

## **Doha Development Agenda (DDA): Chronology - Brussels, 24 July 2006**

**November 2001, Doha, Qatar.** The Doha Development Agenda is launched.

**September 2003, Cancun, Mexico.** WTO Ministerial collapses without agreement, and WTO Membership enters into period of reflection. Country groupings such as the G-20 (consisting of middle-income developing countries) and the G-90 (consisting of poorer developing countries) emerge. Having collapsed, the ministerial fails to address obstacles to the G-90 countries' exports of cotton.

**May 2004.** The EU in a letter to all WTO members offers to eliminate all agricultural export subsidies by an agreed date. It further commits itself to a large reduction of all trade distorting subsidies, and proposes early action on cotton through the elimination of all forms of export support, creating free and vital access for many developing countries with export interests. The EU also proposes a Round for Free for Least Developed Countries, leaving these countries to decide themselves if they wish to open their markets.

**July 2004.** The EU letter of May 2004 triggers intensive talks in Geneva. The result is the revitalisation of the round and a subsequent agreement in July 2004 on the Framework for continued negotiations which sets out the ambitions for the DDA, the so-called July Framework Agreement. The EU calls on the United States to match its offer on export subsidies and on domestic agricultural support with an equivalent move. The EU also emphasises the need to increase efforts to open markets for goods and services, noting the importance of such opening for global growth and development.

**January 2005, Davos, Switzerland.** Trade ministers meeting on the fringes of the World Economic Forum agree to inject further momentum into the DDA process.

**March 2005, Mombassa, Kenya .** At a Mini-Ministerial Meeting in Mombassa, the EU tables a concrete package of proposals on the Round's development goals, including flexibility on market opening for non-agricultural goods (NAMA), reduced tariffs for imports from Least Developed Countries and the need for wider flexibility in Rules of Origin systems.

**May 2005, Paris, France.** At a Mini-Ministerial Meeting in Paris agricultural negotiators conclude difficult negotiations on how to establish a tariff equivalent in cases where the tariff is not a straightforward percentage (i.e. a formula for establishing Ad Valorem Equivalents).

"The Doha Round is too big to fail. It is not just about trade. It is about maintaining the credibility of multilateral cooperation; showing that multilateral institutions can find global answers to global issues; proving that trade can be put at the service of development."  
*EU Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson, November 2005*

**July 2005, Dalian, China.** Ministers agree to use as a basis for further negotiations a G20 proposal for agricultural support reductions and widening market access in agriculture. The EU welcomes the G20 initiative.

**October 9 2005, Zurich, Switzerland.** More than a year after the signing of the Framework Agreement the United States offers to cut domestic agricultural subsidies by 60% and phase out some of its export subsidies. It also tables proposals for agricultural market access suggesting cuts of 90% in the highest farm tariffs.

**October 9 2005, Zurich Switzerland.** The EU proposes that the Hong Kong Ministerial should adopt a development package. This package must among other things include a commitment from all developed countries on the granting of duty and quota free access to

all products from Least Developed Countries; maximum flexibility for Least Developed Countries in tariff reduction

**October 10 2005, Geneva, Switzerland.** The G10 and the G20 table proposals on market access in agriculture.

**October 28 2005.** As part of a comprehensive offer in all areas of the negotiation, the EU offers to cut EU trade-distorting domestic farm support by 70% and cut its highest tariffs by 60%, and to halve its average agricultural tariff to just 12%. The EU makes this offer conditional on ambitious moves in NAMA and services from others, agreement on a register and extension for Geographical Indications. The EU reiterates that dismantling of agricultural support has to lead to a level playing field also among developed countries, and again requests commitments from the US on Food Aid, export credits and changes to the Blue Box criteria and from Canada, Australia and New Zealand on State Trading Enterprises.

**10 November 2005.** WTO Director General Pascal Lamy publicly lowers the level of ambition for the Hong Kong Ministerial, making it clear that the meeting can no longer hope to achieve agreement on 'full modalities'. The EU calls for the Hong Kong meeting to lock in the progress made since the 2004 Framework Agreement and serve as a springboard for advance in 2006.

**December 2005, Hong Kong.** At the December 2005 Hong Kong WTO Ministerial Meeting negotiators agreed to try to achieve broad agreement on tariff and subsidy reductions for agriculture and tariff reductions for industrial goods by the summer of 2006. This would allow negotiators to use the remainder of 2006 to agree on other important issues such as trade in services.

**Winter and Spring 2006.** Negotiations at Ministerial level have continued in 2006. Following a mini-ministerial meeting in Davos, Switzerland in January, these have chiefly taken the form of a series of bilateral and plurilateral meetings between key negotiators. Trade negotiators from the EU, the US, Brazil, India, Japan and Australia met in London in **March 2006** for two days of talks.

Although these meetings have been constructive, the EU's offer of October 2005 remains the only full offer on the negotiating table and no equivalent moves have so far been proposed in trade in industrial goods or services to balance the cuts proposed by the EU in agriculture. For the EU, these balancing moves are essential if the Round is to be successfully concluded.

In **April 2006**, European Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson signalled that the EU was willing to further enhance its agriculture offer within the limits of its negotiating mandate, if other made similar concessions. This move was welcomed by, among others, Brazil, China, Kenya, Egypt and Australia.

In **May 2006** negotiations intensified at the working groups in Geneva with focus on agriculture and NAMA.

In **June 2006** EU Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson outlined a possible deal, echoing WTO DG Pascal Lamy and many others said: *"The G20 wants steeper cuts in US farm subsidies before it is willing to table the required cuts in industrial goods. Washington can unlock this by stepping forward with a better offer. If this happens the EU will, at the same time, meet them both with a strengthened offer."*

In St Petersburg in **July 2006**, G8 Leaders pledged to send their negotiators back to Geneva with a mandate to show further flexibility.

On **23 July** in Geneva the US indicated that it would not do so. WTO DG Lamy suspended negotiations. EU Trade Commissioner Peter Mandelson said: *“This is neither desirable nor inevitable. It could so easily have been avoided. What stands between us and the modalities of an agreement are not vast numbers or enormous sums...the United States was unwilling to accept, or indeed to acknowledge, the flexibility being shown by others in the room and, as a result, felt unable to show any flexibility on the issue of farm subsidies...Actions have consequences and this action has led to the Round being suspended”*