Chapter 10); rice, wheat, corn or rye flour (Chapter 11); prepared fish (Chapter 16); sugars (Chapter 17); chocolate (Chapter 18); and distilled spirits (Chapter 22).**

**Singapore's schedule for eliminating tariffs on the products of Japan also is contained in Annex I. It calls on Singapore to eliminate tariffs on all products of Japan as of November 30, 2002.**

**Article 14, paragraph 2 states that at the request of either party, the parties will consult to consider scheduling the elimination of customs duties on goods that are not yet set out in the Schedules of Annex I.**

- (a) What was Japan's rationale for excluding so many tariff lines in agriculture from this agreement at the time it entered into force?**

The agricultural sector is covered by the JSEPA, and tariffs on approximately 98% of total trade between the parties are free. The JSEPA fulfills the requirement of Article 24 of GATT.

- (b) Have any Japanese tariff lines subsequently been added to its Schedule in Annex I (i.e., any tariff lines that were not yet set out in the Annex at the time the agreement took effect)? If so, how many tariff lines were added, and why were they not included when the agreement took effect?**

There is no tariff line subsequently added.

- (c) Does Japan have any plans to identify additional tariff lines - particularly for agricultural products - for tariff elimination under this agreement, and if so, when and for what products?**

There are no such plans at the moment.

- (d) What proportion of Japan's tariff lines are not yet included in the schedule? For the year 2003, approximately what proportion of Japan's total merchandise imports from Singapore was merchandise classified under tariff lines that were not included in Japan's Schedule in Annex I?**

For the year 2003, 24 % of Japan's tariff lines, which account for approximately 7% of Japan's total merchandise imports from Singapore, are not yet included in the schedule.

- (e) Is there any requirement in the agreement that tariff lines not currently included in Japan's Annex eventually be included in the Annex? Does the agreement embrace the possibility that the parties could simply agree to never request consultations on the addition of further tariff lines, or to hold consultations to "consider" tariff elimination, but never really act?**

In Article 8, we have established a Supervisory Committee to ensure the proper implementation of this Agreement, to review the economic relationship and partnership between the Parties, and to consider the necessity of amending this Agreement for furthering its objectives. In Article 10, we have a general review of the operation of this Agreement in 2007 and every five years thereafter. In addition, Article 14(2) of JSEPA also provides for consultations to schedule the elimination of customs duties on goods that are not yet set out in the schedules of Annex 1.

- (f) Japan's Annex phases out tariffs on certain products of polyethylene—which ranged from 2.8% to 3.9% when the agreement took effect—over eight periods, with final tariff elimination not taking place until January 1, 2010. Why is such a long phase-out period required for tariffs that are not very high?**

We understand that your question is referring to the tariff elimination schedule of HS 390110090 etc. Concerning this product, production facilities have rapidly been increased under the Singapore Government's assistance to the petrochemical industry, and most of these products are

made for export. (The demand for this product is almost zero within Singapore, and so, the expansion of production facilities was undertaken specifically for Japan.)

Therefore, if the tariff on this product is rapidly lowered, the Japanese petrochemical industry will suffer severe damage, so the tariff elimination schedule by 2010 is determined in JSEPA.

- (g) **Does Japan apply any tariff-rate quotas to products of Singapore during the transition period during which tariffs are being eliminated? If so, will the TRQ in-quota volumes grow during the transition period?**

Japan has no such tariff-rate quotas.

**2. Article 14, paragraph 4 states that each party will eliminate other duties or charges of any kind imposed on or in connection with the importation of goods of the other party.**

- (a) **Which duties or charges has/will each party eliminate(d) with respect to imports from the other party for the purpose of complying with paragraph 4? What is the purpose of these duties or charges?**

Neither Party has such duties or charges.

- (b) **Do the eliminated duties or charges generate public funding for any government-provided, trade-related functions related to merchandise trade between the parties?**

Neither Party has such duty or charge elimination that generates public funding.

- (c) **If so, once they are eliminated on merchandise trade between the parties, will the party imposing the duty or charge continue to perform those trade-related functions without raising the level of the duty or charge on merchandise trade with third countries?**

Please see the answer to question 2(b).

**1.2 Quantitative Restrictions**

**3. Article 17:(a) - Neither country will institute or maintain WTO-inconsistent non-tariff barriers (NTBs) on imports from or exports to the other party.**

- (a) **Since both countries are WTO members, they should be refraining from such activity already; why is this item even here?**

As Japan and Singapore are WTO members, we do not have non-tariff measures, inconsistent with WTO. However, we have put this item here to re-affirm commitment that neither Party shall adopt nor maintain any non-tariff measures inconsistent with WTO.

- (b) **Will either party continue to impose WTO-consistent NTBs on imports from or exports to the other party? Will any such NTBs eventually be phased out with respect to trade between the parties? For what purpose does the party continue to impose these NTBs?**

We will continue to impose WTO-consistent NTBs such as SPS or TBT measures; however the purpose is as prescribed in the WTO Agreements.

- (c) **Does/will a party maintaining any WTO-consistent NTBs administer them differently with respect to trade with the other party and trade with third countries? If so, how are they administered differently and why?**

No, we do not administer them differently.

**4. Article 17:(b) - Each party will ensure the transparency of any NTBs and their compliance with the party's WTO obligations with a view to minimizing possible distortion to trade as much as possible.**

- (a) **Will either party remove or diminish any NTB with respect to imports from or exports to the other party, but retain that NTB with respect to imports from or exports to the US and other third countries?**

No, we do not discriminate against third parties

- (b) **Would removing or diminishing any NTB with respect to the products of the other party undercut the NTB's original purpose or function?**

We are not removing or diminishing any WTO-consistent NTB.

- (c) **If not, can the NTB be diminished to any degree with respect to products from third countries in a way that does not undercut it?**

See answers to Questions 4 (a) and (b).

**3. Rules of Origin**

**5. Article 23 states that in cases where product origin is determined using the value-added method (and based on a percentage specified for that product in Annex IIA), the qualifying value content is 100% if the value of the material from the parties is at least 60% of the total value of materials and the last production or operation took place in one of the parties.**

**Is the 60% threshold too high, encouraging unrealistically high levels of qualifying content and restricting market access for imported materials and components from third countries?**

The 60% threshold has been agreed by the contracting parties as a result of the negotiations. The threshold could be reviewed if the both parties so agree.

**5. Safeguards**

**6. Article 18 relates to the imposition, during the transition period to bilateral duty-free trade, of safeguard actions by one party to the products of the other in the event of serious injury of a domestic industry of the first party.**

**In what ways are this FTA's threshold and methods for determining injury the same, and in what ways are they different, from the threshold and methods used for safeguard actions under the WTO? Does each party hold the other party to a standard for determining injury that is no more favourable than that to which it holds WTO members?**

The emergency measures in this FTA have several points different from the threshold and methods used for safeguard actions under the WTO.

1. These emergency measures are used only during the transition period (of 10 years.)
2. In using this emergency measures each party may:
  - (a) suspend the further reduction of any rate or customs duty on the good provided for in this Agreement; or
  - (b) increase the rate of customs duty on good to a level not to exceed the lesser of:
    - (i) the most-favoured-nation applied rate of customs duty in effect at the time when the measure set out in this Agreement is taken; and
    - (ii) the most-favoured-nation applied rate of customs duty in effect on the day immediately preceding the date of entry into force of this Agreement.
3. These emergency measures shall not be maintained exceeding one year with very exceptional circumstances maintained for up to total maximum period of three years. Also these measures shall not be applied again to the import of a particular originating good which has been subjected to the measure during the transition period.

In terms of determining injury there is no favourable standard to the other party than to the other WTO members.

**7. Article 18, paragraph 3 relates to the notification requirements of each party to the other with regard to one party's imposition of a safeguard action on imports of products of the other party.**

**The imposition by one party of a safeguard action only against a product of another party would impact trade in subject merchandise between the imposing country and third countries. As such, do the parties also intend to also notify the WTO, or at least make essential information related to such notifications publicly available?**

Because the increase of the rate of customs duty on good to a level that does not exceed the lesser of the most-favoured-nation applied rate of customs duty in effect, it does not have a bad impact on trade in subject merchandise between the imposing country and third countries. There is no notification to the WTO required in this Agreement; however we will make essential information available to public.

## **II. GENERAL PROVISIONS OF THE AGREEMENT**

### **1. Exceptions And Reservations**

**8. Article 19, paragraph 1 lists reasons ((a) through (j)) for which the parties reserve the right to adopt or enforce measures that may inhibit trade.**

- (a) **Please list any trade-inhibiting policies currently in force that are justified under any of the reasons described in (a) through (j). What products are affected by these measures?**

The language of these exceptions is the same as the Article XX of GATT 1994. Please find a reference of the Article XX of the GATT 1994.

- (b) **Is each such measure administered exactly the same with respect to the products of third countries? If not, for which products does the administration of the measure differ with respect to non-parties, and how does it differ? What volume of trade is impacted?**

The language of these exceptions to trade in goods is the same as the Article XX of GATT 1994.

**9. Article 19, paragraph 1, reason (i) states that under certain circumstances, parties may impose restrictions on exports of domestic materials necessary to ensure essential quantities of such materials to a domestic processing industry during periods when the domestic price of such materials is held below the world price as part of a governmental stabilization plan.**

- (a) **What exactly is meant by domestic materials? Do they include manufactured items that are components of other manufactured items?**

Please find the reference of the Article XX of GATT 1994.

- (b) **What exactly is a government stabilization plan? Are there criteria to help observers know whether such restrictions, if imposed in the future, are really part of a government stabilization plan or are imposed merely as protectionism?**

Please find the reference of the Article XX of GATT 1994.

### **3. Dispute Settlement Procedures**

**10. Chapter 21 contains the agreement's procedures for dispute avoidance and settlement, including the establishment of arbitral tribunals.**

- (a) **Chapter 21 does not specifically described what award may be granted by an arbitral tribunal to the prevailing party in a dispute. Could such an award include a binding order to a party to modify the substance or enforcement of a law, regulation or procedure affecting international trade or investment between the parties?**

An award made by an arbitral tribunal constituted under the Dispute Settlement chapter of JSEPA shall be complied with promptly. In the award, the arbitral tribunal shall set out its findings of law and fact, together with the reasons and may include suggested implementation options. The Parties agree that the award of the arbitral tribunal shall be final and binding on the Parties.

- (b) **If such an award would result in a binding order to modify a law, regulation or procedure on intra-party trade or investment, would WTO parties be notified of the change and why it was necessary?**

JSEPA does not derogate from the commitments which each Party had made under the WTO agreements. As such, each Party is still required to comply with the transparency requirements imposed therein, such as those in Article X of the GATT and Article III of GATS.

In addition, under Article 2 of the JSEPA, the Parties are also required to promptly make public, or otherwise make publicly available its laws, regulations, administrative procedures and administrative rulings and judicial decisions of general application as well as international agreements which pertain to or affect the operation of the JSEPA.

### **III. OTHER**

#### **3. General**

**11. Article 36 requires each party to provide for prompt customs clearance of goods traded between the parties by, among other things, simplifying its customs procedures.**

- (a) Will a party's simplification of customs procedures apply equally to trade with the other party and trade with non-parties?**

Yes, it does.

- (b) If not, which customs procedures will be applied differently, and how and why will they be applied differently?**

Please see the answers for question (a) above.

### **SERVICES ASPECTS**

#### **I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE AGREEMENT**

##### **3. Scope**

**12. As with any positive list agreement, it is difficult to ascertain the actual level of liberalization without examining both the scope of service sectors included as well as the nature of any reservations that apply to those sectors that are listed.**

**Could the Parties facilitate this assessment by describing the principal improvements in market access and national treatment resulting from this agreement? For example, could the Parties provide a list of sectors included in this agreement that were not listed in their respective GATS schedules and indicate the extent to which these sectors are bound without reservations?**

**Similarly, with respect to those sectors that are listed in the GATS schedules of commitments, could the Parties describe areas where further liberalization was achieved through the elimination of limitations to market access and national treatment?**

As to the level of liberalization, commitments made by Japan cover 134 services sub-sectors, while Singapore makes its commitments covering 139 sub-sectors. In comparison with all 155 sub-sectors listed in "services sectoral classification list (MTN.GNS/W/120)", the coverage of commitments by both countries fulfils the condition of "substantial sectoral coverage" in the meaning of GATS V: 1(a).

As to the areas where further liberalization was achieved, Singapore makes new commitments in 77 sub-sectors, while Japan makes new commitments in 32 sub-sectors. If you need more detailed information, please refer to the Schedule of Specific Commitments of both countries.

**13. It appears as though services provided through a commercial presence (i.e., an establishment) may be covered under both the chapter on services and the chapter on investment. It also looks like the services chapter uses a positive list, while the investment chapter uses a negative list. Is this the case or have they used the annexes to clarify what's covered where?**

Yes. As services provided through a commercial presence are also an investment as defined in the chapter on investment, they will also be covered under the chapter on investment.

**14. Please explain the relationship between the services and investment chapters as they pertain to services provided through an establishment or a commercial presence.**

Already orally explained at the 35th session of the CRTA. Please refer to paragraph 20 of the minutes (WT/REG140/M/1)

**15. How might a service provided through an establishment be covered by the disciplines contained in each of these chapters?**

Where relevant, the disciplines of both chapters will apply to a service provided through an establishment.

**16. Are there any differences in sectoral coverage between services provided through a commercial presence under the Services Chapter as compared with services provided through an establishment under the Investment Chapter?**

The services sectors covered by the chapter on services are listed in each Party's schedule of specific commitments. The sectors covered by the chapter on investment are defined by the investment annex reservations. These reservations spell out the sectors which are not subject to the investment disciplines.

Additionally, both parties would like to submit the chart of the Japan-Singapore MRA (see Annex).

#### **IV. OTHER**

**1. Movement Of Natural Persons**

**17. Article 93 states that each party *may recognize* professional qualifications (e.g., education or experience, licenses or certifications) of natural persons of the other party. Article 93 appears to not require such recognition be mutual, and to give broad latitude to each party to continue to not recognize professional qualifications. (Article 94 establishes a Joint Committee on Mutual Recognition of Professional Qualifications, which appears intended to identify ways to broaden such recognition.)**

**(a) Why is there not a stronger provision to ensure that recognition of professional qualifications is truly mutual?**

The provision takes into account the differences in the requirements for certification and/or licensure of various professionals between Japan and Singapore. Article 93 does sufficiently provide for mutual recognition - Clause 3 requires each party to accord the other the opportunity to make the case for mutual recognition. As such, the recognition of professional qualifications between Japan and Singapore is committed at a level that is comfortable with both parties.

**(b) Which professional qualifications are recognized by each party or by one party? What industries are affected?**

Both countries have already started discussion to explore possible areas for mutual recognition of professional qualifications in the Joint Committee established under the Article 93.



Within the JSEPA, both parties have committed to the entry and temporary stay of business persons who possess acceptable qualifications, and any other conditions as required by the host country which are not confined to specific industries. The specific commitments can be found in Annex VI of the JSEPA.

### **Trade and Investment Promotion/Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs)**

**18. Article 126 states that the parties will cooperate in promoting trade and investment activities by private enterprises of each.**

**What types of steps are envisioned to promote trade and investment? Could such promotion include preferential, government-assisted financing of investment and trade, tax breaks or other assistance or benefits by a party's government at any level to investors of the other party, etc.?**

Under the JSEPA, besides the liberalization of trade in goods and services, there are many other areas of co-operation. One of these is co-operation in trade and investment promotion. To implement this, IE Singapore and JETRO (Japan External Trade Organization) has signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), under the JSEPA, on 26 October 2001.

A Working Committee meeting between IE Singapore, JETRO Singapore and SPRING Singapore was held on 30 Jan 2003 to discuss the events for implementation in 2003. A second Working Committee meeting was held during the second half of 2003.

The progress under the different areas of the MOU is as follows:

(a) Joint organization of industry-specific missions and seminars.

So far, IE has co-organized with JETRO: Two IT seminars in Tokyo and "Doing Business in Japan" Seminars during 2003. IE is also embarked on an Electronics and Precision Engineering (EPE) mission to five prefectures and cities in Japan (Kumamoto, Osaka, Gifu, Tokyo and Kanagawa) in October and November 2003.

(b) Joint organization of business study missions to third countries.

IE proposed to JETRO that Japanese companies can participate in the IE missions which are open to participation by foreign companies. JETRO is considering this proposal and it will be further discussed.

(c) The sharing of online databases of Singapore and Japanese companies keen to establish business ties.

The JETRO's TTPP-IE Singapore Database search gate was completed on mid 2002, helping companies in Japan and Singapore to exchange information to facilitate business tie-ups.

In addition to the activities under the IE-JETRO MOU, IE has also promoted JSEPA through organizing FTA Outreach Programs for the Electronics and Precision Engineering, Logistics, International Trading, Shipping and Lifestyle industries over the course of 2003.

Existing schemes to attract foreign companies to Singapore are open to all foreign countries. Such promotion does not include preferential, government-assisted financing of investment and trade, tax breaks or other assistance or benefits by a party's government at any level to investors of Japan.

**19. Similarly, Article 131 states that the parties will cooperate in facilitating investments of Japanese SMEs in Singapore (with a view to enhancing bilateral SME cooperation elsewhere in Southeast Asia) and of Singaporean SMEs in Japan.**

**What types of steps are envisioned to facilitate investment by SMEs? Could such facilitation include preferential financing of investment, tax breaks or other assistance or benefits by any level of a party's government to investors of the other party, etc.?**

In supporting JSEPA, IE Singapore and JETRO have also organized seminars and facilitated business-matching sessions for incoming Japanese enterprises from different prefectures and cities. IE Singapore has led trade missions to Japan with companies in various industries such as food, electronics and precision engineering. In addition, we received incoming delegations from Japan, which comprised of companies in industries such as IT, lifestyle and food. These business exchanges signal increased business interest in Japan among Singapore companies.

As part of the JSEPA agreement to help facilitate and increase trade relations between enterprises in Japan and Singapore, JETRO has set up its Business Support Centre (BSC) in Singapore. Through its Centre, JETRO has been successful in facilitating the entry of Japanese enterprises into Singapore. Similarly, IE Singapore has opened a Business Support Office in Tokyo in August last year to replicate the success of JETRO's BSC in Singapore. Through our Business Support Office in Tokyo, IE Singapore hopes to facilitate the successful entry of more Singapore companies into the Japanese market, thus bringing about a greater development and exchange of new knowledge, ideas and know-how between the two countries. IE Singapore works in partnership with JETRO and its Invest- Japan Business Support Centre (IBSC) to jointly attract more Singapore companies to set up operations in Japan.

Such facilitation does not include preferential, government-assisted financing of investment and trade, tax breaks or other assistance or benefits by a party's government at any level to investors of Japan.

## **Investment**

**20. Article 75, paragraph 2 states that although both parties are generally precluded under paragraph 1. from imposing specified performance requirements on investments by a person of the other party, neither party is precluded from conditioning the receipt or continued receipt of an "advantage," in connection with such investments, on compliance with certain of those requirements.**

- (a) What specifically is meant by an "advantage" in this paragraph? Give specific examples, particularly of any "advantages" that presently are in effect. What volume of investment is affected by these advantages?**

The reference to an "advantage" generally relates to the incentives or grants which the Parties offer to promote investment. In determining whether to make an investment, there are other key factors for consideration by an investor such as a stable macroeconomic and pro-business environment. As such, it would not be meaningful for us to track the specific data as requested

- (b) May investment by third-country investors be subject to the same conditions for the receipt of advantages? Are the same advantages and terms available to third-country investors as are available to the other party? May advantages to third-country investors, if available, be subject to the same conditions as are advantages to investors of the other party?**

The investment chapter of the JPEPA does not create any rights or obligations to an investor of third-country.

**21. Article 76 allows for specific exceptions to the provision of national treatment for investment (Article 73) and the general prohibition on performance requirements for investment (Article 75). These exceptions are those specified by the parties in Annexes VA and VB or any amendment or modification thereto that does not decrease the level of conformity of the exception with Articles 73 and 75.**

**(a) Why do these exceptions exist?**

There exist some restrictions to foreign investments in a limited number of sectors as listed in the Annex. Security exceptions and prudential measures for financial sector would be typical reasons among others for maintaining such exceptions.

**(b) What volume of investment in that party do these exceptions apply to? What types of investment and trade are directly affected by these exceptions (e.g., sourcing of components, production of domestic markets due to export requirements)?**

Generally, Singapore's exceptions to its liberal investment regime relate principally to restrictions on foreign ownership of real estate, domestic news media and the regulation of the manufacture of arms and explosives and certain products such as cigars, cigarettes and matches. We do not track such data as the volume of investments in such areas is marginal. Japan maintains sectoral exceptions among others for agriculture, mining industry, water transport industry, telecommunication industry and financial services. Data concerning the volume of investments for these exceptions are not available.

**(c) Do these exceptions apply equally and identically to investments by third-country investors? If not, what is the purpose for any differential treatment?**

The exceptions under JSEPA are applied to investment of investors of a Party

**22. Article 83 provides general exceptions to the agreement's provisions on investments, allowing each party to implement measures necessary to protect public morals or maintain public order, protect human, animal or plant life or health, etc.**

**(a) Please list the measures that qualify as exceptions under Article 83.**

Currently, we do not have specific measures in place. This provision is consistent with our commitments under Article XIV of WTO GATS.

**(b) For each measure specified under (a):**

- (i) What volume of investment in the party implementing that measure is affected by the measure?**
- (ii) How and to what degree is investment by the other party impacted?**
- (iii) How, if at all, does this measure impact investment from third-country investors differently from how it impacts investment from the other party's investors?**

See above.

**23. Japan's investment annex indicates a national treatment reservation concerning prior notification for investment in telecommunications, securities, and something called "omnibus industry." Which sectors are included in "omnibus industry"?**

"Omnibus industry" means passenger transport services by bus.

**24. Are national treatment reservations corresponding to this provision included in Japan's Schedule of Specific Commitments under telecommunications and financial services?**

Reservations of investment chapter and Schedule of Specific Commitments for services chapter are independently maintained, in the sense that respective chapters constitute self-contained disciplines which regulate, on its merits, what matters and in which format should be reserved. On this account, there is no inconsistency in the overlapping areas of both chapters. Besides, "securities" in the reservation of investment chapter means security services and does to relate to financial services.

**25. Singapore's investment annex appears to limit the scope of its commitments under the national treatment and performance requirements disciplines to a positive list, namely those sectors scheduled in accordance with the services chapter. Japan appears to take a reverse, or negative list, approach by specifically listing sectors excluded from the scope of the investment disciplines (e.g., nuclear energy). What is the reason for this different approach? Do the Parties believe that these approaches have achieved a balanced result?**

Each Party's commitments constitute an acceptable package which is a negotiated outcome at the time of the JSEPA negotiations.

#### **Monopolies and Exclusive Suppliers**

**26. We note that Art. 65 pertaining to monopolies and exclusive suppliers is based upon GATS Art. VIII, but also includes an additional provision (Art. 65(3)) regarding the request of information pertaining to a suspected abuse by a monopoly supplier. However, because Article 65(3) does not contain a requirement that the other Party must actually furnish information upon request, what is the practical value of this provision?**

While the paragraph does not impose a firm obligation on the other Party to furnish the information, it is nonetheless an important signal of both Parties' commitment to the principles of transparency

ANNEX

**Japan – Singapore MRA on Telecommunications, Technical Equipments, Radio Equipments, and Electrical Safety**

