United Nations

TD/B/C.I/EM.9/3

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

Distr.: General
23 November 2017

Original: English

Trade and Development Board
Trade and Development Commission
Expert Meeting on the Ways and Means of Improving the Implementation of Priority Areas Agreed in the Istanbul Programme of Action
Geneva, 6–7 November 2017

Report of the Expert Meeting on the Ways and Means of Improving the Implementation of Priority Areas Agreed in the Istanbul Programme of Action

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, 6–7 November 2017

Contents

Introduction

The Expert Meeting on the Ways and Means of Improving the Implementation of Priority Areas Agreed in the Istanbul Programme of Action was held at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, Switzerland, on 6 and 7 November 2017.

I. Chair's summary

A. Opening statement

1. In his opening statement, the Director of the Division for Africa, Least Developed Countries and Special Programmes, UNCTAD, highlighted that the Expert Meeting would focus on improving the implementation of two priority areas agreed in the Istanbul Programme of Action, namely building productive capacities and doubling the least developed countries' share of global exports by 2020, which was also a target under Sustainable Development Goal 17.

2. The Director noted that recent national experiences showed that fast growth, though important, was not sufficient to achieve sustainable and inclusive development in the least developed countries. Instead, lasting improvements in living standards and progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals and the goals of the Istanbul Programme of Action could only be achieved through structural transformation and economic diversification, to allow for the creation of employment and higher value added sectors. A key ingredient was the building of productive capacities. In addition to vulnerability to external shocks in commodity-dependent least developed countries, the least developed countries were characterized by large informal agricultural sectors, and these factors further underscored the need to implement rigorous strategies for inclusive and broad-based economic growth, diversified productive structures and improved industrialization profiles in the least developed countries.

3. With regard to doubling the least developed countries' share of global exports by 2020, the Director noted that the most recent data suggested that this share had in fact decreased. This was of particular concern as imports had increased substantially over the same period, leading to a growing trade deficit. In addition, least developed country exports continued to be concentrated in terms of both products and destinations, highlighting the need for diversification.

4. Against this background, the Director stated that the Expert Meeting would review lessons learned to date from the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action and identify the core challenges faced by the least developed countries and their development partners in achieving its priority areas. One related issue was the need to explore how the least developed countries could strengthen domestic resource mobilization and increase access to international development finance, including exploring how public–private partnerships could be used more effectively. Other challenges were related to enabling the private sector, accessing the technology and skills needed for higher value added production, exploring the mechanisms needed to effectively participate in global value chains and to draw development benefits from them and promoting greater foreign direct investment flows and technology transfer to the least developed countries. Another challenge concerned overall policy prioritization and coherence, which depended on individual country circumstances. The Director noted that UNCTAD was developing a framework of measurable indicators of the level of productive capacity, which could assist policymakers. Finally, the Director stated that there was a need to consider what development partners could do to better assist the least developed countries in achieving the targets of the Istanbul Programme of Action, including opportunities for improving market access conditions for the least developed countries and addressing non-tariff barriers.

B. Ways and means of improving the implementation of priority areas agreed in the Istanbul Programme of Action: Productive capacities and doubling the share of the least developed countries in world exports

(Agenda item 3)

Overview of progress in implementation and achievement of the goals of the Istanbul Programme of Action

5. At the first informal session, the secretariat introduced the background document entitled “Improving implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action goals and targets related to productive capacities and doubling the share of the least developed countries in global exports” (TD/B/C.I/EM.9/2), which provided an assessment of the progress achieved by the least developed countries towards specific goals and targets in the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2011–2020 (Istanbul Programme of Action). Economic growth alone did not guarantee sustainable and inclusive development, as shown by recent experiences in the least developed countries. Despite high growth in the early 2000s, the least developed countries had not been able to improve human and social indicators or significantly increase employment or manufacturing value added. UNCTAD work revealed that sustainable and inclusive growth and development could be realized only through building or developing productive capacities as key ingredients of structural transformation and economic diversification. UNCTAD had identified that the goal of doubling the least developed countries’ share of global exports by 2020, a priority area in the Istanbul Programme of Action, was one of the most daunting challenges for the least developed countries, which had experienced a decrease in this share since 2010, accompanied by bulging deficits in trade balances and an increasing concentration of exports.

6. The panellists for the first informal session comprised a former minister of trade and industry, Haiti; a chief economist to the Prime Minister, Senegal; a senior programme officer, United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States; the Head, Development Planning and Inclusive Growth, United Nations Development Programme; and the Chief, Countries with Special Needs Section, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.

7. The first panellist affirmed that, currently, the most important matter was to ensure synergies and coherence between national plans and international programmes and agreements, including the Sustainable Development Goals and the Istanbul Programme of Action. The panellist described the experience of Haiti, which was committed to achieving the Goals and implementing the Programme as an integral part of its national development framework, yet had a long way to go in many areas. The panellist identified weak ownership and institutional capacities and the lack of increased partnerships as being the most significant obstacles to the country’s progress towards the goals of the Programme.

8. The second panellist highlighted the importance of aligning the Istanbul Programme of Action with other international trade and development agendas, with a particular focus on the need to better link action plans to the criteria for graduation from least developed country status. Senegal, for example, had integrated all eight of the priority areas of the Programme into its national development plan, and had made progress since 2011 towards most of the goals of the Programme, including those related to graduation thresholds. If it was able to maintain its current socioeconomic performance levels, Senegal could graduate from least developed country status by 2025.

9. The third panellist stressed the importance of reducing vulnerability and building resilience in the least developed countries. In this regard, the need for increased investment, both public and private, was emphasized, in particular for energy and information and communications technology infrastructure. The panellist noted, however, that not all finance was suitable for all purposes, and it was important for the least developed countries to assess whether the cost of an investment was justified by its social and economic returns. In addition, the panellist highlighted the need to improve least developed country capacity in tax administration, project development and investor negotiation.

10. The fourth panellist noted that, according to a select group of indicators, significant progress had been made to date in the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action. However, progress varied across the eight priority areas and across countries. The least developed countries were a heterogeneous group, and this underscored the need to look beyond group averages and examine country-by-country assessments. The panellist stressed that achievements by the least developed countries were fragile, with serious risks of reversal due to a high level of population growth, enduring political and security crises and a high level of inequality.

11. The fifth panellist highlighted the diversity of the least developed countries in Asia and the Pacific with regard to resource endowments, including human and natural resources, as well as demographics, institutions and progress achieved towards the goals. The panellist stated that a one-size-fits-all approach should be avoided, and that diversity required addressing country-specific challenges within an integrated international support framework for the least developed countries. The panellist drew attention in particular to the problem of the lack of infrastructure and the substantial financial needs in this regard; the finance needed to build new infrastructure and expand and maintain existing infrastructure in the least developed countries was estimated at 10.7 per cent of gross domestic product per year to 2030. With regard to graduation, the panellist stressed the need for the least developed countries to clearly assess the costs and benefits, or advantages or disadvantages, of graduation, and that the specific measures to support the least developed countries should be phased out in a gradual and predictable manner.

12. The ensuing discussion focused on the ways and means of achieving progress in the priority areas of the Istanbul Programme of Action. One delegate emphasized the importance of identifying good practices for retaining skills and creating an environment for local talent to remain in a country. Another delegate reiterated that greater coherence between national development plans and the international development agenda was critical, and also stressed the importance of rehabilitation of the concept of industrial policy that had long been excluded from mainstream consensus. A few delegates highlighted the need to have an active industrial policy, and emphasized the importance of manufacturing activities in terms of employment generation and skills development and their multiplier effects. One panellist recognized the importance of the manufacturing sector in most of the least developed countries, yet noted that some countries had small markets and limited resources that constrained their capacity to develop manufacturing activities. There was broad consensus that the least developed countries had made progress in some areas but not with regard to many of the core indicators. The discussion highlighted that building productive capacities was critical in the least developed countries, to attain development objectives, and that data availability and reliability was key in helping the least developed countries to quantitatively assess their levels of productive capacity, in order to identify achievements, strengths and weaknesses and the most pressing priorities, as well as to formulate and implement policies and strategies to address challenges.

Strengthening productive capacities for transformation and development

13. The panellists for the second informal session comprised the Head, Trade and Poverty Branch, UNCTAD; a professor at Complutense University of Madrid; the Coordinator, Technology, Structural Transformation and Jobs Programme, International Labour Organization; the Director, Knowledge and Learning, African Capacity-Building Foundation; a trade adviser, Commonwealth Secretariat; and a co-founding partner of Ntare Insights, Rwanda.

14. The first panellist identified two ways of enhancing productive capacities, namely increasing the output of existing products and producing new and more sophisticated products, which involved diversification. The panellist asserted that while the medium-term to long-term goal should be to build new capacities, the focus in the short term should be on how to maintain and utilize existing capacities, with efforts directed primarily to areas in which quick gains might be possible. The panellist noted, however, that an economy could experience the wrong kind of structural change, which could coexist with low levels of development of productive capacities. There was an abundance of ideas and frameworks on

how to develop productive capacities, yet further information was required on how to concretely operationalize them at the country level.

15. The second panellist addressed aid for trade and how it could support productive and export capacities in the least developed countries. Integration into global trade depended not only on building competitive and productive capacities but also increasingly on whether countries could reduce behind-the-border and at-the-border trade barriers. Aid for trade aimed to support countries that lacked capacity, in order to formulate and implement trade policies and improve procedures, institutions and infrastructure. The panellist noted that the effectiveness of aid for trade on recipient country trade capacity was mixed, but that, on the whole, assessments had been positive. He emphasized that, since the limited aid for trade resources flowed more often to middle-income countries, better targeting of such resources was needed, with greater allocation to the least developed countries.

16. The third panellist addressed the issue of transforming education for industrial and technological development in the least developed countries, to generate rapid sustainable and inclusive productive transformation. The panellist stressed the importance of education and knowledge-based approaches to productive transformation that focused on improving the capabilities of societies to innovate, diversify, enter into more complex activities and drive new growth industries. She highlighted the need for each country to develop its own vision for productive transformation and to design educational policies that could build the knowledge base and capabilities needed for structural transformation and industrial development. She noted that such policies should include moving away from an exclusive focus on primary education to formulating a policy package that aligned education and training policies with industrial, innovation and trade policies.

17. The fourth panellist discussed the issue of building capacities in science, technology and innovation for economic diversification in the least developed countries. Focusing on the experience of countries in Africa, the panellist noted that, through science, technology and innovation policies, Ethiopia and Rwanda had witnessed a surge of export earnings from, respectively, coffee and light manufacturing products. The panellist detailed policy recommendations, including in the following areas: formulating and implementing evidence-based and science, technology and innovation-driven industrialization policies; providing enhanced financial and technical support towards science, technology and innovation development through aid for trade mechanisms; and supporting institutions in capacity development and policy coordination, with the aim of building science, technology and innovation capacities at national and regional levels.

18. The fifth panellist explored the link between bilateral, regional and multilateral trade agreements, and building productive capacities in the least developed countries. In sub-Saharan Africa and various small States, trade agreements could be useful instruments in mitigating some of the constraints that hindered the development of productive capacities. The panellist emphasized that trade agreements provided opportunities to quickly increase market access, which could serve as an incentive to build productive capacities. The panellist stated, however, that such benefits could not be realized without the negotiation of good trade agreements that ensured representation and voice for the least developed countries. Developed countries needed to provide trade assistance that ensured that countries in Africa, small island developing States and the least developed countries developed their capacities to produce and trade.

19. The sixth panellist detailed the efforts of Rwanda and the East African Community to increase trade shares and develop productive capacities. The Government of Rwanda had defined its development strategy in Vision 2020, which envisaged Rwanda as becoming a middle-income country by 2020, with a services-oriented and knowledge-based economy. In East Africa, the Northern Corridor integration projects had facilitated the movement of goods, yielding positive results and receiving positive responses from the private sector. The panellist stressed that Governments could put in place polices that included supporting selected small and medium-sized enterprises, to gain access to external markets, and implementing supplier development programmes to make supply chains more efficient.

20. The ensuing discussion considered whether Governments or the private sector should invest in education. One panellist stated that the more important issue was to

designate who should be responsible for defining education programmes and teaching methods, and that it was important to have a mission-oriented education system in which Governments, enterprises and civil society could contribute. One delegate questioned the benefits of trade agreements for developing countries; Nigeria, for example, had not signed an economic partnership agreement with the European Union as it might have led the country to deindustrialization. A few other participants stressed the need for skilful negotiators capable of defending the trade and development interests of developing countries in international agreements.

Mobilizing financial resources for the development of productive capacities

21. In his opening remarks at the third informal session, the Chair of the session noted that the goal was to identify best practices in mobilizing domestic resources and discuss how development partners and the private sector could support the development of productive capacities in the least developed countries. The panellists comprised the Manager and Special Representative of the World Bank to the United Nations and the World Trade Organization; a lead economist, International Fund for Agricultural Development; the Chief Business Officer of Cassa Depositi e Prestiti, Italy; the Deputy Director General, Centre for Development Policy Research, Ministry of Planning and Investment, Lao People’s Democratic Republic; a senior research fellow, World Trade Institute; and a research fellow, Overseas Development Institute.

22. The first panellist noted that official development assistance continued to fall short of the goal of 0.7 per cent of gross national income, and was currently around 0.3 per cent. The panellist noted that even if the goal were attained, it might not be sufficient to finance the Sustainable Development Goals, which required an estimated $5 trillion per year. Additional resources were therefore required through improved domestic resource mobilization, better use of official development assistance and private capital flows, including foreign direct investment, remittances and philanthropic finance. The panellist highlighted the work of the World Bank on improving tax policy and tax administration in the least developed countries. He added that there was a need to use official development assistance more strategically and to design projects in a way that maximized the use of commercial capital. In this context, the panellist referred to the cascade approach of the World Bank to identifying finance for projects, which ensured that public funds were only used if no commercial capital could be attracted.

23. The second panellist underscored that research had shown a positive correlation between structural transformation and the reduction of rural poverty, yet the speed of transmission varied greatly by country. The panellist noted that there was a need, therefore, for supportive policies to strengthen agricultural productivity, including through investments in agricultural processing systems, which could also assist the least developed countries to expand their agricultural output and reduce their growing import bill.

24. The third panellist highlighted the role that national investment promotion agencies could play in assisting the least developed countries to access private capital. For example, the European Union external investment plan was expected to leverage more than €44 billion in investments from public contributions of €4.1 billion. The panellist noted that taking advantage of commercial capital required the design of new projects and new financial models, such as blended finance that mixed concessional and commercial bank finance.

25. The fourth panellist detailed the challenges faced by the Lao People’s Democratic Republic in achieving structural transformation and diversifying exports. The country had achieved high growth since 2002, yet this was driven by natural resource exploitation and the services sector. Since 1980, the country had begun to export about 40 new products, and its product complexity index was comparatively low. In addition, only 20 per cent of manufacturing firms in the country participated in international production networks, and most of these were large firms. The panellist highlighted that this demonstrated the challenges faced by small and medium-sized enterprises in landlocked developing countries in integrating into global value chains.

26. The fifth panellist presented an analysis of aid for trade flows in services, which accounted for most funds under the programme. Research showed that the programme faced challenges with regard to distribution and effectiveness. Most aid for trade was directed to middle-income countries rather than the least developed countries, and neither total aid for trade flows, nor official development assistance not related to aid for trade, was positively correlated with trade. In contrast, aid allocated to productive capacity-building in non-services sectors such as agriculture, mining, industry and construction was correlated with merchandise exports. The panellist noted, however, that such an effect could not be identified for aid for trade allocated to economic infrastructure or productive capacity-building in services or trade policy and regulation. The panellist recommended focusing further research on this issue, as well as greater attention to the design of aid for trade programmes, to render them more effective.

27. The sixth panellist noted that private financial flows to sub-Saharan Africa had increased in the last 10 years, yet remained heavily concentrated by country, with the least developed countries attracting a small fraction. For example, Nigeria accounted for 45 per cent of such flows. In addition, most flows targeted the natural resources sector. The panellist highlighted some of the obstacles encountered by private investors in the least developed countries, including high levels of political and macroeconomic risk, the lack of adequate investment vehicles, the expensive and unreliable electricity supply, difficulty in accessing global markets and the lack of demonstrated business models. Possible policy measures to address such concerns included better tailoring of financial structures and improved coordination for value chain development.

28. During the ensuing discussion, one delegate highlighted the market access challenges faced by the least developed countries and the need to increase the level of development ambition. Another delegate emphasized that the existence of productive capacities was as important as market access for the least developed countries, and that trade-related support measures were not always well integrated into national development plans. One delegate questioned how development partners and the private sector could support domestic resource mobilization in the least developed countries, and another delegate questioned whether central banks played a role in domestic resource mobilization and supporting small and medium-sized enterprises. The representative of an intergovernmental organization noted that the European Union had not yet complied with the decision under the World Trade Organization to remove export subsidies. With regard to resource mobilization, the representative of a United Nations programme noted that such mobilization was complicated by the fact that many of the least developed countries faced challenges in using resources effectively, that large parts of many of their economies were informal and that the similarity of their economic structures prevented many of the least developed countries from trading with each other. The representative considered whether greater debt sustainability in the least developed countries could support efforts to raise domestic resources.

29. The panellists noted that the World Bank had carried out national expenditure reviews to enhance the efficiency of resource use and was conducting ongoing work on tax policy. With regard to the widespread informality in the least developed countries, the panellists noted that several international organizations were working on the formalization of economic activities, and with regard to the need for better coordination, the panellists suggested that financing plans could be included in national development plans. Tapping into private capital flows carried the risk of indebtedness and there was a need for caution in this regard. The panellists noted that central banks needed to concentrate on guaranteeing monetary stability rather than engaging in domestic resource mobilization or supporting small and medium-sized enterprises. In particular, one panellist stressed the importance of generating higher savings rates in the least developed countries, to encourage domestic resource mobilization, for example through deposit insurance. Finally, the secretariat noted that recent UNCTAD research had shown that similarity of economic structure was not an obstacle to trade between the least developed countries, and that the lack of productive capacities was a more important factor in preventing trade.

Ways and means of doubling the export share of the least developed countries and enhancing their benefits from global trade

30. The panellists at the fourth informal session comprised a professor, University of Geneva; a chief economist, International Trade Centre; the Chief, Economic Modelling and Quantitative Analysis Section, World Trade Organization; the Head, Programmes, Third World Network Africa; a senior research fellow, South African Institute of International Affairs; and a project coordinator, Directorate General for Trade, European Commission.

31. The first panellist discussed the types of policy instruments and governance that could help promote exports in low-income countries and the least developed countries. He highlighted the role of public policies, in particular in the form of export promotion agencies, in promoting exports and trade, which were likely to generate higher returns in terms of export growth. The panellist noted that export promotion agencies differed with regard to their economic size, allocated budget and governance structure and the types of activities in which they engaged. Best practices had been developed in many export promotion agencies worldwide, and positive impacts had been observed with regard to medium-sized firms and as a result of incentives provided for the export of new products and/or to new markets, which had a potentially positive impact on diversification and structural transformation. The panellist stressed the importance of understanding the different institutional contexts within developing countries. The development impacts from exports, in particular in terms of welfare, which were beyond the mandate of export promotion agencies, needed to be taken into account. The panellist concluded that the least developed countries needed to carefully consider the types of exports they wished to promote and the impact they might generate. For example, extractive industries such as oil could generate negative impacts on the environment and also inhibit the achievement of development objectives if rents were not invested in economic and social programmes.

32. The second panellist focused on the role of competition between small and medium-sized enterprises, to enhance least developed country benefits from global trade and double the least developed countries' share of global exports. Small and medium-sized enterprises mattered for development goals, and the benefits could be numerous given their prevalence in the world; around 95 per cent of global firms were small and medium-sized enterprises and employed nearly 70 per cent, or the majority, of the workforce, mainly composed of low-wage workers, that is, the main income earners of vulnerable households. The panellist stressed the important productivity gaps between large and small enterprises, which were also reflected in wage gaps. This had a significant impact on the possibility of linking least developed countries to global value chains through trade. The panellist noted that poorer countries tended to have lower competitiveness and productivity gaps in comparison with more advanced economies. Channelling investment to the least developed countries to improve competitiveness was therefore important and, in addition to investment, the design of capacity-building programmes was crucial.

33. Another crucial aspect in increasing the least developed countries' share of global exports and diversifying their exports was the role of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation, which had been ratified by 17 of the least developed countries. The third panellist noted that the trajectory of the least developed countries' share of global exports was encouraging but that a discerning change in the structure of trade had not been observed. Implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation could contribute to the diversification of exports, as it was expected to lead to reductions in the fixed costs of trade, allowing firms to export products they had previously only sold in domestic markets and to enter markets previously considered too costly. The panellist noted the importance of small and medium-sized enterprises for least developed country exports, and that trade facilitation could promote their entry into export markets. Smaller firms were more likely to export and could increase their export shares more than large firms. Finally, the Agreement on Trade Facilitation could enhance the attraction of foreign direct investment, and the special and differential provisions allowed members to tailor implementation to their circumstances.

34. The fourth panellist stressed the importance of national policy frameworks in building productive capacities, considering them equally important to financial resources, if not more important. The panellist focused on the interfaces between the Istanbul Programme of Action and other international policy regimes, in particular the trade regime.

He noted that the least developed countries had made notable progress at the national and regional levels in diversifying export bases, but that progress was lacking in the international trade regime, and developed country partners had a responsibility in this regard. The panellist highlighted the negative consequences of international policy regimes, in trade, investment and official development assistance, on national policymaking, in particular with regard to policy space.

35. The fifth panellist considered the benefits to and challenges faced by the least developed countries with regard to engaging in regional and global value chains. It was important to link into regional and global value chains, and a strong State and policy package played a critical role in this context. The panellist stressed that regional trade agreements represented a vehicle for better integration into regional and global value chains as they provided an agenda for businesses that could favour employment and trade expansion.

36. The sixth panellist discussed the role of preferential schemes for least developed country exports granted by development partners, in particular under the Everything but Arms initiative of the European Union and the Generalized Scheme of Preferences. The panellist noted that the schemes mostly tended to benefit countries with more advanced productive capacities, to the detriment of others of the least developed countries. For example, the least developed countries in South Asia represented around 85 per cent of European Union imports under the Everything but Arms initiative. The panellist highlighted the gender relevance of the preference schemes, in particular in textiles and clothing, areas in which mostly women were employed, which had a transformative potential for societies.

37. The ensuing discussion focused on how the least developed countries could materialize the benefits from multinational corporations. One delegate noted that, in addition to doubling exports, there should be a focus on how to realize the benefits that needed to accrue to the least developed countries, including capital flows and other resources needed for export growth and diversification. One panellist highlighted contentious issues concerning international trade and aid regimes, in particular the crucial need for the least developed countries to retain policy space. Finally, one delegate stressed the lack of institutional and technical capacities in the least developed countries to design the strategies needed to grow and transform their economies, and emphasized that the least developed countries needed to work together in pursuing common frameworks of cooperation and policy implementation. The discussion highlighted the importance of leaving no one behind in the development process.

II. Organizational matters

A. Election of officers

(Agenda item 1)

38. At its opening plenary, on 6 November 2017, the Expert Meeting on the Ways and Means of Improving the Implementation of Priority Areas Agreed in the Istanbul Programme of Action elected Ms. Julie Emond (Canada) as its Chair and Mr. Mohamed Bukheet (Sudan) as its Vice-Chair-cum-Rapporteur.

B. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

(Agenda item 2)

39. Also at its opening plenary, the Expert Meeting adopted its provisional agenda (TD/B/C.I/EM.9/1). The agenda was thus as follows:

1. Election of officers
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

3. Ways and means of improving the implementation of priority areas agreed in the Istanbul Programme of Action: Productive capacities and doubling the share of the least developed countries in world exports

4. Adoption of the report of the meeting

C. Outcome of the meeting

40. Also at its opening plenary, the Expert Meeting agreed that the Chair should summarize the discussions.

D. Adoption of the report of the meeting

(Agenda item 4)

41. At its closing plenary, on 7 November 2017, the Expert Meeting authorized the Vice-Chair-cum-Rapporteur, under the authority of the Chair, to finalize the report after the conclusion of the meeting.

Annex

Attendance*

1. Representatives of the following States members of UNCTAD attended the meeting:

Algeria	Morocco
Bulgaria	Mozambique
Djibouti	Myanmar
Egypt	Nepal
Ethiopia	Nigeria
Germany	Oman
Haiti	Saudi Arabia
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Senegal
Japan	Spain
Jordan	Sudan
Lao People's Democratic Republic	Togo

2. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented at the meeting:

African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States
Commonwealth Secretariat
European Union
Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
South Centre

3. The following United Nations organs, bodies and programmes were represented at the meeting:

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
International Trade Centre
Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States
United Nations Development Programme

4. The following specialized agencies and related organizations were represented at the meeting:

International Fund for Agricultural Development
International Labour Organization
International Telecommunication Union
World Trade Organization

5. The following non-governmental organizations were represented at the meeting:

General category

Third World Network

* This attendance list contains registered participants. For the list of participants, see TD/B/C.I/EM.9/INF.1.