

Unclassified

CCNM/GF/COMP(2002)4



Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economiques  
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

31-Jan-2002

English - Or. English

**CENTRE FOR CO-OPERATION WITH NON-MEMBERS  
DIRECTORATE FOR FINANCIAL, FISCAL AND ENTERPRISE AFFAIRS**

CCNM/GF/COMP(2002)4  
Unclassified

## **OECD Global Forum on Competition**

### **EXPERIENCES OF OECD OUTREACH AND MEMBERS' TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES IN 1999-2000**

-- Session II --

*This document contains excerpts from the Secretariat note that was initially discussed at the Working Party No. 3 held on 13 February 2001. It is submitted AS BACKGROUND for discussion under Session II of the second meeting of the Global Forum on Competition to be held on 14-15 February 2002.*

**JT00120192**

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine  
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

English - Or. English

## EXPERIENCES OF OECD OUTREACH AND MEMBERS' TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES IN 1999-2000

### II. Definition of Terms and Summary of Responses

7. This note and its annexes refer to technical assistance as being provided in the following forms, each of which has been used by one or more Members:

- Conferences are usually short large scale meetings for an exchange of views, typically among high-level experts, policy-makers, etc. They can be efficient for establishing contacts and for policy dialogue that raises awareness of issues and mutual understanding; in fact, they seldom provide technical assistance.
- Seminars and workshops are usually smaller scale events intended to increase the capacity of their participants. OECD outreach consists primarily of such events, often using a case-study format.
- Long-term resident advisors spend at least one month working in the competition authority of a beneficiary country. Longer stays are even more beneficial, because the advisor grows to understand the country's legal and economic situation. In the view of the US, "this can be the most effective form of assistance."<sup>1</sup> (In the early to mid-1990s, US authorities sent teams of advisors for periods of 6-9 months to Central European countries, particularly Poland. EU "twinning" programs under the PHARE program involve funding for competition experts from EU Member Countries as long-term resident advisors to Central and East European competition authorities.) Longer stays increase the opportunity cost of the competition authority providing an advisor, however.
- Short term consultations – visits of a few days to one month – are a common form of assistance and can be very effective at dealing with specific issues.
- Internships are long-term, at least one-month stays of competition experts from beneficiaries at an experienced competition enforcement authority. They need considerable preparation by the host to be effective, and are generally costly. Sometimes, costs are shared by the host and the beneficiary. For instance, the response by Mexico mentions that "[t]echnical assistance provided by the [Mexican competition authority] is funded either by the [authority] itself, when it comes to seminars, or by recipient countries, as in the case of most internships."<sup>2</sup>
- Study visits are short visit of competition officials from beneficiary countries to experienced competition enforcement authorities. Study visits are a less expensive way of establishing professional contacts and exchanging views with beneficiaries, especially where costs are shared between the host and the beneficiary. For the purposes of establishing contacts and exchanging views, they need limited preparation and they can be carried out on an ad hoc basis to a wide range of beneficiaries. However, in order to have a training effect, study visits need considerable preparation by the host. Australia's experience shows that "smaller delegations, rather than large ones, are the best forums for interactive learning."<sup>3</sup>

8. Another model for technical assistance – creation of an institute that would provide extended courses to government officials from transition and developing countries – has been proposed, but the Secretariat is not aware of any operational programs that use this model.

### **III. Need for and attributes of effective technical assistance**

16. This section analyses the information received with respect to the need for and attributes of technical assistance.

#### ***The need for increased technical assistance***

17. As noted above, calls for significantly increased technical assistance to developing countries have been made at the June 1999 OECD Trade and Competition Conference, meetings of UNCTAD and the WTO Working Group, and various other fora. Questionnaire responses that address the issue agree that more technical assistance is needed. Based on its direct experience, the Italian competition authority "shares the view, recently echoed in international fora such as the WTO and UNCTAD,<sup>4</sup> about the emergence in recent years of a rising demand for [technical assistance]."<sup>5</sup> Similarly, Japan stresses that more technical assistance activities are necessary both in the policy and the training field.<sup>6</sup> The Mexican competition authority also "agrees that increase is needed in both training and policy technical assistance activities."<sup>7</sup> Canada<sup>8</sup> and the European Commission<sup>9</sup> also support increased technical assistance.

18. As also noted above, questionnaire responses contained little if any discussion of whether or how the resources that would be needed to increase technical assistance might be found. Providers of funding for such work must of course assess the relative priority of competition policy and other important goals. It appears from informal discussions with World Bank officials that the Bank's current balancing of competing objectives has resulted in such a focus on direct poverty reduction projects that funding available for competition policy work is or may be reduced.

19. Although the balancing that goes on within governments and other funding bodies extends beyond the competence of competition authorities, the apparent imbalance between need and supply makes it important to consider whether competition authorities and others interested in this field can and should do more to educate policy-makers in their governments or other bodies about the importance of such assistance. In this connection, the CLP Division has been in contact with the Secretariat serving the OECD Development Assistance Committee, and that important group appears interested in placing greater emphasis on competition policy. It would be useful to know more about delegates' views on how the funding agencies in their governments assess the relative importance of competition policy and the prospects for increased funding. Comments from the World Bank and other international organisations are also invited.

#### ***Attributes of effective technical assistance***

20. Regardless of the prospects for increased funding, it is important that every reasonable effort be made to hold down the costs and maximise the benefits of technical assistance. One major purpose of the questionnaire was to learn to what extent past work in delivering assistance provides information concerning the effectiveness of different forms of assistance. Major points made in the responses are discussed below, but differences in specificity and terminology prevent much in the way of conclusions in this area. After the discussion in February, the CLP Division's Outreach Secretariat intends to pursue this issue further by engaging in further follow up via e-mail and telephone with knowledgeable officials in Members' capitals and the staff of international organisations.

21. The responses discuss the effectiveness of technical assistance depending on the level of development of recipients' competition regime, the effectiveness of country-specific and regional assistance, and considerations governing the provision of assistance to individuals who are not competition officials.

### *The recipients' competition regime*

22. In order to be effective, technical assistance needs to be adapted to the needs and circumstances of beneficiaries. Like Japan<sup>10</sup> and Canada,<sup>11</sup> Australia has found "that the effectiveness of co-operation activities varies in line with the stage of development of the country's competition regime."<sup>12</sup> Japan's response states that "[i]n general, providing basic legal knowledge is necessary for the countries without competition laws, while providing practical experience appears to be more useful for the countries with their own competition laws."<sup>13</sup> The EC makes the related point that the nature of requests varies with the sophistication of the requesting country:

Some countries request assistance with drafting the envisaged competition law or amending an existing one to broaden its scope or improve its enforcement. Other, more experienced countries, request assistance to deal with particular cases including at the level of micro-economic analysis or investigation techniques adapted to the type and sector of the case. A broader category of requests refer to the participation of experienced attorneys or economists to seminars or workshops dealing with specialised antitrust or regulatory reform issues.<sup>14</sup>

23. Implicit in the three types of assistance Italy considers most effective are differences in the level of development of the requesting country's competition regime: (i) "support to the design of competition laws and implementing regulations"<sup>15</sup>; (ii) "the training of officials directly involved in enforcement";<sup>16</sup> and (iii) "activities aimed at enhancing the awareness of government officials of administrations other than the competition authorities vis-à-vis pro-competitive regulatory reforms."<sup>17</sup>

24. Australia's response contains the most specific discussion of the best forms of assistance for countries at different levels. For "countries ... in the exploratory stage of competition policy development, Australia has found it most effective to bring officials to Australia to examine legislative and regulatory structures first-hand."<sup>18</sup> On the other hand, "[c]ountries with a more developed competition policy and institutional framework appear to benefit most from in-house staff exchanges and consultancies."<sup>19</sup> In fact, the response by Australia found that "[i]n-country training ... appears to be most effective once competition legislation is in place. [...] These arrangements are effective in providing practical, skills-based training and go well beyond theoretical issues."<sup>20</sup>

25. Australia also offers its views on the level of understanding of competition issues among developing countries:

[W]e are now starting to see a move to a second generation of technical assistance activities, particularly in the field of competition law and policy in the Asia-Pacific region. The first phase has involved discussion of the theory, rationale and models for competition law and policy. The ACCC is of the opinion that most developing countries are now in the position where they need assistance in moving beyond this theoretical level, to seeking assistance in how to actually implement a competition law, how to conduct investigations, how to define markets, how to institute compliance mechanisms, how to set priorities, how to achieve and best utilise an effective media strategy etc.<sup>21</sup>

26. Using somewhat different terminology, Canada notes that most of the requests it receives seek assistance in implementing new competition laws, but

there is a significant number of countries who have yet to be persuaded of the benefits of a competition policy while others need advice on how to draft and implement a competition law. As a result, there is a real need for technical assistance focused on building a culture of competition, drafting of competition laws, consultative processes, the establishment of a competition authority, and domestic public information/education processes.<sup>22</sup>

27. The response by Mexico finds that "Latin American countries mostly demand assistance to (i) devise competition laws and institutions; (ii) understand the economic rationality of competition rules; (iii) apply the economic aspects of competition law and policy; and (iv) learn of competition aspects of sector-specific regulation."<sup>23</sup>

### *Country-specific and regional assistance*

28. To some extent, beneficiaries' level of competition law and policy development is also a factor in determining the relative effectiveness of country-specific and regional events. Australia stresses that the more practical assistance needed by beneficiaries with more developed competition regimes can be better provided on a country-specific basis:

Australia has found that, in the exploratory stage, programs grouping delegates from different countries are the most effective to facilitate the exchange of information and experiences. However, once countries have legislation in place and specific technical assistance is required, an in-country, and country specific, approach has proved to be the most effective.<sup>24</sup>

29. Canada agrees:

Regional seminars may provide a useful overview of competition policies and laws for some countries. However, they are not as effective as other means when there is a need for assistance in how to implement or enforce competition laws in the field.<sup>25</sup>

30. On the other hand, the EC states that a regional approach can be both less expensive and more effective, and its response does not appear to be excluding events intended to improve the investigation and other skills of law enforcers. It explains that:

[a] more efficient use of resources could ... be achieved through the use of technical assistance such as training activities aimed at more than one country or a particular region with similar/comparable needs, rather than merely one country at a time. This would also carry with it the added value of providing competition officials from such countries valuable exposure to their counterparts from other countries.<sup>26</sup>

31. Like the EC, the OECD Secretariat has also found multi-country events very effective means of working on implementation and enforcement issues. For example, its annual two-week seminar in Vienna for enforcement officials from all transition countries draws relatively high level officials and focuses almost entirely on actual cases from those countries. All CIS countries with a competition law are invited to send at least one official to its annual law enforcement seminar in Russia, and its Baltic Programme events include officials from the three Baltic states, the contiguous Russian territories, and the Russian MAP.

32. The Secretariat believes that there is no real conflict in these apparently differing views. Whether a country-specific or multi-country event is preferable depends, we believe, upon more than whether the participants are still considering or developing a competition law or are seeking to learn more practical enforcement techniques. Although a country-specific event is probably the most efficient way to provide law enforcement training if the participants are investigators who are truly prepared to accept that training,

the question is not merely how much knowledge will be absorbed by the participants, but how much benefit that increased knowledge will have. Second, at least some participants often characterise some lessons as developed country theory that is inapplicable to their situation, and to reach such participants it can be useful to have participants from other developing countries that are somewhat further along the learning curve. Also, case discussions are not only useful for teaching investigation techniques, they are concrete ways of illustrating the impact of good and bad enforcement policies. For such policy discussions, it is very useful to have representatives from different countries (and different parts of large countries).

33. Japan's response adds another consideration when it notes that the example and development of one country can have a "spillover" effect among its regional peers: "Thailand in the APEC program is immensely important, particularly in setting a role model for the countries in the region and hosting the meeting."<sup>27</sup> Depending on the circumstances, taking advantage of a recipient's influence on other countries could call for holding country-specific events to make it a better a role model or holding regional events at which the country can be a role model.

#### ***Inclusion of participants other than competition officials***

34. In the broadest sense, it seems clear that competition policy assistance should include a wider audience than just competition officials. Australia notes that it is "highly useful to involve members of the judiciary, academia, business and consumer organisations, as examples, in order to develop an entire 'culture of competition' that is understood and accepted across the entire community."<sup>28</sup> Canada seems to agree.<sup>29</sup> Usually, UNCTAD's technical assistance activities are also "open to others [i.e., not competition authorities and officials, such as] other Ministries, university and business circles, consumer associations, private sector representatives."<sup>30</sup> Most World Bank conferences are also open to a wide range of participants.

35. Some activities that include participants other than competition officials are clearly technical assistance as that term is (broadly) defined in this note. For example, Finland mentions the importance of providing technical assistance to the judiciary,<sup>31</sup> and the OECD has worked with the Supreme Arbitrazh Court in Russia. Some of the other activities, however, represent a kind of generalised "competition advocacy" that constitutes policy dialogue or political support rather than technical assistance. While not implying anything about the relative value of these two different kinds of assistance, this distinction is useful when discussing, for example, the effectiveness of different ways of delivering assistance. The distinction is also useful in discussing what kinds of events particular donors tend to organise.

#### ***Qualifications of technical assistance providers***

36. In addition to law enforcement experience, which is so important that it is discussed separately below, the Secretariat has previously suggested that it is important that at least one member of any technical assistance team have significant experience in providing such assistance to a country whose economy, culture, and legal system is very different from his own. In the Secretariat's experience, competition experts without outreach experience frequently give logical but incorrect interpretations to the laws, cases, statements, and questions they encounter. On relatively long-term missions, such communications failures have time to get worked out, but for missions or seminars of a week or less they can be extremely costly. Someone with outreach experience can often serve as a sort of second level interpreter for those panellists who do not know, for example, that seminar participants use "dumping" to refer to predatory pricing, that entry barriers may exist in markets we are used to thinking of as easy to enter, or that issues (such as corruption or misleading advertising) that we do not consider a competition problem (since they are covered by laws enforced by other agencies) are in fact competition problems in countries where they are not effectively handled by any agency.<sup>32</sup>

37. Members' responses show that they also regard knowledge about both the specific beneficiary and the general experience of transition and developing economies to be crucial. Drawing a long list of the necessary characteristics of those providing technical assistance in the field of competition law and policy, Canada also emphasises such qualities:

- familiarity and preferably experience in dealing with issues and unique requirements of emerging and developing economies;
- capacity to communicate knowledge that is sensitive to the needs, level and expectations of the recipients;
- = experience in dealing with national and international government and non-government institutions; and
- = experience in a multicultural environment.<sup>33</sup>

38. Further, like Mexico,<sup>34</sup> Australia agrees that

[c]onsultants and competition policy experts also need to be strongly aware of, and have an appreciation of any cultural, political and social differences that exist. These factors have an enormous impact on how business is done in other countries. What may be considered the traditional or 'text book' approach to addressing competition issues in Australia (or other such developed countries) may simply not work in developing economies. Consultants therefore need to adopt broader, more flexible and more creative strategies and approaches to competition policy than might otherwise be the case.<sup>35</sup>

39. In addition to the above qualities, Mexico stresses that "[e]xperience on the trade and industrial difficulties that face small open economies are also of great help."<sup>36</sup>

#### **IV. The role of competition authorities and private contractors**

40. As pointed out in its note to the CLP in October 1999,<sup>37</sup> the Secretariat believes that competition officials' experience in dealing with enforcement, institutional, and procedural issues makes them uniquely qualified to provide technical assistance. Members' responses indicate that they basically share the Secretariat's views on this point. Moreover, it is clear that most of the technical assistance provided by major OECD donor countries (and the World Bank) is designed by officials without a competition policy background and delivered by private contractors, some but not all of which include former competition officials on their team. The obvious issue is whether there are any practical means by competition authorities, working in their capitals or through the CLP, could improve the quality of technical assistance – and thus the quality of non-Members' competition enforcement and regulatory analysis – by delivering more of the assistance or playing a greater role in designing assistance projects and selecting the private contractors.

41. The main advantage cited by Members for using private contractors is simply to overcome the resource constraints faced by competition authorities. Canada responded that, in general, "[p]roviding technical assistance can be facilitated through private contractors in light of constraints within government relating to core mandate and legal, regulatory and/or financial impediments that can prevent or inhibit the delivery of assistance and the recovery of costs."<sup>38</sup> Japan<sup>39</sup> and Australia offered similar comments, with the latter noting that "[t]he main advantages [of private contractors] relate to issues such as resource constraints, and the ability to tap into the skills and expertise of consultants in other fields, such as those in regulatory, academic, or legal fields."<sup>40</sup> As mentioned by Finland, lectures by private contractors can be useful to provide "a good idea of how the private sector faces competitive concerns,"<sup>41</sup> but this benefit results from using private sector participants, not from contracting out technical assistance in general.

42. The disadvantages to using private contractors that Members described are essentially the same as those previously mentioned by the Secretariat. For instance, Canada warns of the limited capacity of private contractors to provide technical assistance that is most relevant for beneficiaries, especially the ones grappling with complex enforcement issues:

[O]ne of the main disadvantages is that much of the technical assistance being requested relates to capacity building and the running of a competition authority about which the Bureau is better placed to provide advice. Moreover, not all private contractors providing technical assistance in respect of competition policy may be able to provide the kind of practical, "real-life" experience that newly established or establishing competition authorities are looking for.<sup>42</sup>

43. Similar comments were offered by other Members, such as Finland,<sup>43</sup> Italy,<sup>44</sup> the US,<sup>45</sup> and the EC.<sup>46</sup> Australia added another potentially important disadvantage to the use of private contractors:

[T]he ACCC does not always receive feedback on the effectiveness or achievements of technical assistance activities that have been outsourced. Similarly, any useful contacts that are made by the consultant are not automatically made available to the ACCC.<sup>47</sup>

44. It appears that, in general, specialised government funding agencies have limited co-operation with their national competition authority. For instance,

[t]he ACCC generally does not play a large role in activities which are otherwise contracted out by the Australian Government to other parties. The ACCC is occasionally approached by AusAID to discuss the framework of a technical assistance activity, or be asked to make suggestions or recommendations on appropriate consultants for an activity, or to provide briefing to the consultant prior to the commencement of an activity.

45. The situation of the Canadian Competition Bureau is similar.<sup>48</sup> As regards the United States, "[t]he U.S. Agency for International Development ('USAID') has financed technical assistance through private contractors or academics, but this has been done without input or participation of DOJ and FTC."<sup>49</sup>

46. Consequently, like Canada,<sup>50</sup> Australia promotes more co-operation between competition authorities and funding agencies: "it is vital to continue to forge closer links between the ACCC and AusAID so that each agency is fully informed of the technical assistance activities being provided by the other in the field of competition law and policy and the greatest benefit possible is able to be achieved by these activities."<sup>51</sup>

47. In light of the above, the Secretariat believes that it would be useful for delegates to discuss the following possible ways to give competition authorities a greater role in the provision of technical assistance without straining their limited resources:

- legislators could assign more financial resources for the provision of technical assistance by competition authorities, including resources to cover the costs of having employees dealing specifically with technical assistance;
- contracts from government funding agencies could cover the agencies' total costs of providing technical assistance;
- competition authorities could be given a much larger share of available funding, with discretion to provide assistance through its staff or to use their expertise to shape technical assistance projects and select qualified private subcontractors; and

- competition authorities could advise funding agencies on the design of their technical assistance projects and on the selection of qualified private contractors.<sup>52</sup>

## V. The international co-ordination of technical assistance

### *Current types and levels of international co-ordination*

48. In general, Members do not actively co-ordinate their technical assistance with each other or with international organisations. For instance, Canada stated that "[i]n the absence of an effective mechanism to do so, [Canada's] technical assistance is generally not co-ordinated with other OECD Members or international organisations."<sup>53</sup> However, some co-ordination results from Members' co-sponsoring or sending representatives to OECD and other seminars that use international panels. Korea and the US, for example, have both co-sponsored events with the OECD.

49. Competition authorities are generally receptive to requests for co-operation if funding is not an issue, but co-operation becomes problematic or even impossible if the requested country provides all or most assistance through private contractors. For OECD case study seminars, we are generally unwilling to use private contractors because of conflicts of interest (and usually lack of relevant expertise). For less sensitive events, we have found private contractors unwilling to co-operate, and only once has a funding agency been sufficiently "hands on" to direct a contractor to co-operate. A particular problem arises in the case of the EU, which has considerable funding for assistance but is unable, we understand, to fund DG Competition participation in assistance organised by others.

- 50. At the regional level, EU Member States provide some assistance on behalf of the EU. Some other countries, such as Japan engage in some kind of regional co-operation in the provision of technical assistance.<sup>54</sup>

51. There appears to be little co-ordination between global organisations that provide technical assistance (OECD, UNCTAD, World Bank, WTO) and regional organisations, though some APEC/OECD co-ordination exists (largely between APEC countries that are OECD Members and the OECD Secretariat).

52. Based on both recently collected information and the Secretariat's experience, there is significantly more co-ordination among OECD, UNCTAD, World Bank, and WTO. As noted above, the organisations generally avoid duplication both through informal contacts and from differences in the organisations' criteria for and means of providing assistance. We believe that the three programs complement each other, and active co-operation is increasing. Before turning to Members' views on possible ways to increase international co-ordination, it may be useful to expand on the past and present co-ordination of the activity of these four international programmes.

*Current co-ordination among international organisations*

53. As noted above, the OECD and some of its Members have provided major technical assistance to competition authorities in Central and East Europe and the former Soviet Union. In general, UNCTAD has not been very active in this area, and has focused its work on less developed countries. The World Bank appears to have worked quite extensively in this area on issues that relate to the functioning of a market economy, but not to have provided much specific technical assistance to competition authorities in these “transition” countries. The area has not been a focus of WTO activity, either.

54. The most recent international assistance initiative in this geographic area is the Investment Compact for Southeast Europe that has been signed by the G7 countries and the EC. The OECD is the official “lead agency” with respect to competition law and policy work done as part of the Compact, and in this capacity it did co-operate with USAID in assessing the competition policy regime in Croatia. One of the Compact’s “regional flagship initiative” relates to “buy, operate, and transfer” programmes and other innovative ways of encouraging private investment in infrastructure. This project was organised by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), which approached the OECD to provide assistance on the competition policy issues that should be considered in designing and operating such programs. We agreed to do so, and UNECE in turn has agreed to participate in the competition law and policy initiative the Secretariat is developing.

55. As interest in competition policy has spread globally, there have been greater opportunities for both co-ordination and for conflict and duplication. These opportunities were probably the greatest in Southeast Asia shortly after the 1997 economic crisis, and there has certainly been increased co-ordination in that area. For example, the IMF and World Bank were very involved in Indonesia and Thailand, and their involvement included work on competition law and policy. The OECD Secretariat therefore maintained contact with those countries through participation in regional events organised by the JFTC and with the KFTC, but it did not join in commenting on the draft laws of Indonesia and Thailand. Rather, the OECD Secretariat worked more to encourage interest in competition law in Malaysia and the Philippines. Co-ordination has also manifested itself in OECD and UNCTAD Secretariat members serving as panellists on each other’s events. And the OECD has co-operated with the World Bank in sponsoring two events – a high level conference in Bangkok in 1999 and a one-week intensive course on competition law in Singapore in 2000 – and OECD Secretariat participated in a back-to-back World Bank conference in Jakarta.

56. In Asia as elsewhere there has continued to be some natural division of labour based on the special relationship that UNCTAD and the World Bank have with less developed countries. Moreover, the WTO began providing technical assistance relatively recently, and through large regional events. Until recently, all of the OECD Secretariat’s work in Africa has been as speaker in programs organised by UNCTAD or others. In South America, the OECD began its work in 1995 and 1996 through joint ventures with the World Bank, and since then informal discussions – both with recipients and with other prospective donors – have contributed to the conflict avoidance that results from the four organisations’ somewhat different approaches to delivering assistance.

57. Those different approaches may generally be described as follows. UNCTAD does hold some training seminars, but it focuses more on shorter, higher-level policy dialogue involving a very broad range of countries. The World Bank also holds some training seminars, but by far the main focus of its work – especially in recent years – has been the provision of in-depth, long-term assistance to a small number of countries. The WTO has held a number of large conferences. OECD outreach consists almost entirely of training seminars that take advantage of its Members’ enforcement experience, and is directed to a range of countries that is narrower than UNCTAD’s or the WTO’s and broader than that of the World Bank.

### *Potential benefits from co-operating in the delivery of technical assistance*

58. Members' responses with respect to the potential benefits of increased co-ordination are discussed below at some length. Before turning to that topic, however, it is important to note a related but separate point – that in one context or another, a number of responses discussed the benefits that would flow from having more “joint venture” events with panellists from a number of different countries. All events held by international organisations have such panels as a matter of course, but this is apparently not the case for other events. Australia notes that joint ventures among donors could help increase the “opportunity [for] recipient countries to receive advice from different sources, allowing for comparison of alternative methods and approaches.”<sup>55</sup> Similarly, Mexico stresses that “greater international co-ordination of technical assistance programs would reflect better the international experience.”<sup>56</sup> UNCTAD share this view, emphasising that co-ordination can be done best “through co-operation between [technical assistance] providers.”<sup>57</sup>

### *Potential benefits and costs of increased co-ordination*

59. All Members addressing the issue agreed that in general, greater co-ordination of technical assistance would or could have some benefits. (*See, e.g.*, Australia,<sup>58</sup> Canada,<sup>59</sup> the Czech Republic,<sup>60</sup> Denmark,<sup>61</sup> Italy,<sup>62</sup> Japan,<sup>63</sup> and Norway.<sup>64</sup>) The identified benefits reflect differing types and levels of co-ordination. In general, there were four different co-ordination/benefit “pairs,” one of which involves the sharing of resource materials, two of which involve different levels of sharing information on future plans, and another of which combines a high level of sharing future plans with some degree of centralised planning.

- First, the goal of reducing organisation costs could be promoted by creating some sort of virtual “library.” This will be referred to as “the library concept.”
- Second, the goal of minimising unwarranted overlap and duplication could be promoted by more and earlier sharing of information on planned events. This will be referred to as “co-ordination to reduce overlap.”
- Third, the goal of providing better assistance through voluntary joint ventures involving international panels could be promoted through even greater and earlier sharing of could lead to deeper forms of voluntary co-operation and thereby produce resource savings in other ways. This will be referred to as “the joint venture concept.”
- Fourth, the goal of rationalising technical assistance could be promoted by combining extensive information sharing with the creation of a central body that provides advice on how donors might best meet recipients' needs. This will be referred to as “the central co-ordination concept.”

60. Each of these forms of co-ordination is discussed separately below. Members' responses do not include much information relating to the benefits or costs of these activities. In fact, the benefits are generally discussed only in theoretical terms, without consideration of current problems or how useful particular forms of co-ordination might actually be in practice. For example, minimising overlap and duplication is described as a benefit without any assessment of how much unwarranted overlap exists. And it is assumed that more co-ordination increase the use of international panels without analysis of the reasons that some donors do not currently use such panels. Moreover, there is no analysis of whether or to what extent any of these forms of co-ordination could be used for technical assistance that is provided by private contractors.

61. The responses do contain some warnings about the costs and obstacles to co-ordination, which are of a technical and a policy nature. Although the nature and extent of these costs and obstacles would of course depend on how extensive co-ordination is contemplated, a few generalisations are possible.

62. On the technical side, Members point out that co-ordination could be very costly. All of these forms of co-ordination would impose costs in terms of both human and financial resources. Thus, the Czech Republic recognises that "the establishment of ... international co-ordination will be very demanding and time-consuming, will require considerable financial support and human resources."<sup>65</sup> The Canadian response sees "funding issues (i.e. raising and allocating funding)"<sup>66</sup> as one of the most significant obstacles to the enhanced co-ordination of technical assistance.

63. Some responses also express concern that co-ordination would impose about the costs because of delays resulting from the co-ordination itself. Denmark believes that "[t]he greatest obstacle to [co-ordination] could be the time constraint."<sup>67</sup> The longer periods necessary for enhanced co-ordination could, in the opinion of Canada, also result in "a slower reaction time to requests."<sup>68</sup> UNCTAD notes that the co-ordination process could harm the effectiveness of technical assistance by leading to "last-minute decisions often due to uncertain funding."<sup>69</sup> It should be noted, however, that implementing the library concept or the information sharing necessary to minimise unwarranted overlap should not result in any delays. Delay would apparently be a cost only from co-ordination involving the joint venture concept or the central co-ordination concept; neither the library nor the calendar would cause any delay in decision-making.

64. Australia points another cost-related issue that would arise from any proposal relying on one central co-ordinator:

Identification of one central authority or organisation to perform this co-ordination role may also be an issue – there is no one clear organisation that this responsibility would flow to. Does this mean that a new organisation would need to be established? This in turn has obvious cost implications.<sup>70</sup>

65. In addition, the co-ordination of technical assistance could raise significant policy issues, again depending on whether and how it was intended to promote co-operation in delivering assistance. First of all, "[t]here may be concern raised that the central co-ordination of technical assistance activities may result in a relinquishing of control of a country's technical assistance and international aid programs."<sup>71</sup> In particular, as regards funding, Australia points out that "most countries, like Australia, would want to retain control over where its aid money goes."<sup>72</sup>

66. Second, agreement on the ways to provide more integrated technical assistance could also be rather difficult. As Canada points out,

some obstacles to greater international co-ordination would be deciding on the fora; securing committed and ongoing funding; establishing common goals among the participating countries; and taking into account the different approaches to competition policy, [...] conflict over prioritising the various projects if funds are limited; debate about how to actually provide the assistance (i.e. design of project since each member may have different views on competition policy); issues of jurisdiction (i.e. what country should be providing the assistance).<sup>73</sup>

*Creating a library of resource materials*

67. Canada points out that the sharing of knowledge/expertise could avoid “reinventing the wheel” each time a technical assistance project is undertaken, resulting in a more efficient use of resources (time, personnel and money).<sup>74</sup> Canada goes on to suggest:

Since much of the technical assistance provided to date is from OECD Members, the OECD could build a resource of information on technical assistance for competition policy which could be useful for future projects. This could include items such as discussions of Member’s past experiences with technical assistance projects; a database of past, current or future projects; a list of experts in the field who have worked on past projects; and any other tools that may be helpful for a government when they are designing or implementing a technical assistance program.<sup>75</sup>

68. Other responses did not focus so directly on the creation of such a library, though the collection of at least some aspects of this information is implicit in the joint venture and the central co-ordination concepts. In the Secretariat’s view, one of the most valuable “other tools” that such a library might contain would be resource materials that had been used for technical assistance events.

69. The costs, the potential benefits, and the likely cost/benefit ratio of the library concept would depend in large measure on the types of information it was supposed to include, as well as whether and to what extent the “librarian” was expected to “manage” the information by, for example, actively pursuing providers to obtain materials and/or organise/synthesise the submissions. Costs could be minimised to the extent that Members put this information on their websites, and the central library consisted essentially of links to those sites. In addition, information such as the documentation for past events could presumably be kept on a central site without great expense because it should not require “management.” The costs and benefits of collecting and maintaining information such as a complete data base on past, current, and future events would be significantly higher and are discussed in general terms below.

*Minimising unwarranted overlap*

70. Australia notes that “[a] lack of co-ordination imposes serious risks of overlap, duplication and therefore wasted resources.”<sup>76</sup> Overlap that wastes resources is by definition unwarranted, but this note refers to minimising unwarranted overlap to emphasise that overlap is not necessarily wasteful. In the first place, two competition policy events held in the same place in consecutive months may not really overlap because one may be an international conference aimed at high level officials and the other may be a training seminar for investigators. It might be more efficient from the perspective of countries that supply panellists for the two events to be held back-to-back, but this is not necessarily the case, and other efficiency considerations must also be considered. Even if the two events are both training for investigators, the overlap is not necessarily unwarranted.

71. In principle, the only form of co-ordination needed to prevent unwarranted overlap should be early notice of events that providers are considering. The initial notice would be different from whatever information might be required to make a public calendar of planned events, because donors would at least sometimes want the information to be kept confidential until plans became more fully developed. The Secretariat is looking into what would be possible in terms of a limited access “bulletin board” on which Members could directly post their plans before they became definite enough to go on a public calendar.

72. Maintaining a public calendar of planned events could also help reduce the risk of undue overlap. Finland raises the idea of the OECD website being used for the purposes of co-ordinating technical assistance. It argues that

[s]ince help is coming to non-members from several countries, the OECD could perhaps provide its own homepage for technical assistance to which each country could report its technical assistance activities: the target countries, description of contents and the relevant dates.<sup>77</sup>

73. At present, UNCTAD's website probably has the most complete calendar, but the OECD calendar is being developed. With respect to a calendar, the costs would appear to depend in large part on how important Members would consider it that the calendar be complete. Maintaining a calendar would not be very expensive if consisted only of information submitted by Members and others, but the costs would rise quickly if the co-ordinator were expected actively to seek out such information.

### ***Facilitating joint ventures***

74. The joint venture concept reflects an intermediate level of co-ordination. For a clearinghouse to be useful in assisting donors to locate other donors that might be interested in joint venturing on an event on a particular topic or in a particular area, a large number of donors would need to submit a considerable amount of data about past activities and current interests. It would be useful, but not necessary, for the clearinghouse also to contain information from countries and regions that are seeking assistance. In addition to facilitating joint ventures in delivering technical assistance, such a clearinghouse could also be useful for individual donors in creating projects tailored for recipients' needs.<sup>78</sup> The Czech Republic specifies various types of information that could be collected and shared:

- a survey of technical assistance already provided or in the process of being provided;
- a survey of requirements of individual countries concerning needed technical assistance; and
- a list of experts able to provide expert technical assistance.<sup>79</sup>

75. Such a clearinghouse would be expensive to create and maintain, however, and it is not clear how much of a benefit it would be as a practical matter.

### ***Promoting central co-ordination***

76. The Canadian response explicitly advocates establishing a new technical assistance co-ordinating body composed of representatives of technical assistance providers.<sup>80</sup> As described,

[t]he co-ordinating body itself would not be providing technical assistance, [i]ts core tasks would include:

maintaining an up to date overview of recipients' needs and stages of development;  
keeping an eye on the various and potentially duplicative technical assistance projects;  
encouraging the development, among interested parties whether recipients or donors, of a strategically planned, more focused and integrated approach to the delivery of international technical assistance for competition policy; and,  
ideally, assessing periodically the progress that is being made through the delivery of technical assistance in ensuring the development of sound competition laws, policies and institutions in developing economies.<sup>81</sup>

77. Furthermore, the co-ordinating body

could keep track of and inform the international competition community about the various initiatives under way. This body could also receive requests for technical assistance and then direct them appropriately. This would not preclude requests going to individual countries, who would in turn advise the body of such activities.<sup>82</sup>

[...]

The co-ordinating body could keep track of projects, field requests and liaise with other organisations in order to provide strategically oriented technical assistance to recipient countries with a view to reduce overlap and duplication. A co-ordinating body would also be better positioned to develop a longer term plan for the provision of technical assistance. Such a plan could take into consideration the different stages of development of the recipients countries to ensure that the design of technical assistance projects fits the differing needs.<sup>83</sup>

78. In filings with the WTO Working Group on the Interaction between Trade and Competition Policy, the European Community and its Members States also argue for a system involving co-ordination by a central body, in this case a future WTO Competition Policy Committee:

An enhanced and more co-ordinated approach to technical assistance should ... be developed in parallel to negotiations on a WTO framework agreement. This should be based on closer co-operation among competent international organisations - including UNCTAD and the World Bank - and full partnership with developing countries. Once such a framework agreement has been established, a WTO Competition Policy Committee should play an important role in promoting and monitoring integrated technical assistance programmes. [Such a framework agreement] would also ensure that the assistance provided would be based on commonly agreed objectives adjusted to the specific needs of the country in question.<sup>84</sup>

79. Under such a system,

a more co-ordinated and targeted approach to technical assistance and capacity-building would also be achieved through the design and formulation of a more comprehensive program for such assistance for a given country. One or more countries or organisations could then assume responsibility for specific elements of the program ranging from studies, over drafting or amendment of legislation, to training officials, rather than addressing the needs of a given country on a piece-meal basis as is currently the prevailing picture.<sup>85</sup>

80. Any central co-ordination system would presumably be quite costly to create and maintain, and it would be interesting to learn whether either Canada or the EU has made a cost estimate for its approach. In addition, while a centralised system could achieve significant efficiencies, the negotiation of integrated approaches would itself be costly and would face the problem that countries generally prefer to allocate funding to assist particular countries, not the countries that it could most efficiently serve in the eyes of an international group. Such negotiation would be necessary because, as noted by UNCTAD, "it does not seem possible to decide that one particular organisation can decide what [technical assistance] activities others may undertake."<sup>86</sup>

#### *Attributes of an international co-ordinator of technical assistance*

81. The necessary attributes of an international co-ordinator of technical assistance would depend on the type and level of co-ordination. Implementation of the library concept would require some expertise if the librarian was to manage the information, but a useful library could be created without the need to include sensitive information. A modest programme to reduce unwarranted overlap would not require any special competition-related expertise. Finland mentioned the OECD website as a possible calendar, and both the Czech Republic<sup>87</sup> and Denmark<sup>88</sup> mention a possible role for the OECD.

82. On the other hand, if international co-ordination is to include managing the kind of information that might be involved in the joint venture concept or would be involved in serving as a proactive central

co-ordinator, more sensitive and complex considerations arise. Australia points out that "[t]he organisation would also need to be aware of any sensitivities and priorities for individual countries' aid programs."<sup>89</sup> A corollary is that donors would need to feel that they could share sensitive information on budgets and priorities with the co-ordinator's secretariat. This consideration might point towards the OECD, but others would not. If the system contemplated that developing countries would make requests to or through the co-ordinator, the criterion noted by UNCTAD – the “widest possible experience of the widest possible types of recipient countries”<sup>90</sup> – would point toward UNCTAD. If the co-ordinator were supposed to study proposals, assess needs, and play a real co-ordination role, the secretariat would need to have both (a) experience in competition enforcement and assistance, and (b) the trust of both donors and recipients.

83. Canada would require the following characteristics for a central co-ordinator of the sort it recommends:

- International recognition, respect and support;
- Commitment by member countries to internationally co-ordinated technical assistance; ...
- Long-term focus (so it can provide on-going support);
- Associated with a pool of skilled personnel/experts (with experience in areas as listed previously - economics, law, development); and
- Solid commitment for long term funding.<sup>91</sup>

## ***Conclusions***

### ***Co-operation in delivering assistance***

84. Quite apart from any efficiencies that may be realisable through any co-ordination system, the Secretariat agrees with those responses which argue that more “joint ventures” with more international panels would tend to improve technical assistance. As noted above, the Secretariat has co-sponsored events with Members, non-Members, and international organisations, and each of these joint ventures have created efficiencies. Moreover, all OECD events have international panels, which we believe makes the assistance more credible and more valuable. The benefits of such co-operation were highlighted at the UNCTAD meetings last September:

For countries without a competition law or with a law but little experience, international organisations could help greatly through their programs of technical assistance. Each international organisation active in the competition field had different constituencies and missions. However, they were not alternatives, but were rather complimentary. In this regard, OECD welcomed the fact that the Secretary General of UNCTAD had acknowledged the co-operation between UNCTAD and OECD in the field of technical assistance. OECD believed that this co-operation should progress further, insofar as resources and other factors permitted.<sup>92</sup>

### ***Co-ordination of technical assistance***

85. The Secretariat is convinced that there is more need and room for the co-ordination of technical assistance. At the same time, the obstacles of co-ordination should not be underestimated. As Members point out, enhanced co-ordination would involve significant financial and human resources and considerable time.

86. Moreover, notwithstanding Members' general support for greater co-ordination, economic,<sup>93</sup> historic, cultural, political and geographic links<sup>94</sup> remain decisive factors in Members' decisions about the type and intensity of technical assistance and the actual beneficiaries. In fact, many Members provide

technical assistance largely or exclusively on the basis of bilateral<sup>95</sup> or multilateral agreements.<sup>96</sup> For instance, Canada's Competition Bureau

primarily supports relationships under current free trade agreements and co-operation agreements. Otherwise, technical assistance is generally provided on an ad-hoc basis. The Bureau responds to requests depending on available resources and nature of request.<sup>97</sup>

87. Moreover, before launching any costly new system there should be more cost/benefit analysis than is possible on the basis of the information we have collected to date. We believe that it would be cost-effective to implement modest co-ordination to reduce unwarranted overlaps, which would in fact also promote joint ventures. Based on currently available information, we think it is an open question whether and which of the other possible forms of co-ordination would be cost-effective. In this respect, one of the issues delegates might want to discuss is whether, how, and with what costs and benefits would any co-ordination system seek to deal with the very large amount of technical assistance that is funded by governments but provided through private contractors. The same questions should also be asked with respect to the smaller but significant amount of assistance that is funded through foundations and other private parties.

88. In order to be cost-effective, co-ordination to minimise unwarranted overlaps should be provided through one or more clearinghouses that are "virtual" and as automated as possible. A clearinghouse should probably consist of some sort of non-public bulletin board for events in the planning stage and a public calendar. Donors should commit to the prompt submission of information, because there could be substantial costs associated with assigning the co-ordinator to engage in the active "outreach" and follow-up needed to maintain a single, central, complete, and up-to-date clearinghouse.

89. Finally, the Secretariat questions whether a single clearinghouse to reduce unwarranted overlaps and promote joint ventures would be preferable to several such clearinghouses, which could of course be connected by links. A single source would be better for users if they could be reasonably sure of its accuracy and completeness, but as noted above it could be costly to assign any single institution the task of actively seeking out information. If a several existing organisations – perhaps APEC, UNCTAD, and the OECD – all maintained linked clearinghouses, the combination might provide more accurate and up-to-date information with lower operating costs and only slightly higher search costs for users.

## **VI. Questions for discussion**

90. The Secretariat is proposes the following issues for possible discussion at the forthcoming meeting:

1. Is the supply of, and demand for, technical assistance currently in balance? If the need for assistance exceeds the supply, what steps might be taken to make donors more aware of this need?
2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of providing technical assistance through competition authorities as opposed to private contractors?
3. Is it desirable and possible to give competition authorities a greater role in the provision of technical assistance without straining their limited resources? If so, what are delegates' reactions to the following possibilities?

- legislators could allocate significant financial resources to competition authorities for the provision of technical assistance, including resources to cover the costs of having employees dealing specifically with technical assistance;
  - contracts from government funding agencies could cover the agencies' total costs of providing technical assistance;
  - competition authorities could be given a much larger share of available funding, with discretion to provide assistance through its staff or to use their expertise to shape technical assistance projects and select qualified private subcontractors; and
  - competition authorities could advise funding agencies on the design of their technical assistance projects and on the selection of qualified private contractors.
4. What are the likely costs and benefits of the following forms of co-ordination?
- reducing the cost of organising technical assistance events and providing advice by creating some sort of virtual "library."
  - minimising unwarranted overlap and duplication by more and earlier sharing of information on planned events.
  - promoting better assistance through voluntary joint ventures involving international panels by even greater and earlier sharing of information on geographic and substantive areas of individual donor's interest and perhaps information on the assistance requested by particular potential beneficiaries;
  - rationalising technical assistance by combining extensive information sharing with the creation of a central body to advise on how donors might best meet recipients' needs.

## ANNEX A

### THE SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The following is a summary of responses to the Questionnaire on Members' Technical Assistance Activities [DAFFE/CLP/WP3(2000)8] by Members and other major providers of technical assistance, namely Australia, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Switzerland, Turkey, United States, the European Commission, UNCTAD, the World Bank and the World Trade Organisation.

#### *Australia*

Australian technical assistance has been mostly provided by the ACCC, largely with funding support by AusAID – the Australian Government Agency for International Development. The ACCC's staff dealing with international activities have also been co-ordinating the ACCC's technical assistance. The ACCC's technical assistance activities include the organisation and hosting of conferences and workshops in Australia and other countries; organising and receiving delegation visits to Australia; participating in workshops, conferences and specific training programs internationally; organising international staff exchange programs; and responding to requests for assistance from our international counterparts. Many ACCC Commissioners and staff become involved in the actual implementation and delivery of the ACCC's technical assistance work.<sup>98</sup>

The geographical focus of the Australian Government's Overseas Aid Program is the Asia Pacific region with Papua New Guinea, Pacific Island countries and the poorest regions of East Asia being the areas of highest priority. The program also responds selectively to development needs in South Asia, Africa and the Middle East.

The promotion and development of effective competition regimes is recognised by the Australian Government as an integral component in achieving effective governance. Approximately 15 per cent of Australia's total aid budget of A\$1.5 billion in 1999/2000 is directed towards projects aimed at improving effective governance in developing countries.

#### *Canada*

The Canadian Competition Bureau is the primary government agency providing technical assistance in the field of competition law and policy. The Bureau primarily supports relationships under current free trade agreements and co-operation agreements. Otherwise, technical assistance is generally provided on an ad hoc basis. The Bureau responds to requests depending on available resources and the nature of the request.

The Bureau does not have any funding in its regular budget which is earmarked for technical assistance. Therefore, it is quite limited in its ability to finance responses to requests for assistance directly. A few officers in the Bureau's Economics and International Affairs Branch allocate a limited part of their time to co-ordinating responses to technical assistance requests. Other officers within the Bureau, with relevant expertise in requested areas, are called upon on an ad hoc basis to provide technical assistance.

Bureau representatives have met on a number of occasions with representatives from other competition agencies to discuss various issues. The Bureau's technical assistance activities are usually held in Canada, but there have been limited instances where Bureau representatives have travelled to the recipient country. Such activities are generally one-off, short-term events and are designed for one country at a time. The Bureau has offered technical assistance both to competition officials and to other groups, however, requests to the Bureau most often come from competition authorities.

In addition to the Bureau, there are other government departments and agencies involved in the organisation and co-ordination of visits, missions and training programs which may include a competition policy component.

The projects handled outside of the Bureau are generally more long-term with greater funding. For example, the Thailand or Indonesian projects involve large amounts of funding from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) over a long period of time. Within these projects, only a portion of the funding is allocated to competition policy. This is very different from the short-term projects the Bureau provides, which do not have significant, if any, funding attached to them.

### ***The Czech Republic***

Founded in 1991, the Czech Office for the Protection of Competition has relied extensively on technical assistance provided by OECD Member countries and international organisations, such as the OECD and the World Bank. In the framework of co-operation with the European Commission and preparation for EU accession, the Office has also gained considerable knowledge of EU competition policy. The Office would be very keen to share its experience and knowledge with other, newly established competition authorities. However, it has very limited human resources for technical assistance. As a result, so far technical assistance has been offered on an *ad hoc* basis.

On the basis of co-operation agreements with East European competition authorities, the Office received officials of the Russian and Romanian competition authorities for short periods. Croatian and Estonian competition officials also visited the Office. In 1999, the Office organised the Forum on New Competition Laws and their Implications for Business in Central and Eastern Europe in co-operation with the UN Economic Commission for Europe and the Czech Ministry of Industry and Trade. On the basis of the acceptance of the Office's proposal by several EU Member State competition authorities, bilateral visits of competition officials should be initiated in 2001.

### ***Denmark***

With the Danish competition authority as the sole provider of technical assistance in the field of competition law and policy, overall technical assistance in the field of competition law and policy by Denmark has been limited. Most Danish assistance has been provided to the Faroe Islands, Greenland and Central and Eastern Europe and mostly in the form of receiving foreign competition officials for short (one-day) study visits.

The competition authority provided all technical assistance from its regular budget and without having human resources specifically devoted to technical assistance.

### *Finland*

The Finnish competition authority has focused its technical assistance activities on geographically close areas: Estonia and nearby Russian regions. It has concluded bilateral agreements with its counterparts in both Estonia and Russia and provided technical assistance in the framework of such agreements.

The Finnish competition authority organised several seminars, internships and other training programs for Estonia, including competition officials and judges. Technical assistance to Russia has involved high-level visits and internships. One-part time person has co-ordinated all technical assistance by the competition authority. The actual provision of technical assistance was carried out by case-handling officials of the competition authority.

### *Germany*

The Bundeskartellamt has provided technical assistance primarily for beneficiaries in Africa, Asia and Central and East Europe. The Bundeskartellamt's technical assistance activities have involved the organisation of short study visits and some seminars, as well as sending current and former staff to events organised by other assistance providers. The Bundeskartellamt does not have resources earmarked for technical assistance and its technical assistance activities are co-ordinated by its international affairs personnel.

It is noteworthy that a number of German institutions, both public and private ones, deal with providing technical assistance, including in the field of competition law and policy. Those activities are mainly funded by Federal Ministries and are carried out in co-operation with the Bundeskartellamt.

### *Italy*

Until now, all Italian technical assistance in the field of competition law and policy has been provided exclusively by the Italian competition authority. Within the competition authority no human resources are specifically allocated to perform technical assistance activities: these are carried out on a rotation basis. Since the competition authority's financial resources for technical assistance are also rather limited, it submitted applications for external funding, for instance to the EC for sending a long-term resident advisor to the Romanian competition authority.

As far as the geographic coverage of technical assistance is concerned, the competition authority does not have explicit priorities, such activities usually being demand-driven. Nevertheless, due to the geographic proximity, the competition authority often receives requests for technical assistance from countries located in the Mediterranean or in Central and East Europe.

The Italian competition authority provided technical assistance in various ways: internships, seminars, submission of written comments on draft laws, etc. The most common forms of technical assistance have been internships of foreign officials and the participation of the competition authority's officials in training seminars. All technical assistance activities have been short-term.

### *Japan*

The JFTC has a very extensive technical assistance program focusing on Asia but also covering many other countries of the world, such as African, Baltic, Central Asian and Latin American countries. The JFTC has 3 full time officials responsible for co-ordinating technical assistance. Experts at the events are recruited from inside and outside the JFTC according to need. The Japanese government contracts private experts for providing technical assistance only in special cases.

The JFTC has been providing technical assistance primarily by way of co-operation with, and with the financial support of, various other agencies and parts of the Japanese government. The JFTC has been involved in short few-day conferences and workshops, longer-term training seminars (up to 1 month) and in receiving visiting advisors for periods between 1 week and 6 months.

The JFTC has not provided technical assistance together with other OECD countries and/or international organisations, although the Japanese government has a program under APEC to which OECD countries and the Secretariat contribute on a regular basis. Within the APEC Program, the JFTC regards “supporting Thailand ... [as] immensely important, particularly in setting a role model for the countries in the region and hosting the meeting.”<sup>99</sup> The JFTC has also participated in UNCTAD training seminars in Costa Rica and India, co-operated with the WTO in a workshop, and participated in OECD outreach events in China (twice) and Seoul.

### *Korea*

The major technical assistance event of the KFTC has been the annual International Workshop on Competition Policy held in co-operation with the OECD since 1996. Participants in those workshops included APEC Member economies closely linked to Korea in economic and geographical terms as well as some transition economies from other regions, such as Romania. The workshops provided an excellent opportunity for the KFTC to share its experiences on the introduction and enforcement of competition law. Usually, the workshops have been used for training KFTC staff and other Korean Government agencies, as well.

The KFTC's technical assistance activities have been funded entirely from the KFTC's budget. Full-time technical assistance personnel in KFTC's International Affairs Division has been co-ordinating assistance.

### *Mexico*

Virtually all Mexican technical assistance in competition issues is provided by the Federal Competition Commission (CFC). Technical assistance activities are co-ordinated by the International Affairs Division of the CFC. It contacts foreign competition agencies and co-ordinates the provisions of technical assistance internally. Case handling personnel provide technical assistance during internships and seminars when necessary. The CFC has provided the following types of technical assistance: sending panellists to seminars and conferences organised and sponsored by others and receiving interns from beneficiaries.

During 1999 and 2000 most Mexican technical assistance was directed to Latin American and Caribbean countries by means of the participation of Mexican officials in seminars and through internships. Seminars included case study seminars and seminars dealing with competition issues arising in specific sectors. Internships were provided to competition officials from Costa Rica, Panama and Peru.

Technical assistance provided by the CFC is funded either by the CFC itself, when it comes to seminars, or by recipient countries, as in the case of most internships. One of the internships was jointly funded by the government of Costa Rica and the government of Mexico under a general technical co-operation agreement, the resources of which are independent from the Commission's regular budget. No other separate supplementary funding from agencies is available for technical assistance activities.

The CFC has contributed extensively to technical assistance activities organised by international organisations and other OECD Members. Mexican officials served as panellists in two seminars and a workshop sponsored by OECD and Latin American competition authorities (Brazil, Peru and shortly Venezuela) to study cases and to discuss competition policy in specific sectors. The Mexican experience was also presented in two UNCTAD seminars, one dealing with the role of competition in globalizing world markets attended by UN countries, and the other held in Costa Rica focused on the Latin American and Caribbean experiences with competition policy. The CFC participated in a training seminar co-organised by the South Korean competition authority and the OECD as well as in the APEC/PFP competition policy seminar.

### *The Netherlands*

The Netherlands competition authority was established on January 1, 1998, and has so far given a relatively low priority to providing technical assistance. The competition authority has hosted officials of the USFTC and of the CTFTC (Chinese Taipei) for exchanges of experience.

### *Norway*

Pursuant to an agreement entered into in 2000, the Norwegian competition authority provided technical assistance to the Competition Commission of South Africa and promoted competition in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) through training of personnel. In the framework of that agreement, the Norwegian competition authority sent short term consultants to South Africa to train the staff of the Competition Commission and officials from SADC countries as well as long-term advisors to the Competition Commission. The technical assistance programme with South Africa was funded by the Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation.

The Norwegian competition authority also sent a panellist to the competition conference organised in the framework of the OECD's Baltic Regional Program. Travel and expenses for the panellist at the Baltic Conference was funded by NCA.

Notwithstanding the above technical assistance, the response by Norway mentions that it "do[es] not proactively seek opportunities to provide technical assistance"<sup>100</sup> and "will always have limited resources and the resources will normally be allocated on an [ad hoc] basis."<sup>101</sup>

### *Poland*

Poland concluded bilateral co-operation agreements with Russia, Lithuania and Ukraine, which have also served as a framework of providing technical assistance.<sup>102</sup> Most technical assistance activities have been provided for Russia. Following a visit by the President of the Polish competition authority to Russia to sign a co-operation program with the Russian Ministry of Anti-monopoly Policy and the Promotion of Entrepreneurship for 2000-2001, several Russian competition experts have paid study visits to the Polish competition authority and Polish experts have visited the Russian competition ministry.

Furthermore, the Polish competition authority sent a panellist to the OECD conference held in the framework of the OECD Baltic Regional Program in October 2000.

### *Switzerland*

In December 1999, the Swiss competition authority sent a panellist to an OECD seminar dealing with competition in the Russian market of bank services. Although, in the absence of a special budget allocated to technical assistance, the Swiss competition authority has not had any other technical assistance activities, Switzerland is engaged in preparatory works assessing the possibilities of providing technical assistance.

### *Turkey*

Pursuant to a co-operation agreement signed with the Economic, Cultural, Training and Technical Co-operation Presidency of Premiership (EKETIB) on February 14, 2000, the Turkish competition authority organised international conferences with the participation of senior competition officials of the beneficiaries and held a training seminar with theoretical lectures on competition policy by Turkish academicians and case studies presented by Turkish competition officials. The countries covered by the agreement with EKETIB are Central Asian republics and South East European countries. Technical assistance activities carried out under the agreement are funded by the competition authority and EKETIB.

### *United States*

The US Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the US Department of Justice have a very extensive technical assistance program, which operates on a bilateral, multilateral and regional basis. Bilateral technical assistance involves long- and short-term visits by experts of the two authorities at foreign competition authorities. Study visits by foreign competition authority officials are also sponsored. Multilateral and regional technical assistance is offered by means of agency staff participation in events sponsored by or organised in co-operation with various international organisations, such as the OECD, the World Bank and UNCTAD.<sup>103</sup>

Advisors for short- and long-term missions involve an approximately equal number of lawyers and economists. Short-term missions were provided to the Member States of MERCOSUR and the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), Balkan countries, Ukraine and Russia. During Fiscal Years 1999 and 2000 long-term resident advisors served in Romania, Argentina and South Africa. Study visits by foreign competition officials have lasted for periods between several days and six weeks. Such visits have been offered to officials from Croatia, Israel, Panama, Romania and Venezuela.

There is one full-time professional official at USFTC assigned to the co-ordination of USFTC technical assistance. Technical assistance by the USDOJ is co-ordinated by the Executive Office, Economic Analysis Group, and Foreign Commerce Section of the Antitrust Division. The technical assistance programs involving the US antitrust authorities have been primarily funded by the US Agency for International Development (USAID).

The US antitrust authorities have participated in several OECD technical assistance activities, such as conferences and case study seminars. The USFTC has financed a case study seminar series in Ukraine jointly with the OECD. "The US agencies believe these activities are well-conceived and

organised, and ably conducted. [They] favour the continuation of OECD case analysis seminars. [They] also favour continuation of U.S. assistance to nations requesting assistance through these seminars.”<sup>104</sup>

### *European Commission*

The European Commission provides its technical assistance to three regions: (i) Central and East European countries (CEECs); (ii) CIS and Central Asian countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mongolia, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan); and (iii) 77 African Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries. All three regions benefit from technical assistance under specific and complex aid regimes. The EU's PHARE Program funds technical assistance for CEECs, while its TACIS program helps CIS and Central Asian countries. Further, a new Partnership Agreement signed with ACP countries in June 2000 addresses ACP countries' needs for technical assistance.

Under the PHARE Program Euro 4.2 billion was allocated for the period between 1990 and 1994 and Euro 6.693 billion for the period between 1995-1999. TACIS had a budget of Euro 4.226 billion between 1991 and 1999 and Euro 3.138 billion has been committed for the period 2000-2006. Technical assistance to ACP countries is financed by the 9<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund (EDF). EDF resources are channelled through two instruments - one envelope for providing grants and one for providing risk capital and loans to the private sector. The 9<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund is worth Euro 13.5 billion. With European Investment bank loans worth an additional Euro 1.5 billion, the total comes to Euro 15.2 billion.

Competition law and policy is part of the above technical assistance programs. With CEECs, most of which have applied for EC membership, enhanced pre-accession strategies serve as a framework for assistance with each country. Such strategies focus on accession partnerships and increased pre-accession aid. The accession partnerships, which are revised regularly, bring together in one document the priority areas in which each candidate country for accession needs to make progress. Legislative alignment, enforcement, institution building and transparency in the field of antitrust and state aid are among the most important priorities identified by the European Commission in the various accession partnerships.

Specific actions under the PHARE Program include 'twinning' arrangements. Under such arrangements, EU Member State experts provide long-term in-country assistance to CEEC competition authorities. The Commission has also held annual high-level conferences for candidate country competition officials. The European Commission's Technical Assistance and Information Exchange Office has organised study visits and workshops for CEEC competition officials. DG Competition has been contributing to such visits and workshops.

### *UNCTAD*

UNCTAD has focused its technical assistance on the following types of activities: “Country-specific seminars, training workshops, regional and subregional seminars, advisory missions on the drafting of anti-trust law and comments on draft legislation.”<sup>105</sup> Usually, it provides both national and regional assistance, in the form of events usually held in the recipient country for 2-5 days. UNCTAD has been providing technical assistance on the basis of “extra-budgetary funding, in addition to regular staff time allocated to such [assistance] activities.”<sup>106</sup> Staff resources include full-time regular staff and additional administrative support when necessary.

## **WORLD BANK**

The World Bank has funded major technical assistance projects addressed primarily to individual countries.

In some cases, for instance for Croatia, the project covered a wide area of private sector development, of which capacity building in the field of competition policy was one component. In some other cases, the entire assistance project focused on competition policy, such as the assistance project for Guatemala.

Either as a component of a larger assistance project or as an assistance project in itself, assistance in the field of competition has usually involved funding for a wide array of activities. In the case of the assistance project for Croatia, the competition component covered the following types of assistance for the Croatian competition authority:

- preparation of substantive and procedural primary and secondary legislation (law amendments, implementing decrees and regulations, administrative guidelines and policy and law interpretation documents);
- development of a training program and linkages with foreign competition authorities and international organisations;
- building of institutional expertise capacity (long-term resident advisor);
- implementation of a public information and dissemination strategy aimed at creating a culture of competition and compliance with the law; and
- definition of organisational and personnel profile.

Technical assistance to Guatemala involved *inter alia* the following types of activities with regard to the Guatemalan competition authority:

- development of information resources, library;
- internal (long-term resident advisor) and external training (internship);
- sector studies, preparation of investigative and procedural manual;
- university and research development; and
- preparation of a corporate compliance program.

## **WORLD TRADE ORGANISATION**

The World Trade Organisation has been dealing with issues of competition policy, including assistance to countries with limited competition law and policy experience, primarily through its Working Group on the Interaction between Trade and Competition Policy established by the Singapore Ministerial Conference in December 1996. The Working Group has organised several conferences with the participation of beneficiaries. These conferences provided excellent opportunities for fruitful policy dialogue. Since the conferences focused less on providing technical assistance as defined by this note, the tables in Annex B to D do not include those conferences.

## ANNEX B

### RESPONDENTS' PLANS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN 2001

Based on the responses to the questionnaire, providers technical assistance activities for 2001 do not show considerable changes in the general policy directions as regards technical assistance are discussed below. Several competition authorities, such as the Czech,<sup>107</sup> the Danish,<sup>108</sup> the Finnish,<sup>109</sup> Mexican,<sup>110</sup> and the Norwegian<sup>111</sup> competition authorities, plan no considerable changes in their future technical assistance activities either as regards the type of activity or as regards the beneficiaries.

Changes in the European Commission's technical assistance activities will follow the development of its international trade agreements. Continuing its current level of technical assistance to its current beneficiaries, in accordance with the new Partnership Agreement signed with ACP countries in June 2000 in Cotonou, Benin, the European Commission will reinforce its assistance to ACP countries.<sup>112</sup> Furthermore, in accordance with its already existing or planned trade agreements with Mercosur, Chile and the Andean Community, the European Commission plans to extend its technical assistance to Latin American beneficiaries.<sup>113</sup>

In order to respond to the increasing demand for technical assistance, the Italian competition authority started to seek external funding for the provisions of additional technical assistance, in particular funding for technical assistance to competition authorities in candidate countries for EU accession. Recently, the competition authority submitted a request for European Union funding for a long-term resident advisor program to be implemented jointly with the German competition authority in Romania in 2001.

Responding to calls for increased technical assistance, Switzerland is engaged in preparatory works assessing the possibilities of providing technical assistance in the field of competition law and policy.<sup>114</sup>

The United States mentions that

[t]he agencies' plans for FY2001, beyond those programs already funded, are awaiting approval of relevant agency appropriations for FY2001, which remain unenacted by Congress as of the date of this submission. Programs that are now funded for implementation in FY2001 include an expansion of our activities in MERCOSUR, and a regional program for the Balkan states. In addition, our activities in South Africa, including resident and short-term advisors, will continue.<sup>115</sup>

With respect to its plans for 2001, UNCTAD points out that

[t]he general orientation of the UNCTAD work in the field of competition law and policy is set by the UN Review Conference on the Set of Principles and Rules for the Control of RBPs, the IGE on competition law and policy and the Working party on medium terms. It has been divided in the following four main areas, as stipulated in the Resolution of 4<sup>th</sup> UN Review Conference and specified by UNCTAD X in its Plan of Action in Bangkok:

- A. Institutional capacity-building, including drafting competition law;
- B. Competition advocacy and educating the public;
- C. Studies on competition, competitiveness and development;

D. Inputs to possible international agreements on competition.<sup>116</sup>

Providers' technical assistance activities planned for 2001 are summarised in a table attached to this note as Annex E.

## ANNEX C

**INVENTORY OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS, OTHER PROVIDERS AND OECD OUTREACH  
IN 1999-2000 BY PROVIDERS AND TYPE OF ACTIVITY**

(Assistance sponsored and/or organised by the provider are in bold, participation in assistance organised and sponsored by others is not highlighted.  
The numbers in brackets following the individual beneficiaries indicate the number of activities in the 1999-2000 period.)

<b>TYPE OF ACTIVITY→</b>	<b>Conference</b>	<b>Seminar</b>	<b>Long-term resident advisor</b>	<b>Short-term consultation</b>	<b>Internship</b>	<b>Study visit</b>	<b>Miscellaneous</b>
<b>PROVIDERS↓</b>							
<b>Australia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>18 Asian and Oceanic economies</b></li> <li>• Bangladesh</li> <li>• India</li> <li>• South Africa</li> <li>• ASEAN</li> <li>• South and South-East Asia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>South Africa</b></li> <li>• <b>ASEAN</b></li> <li>• APEC (6)</li> <li>• South Africa (2)</li> <li>• Asia-Pacific countries (2)</li> <li>• Indonesia</li> <li>• People's Republic of China (OECD)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Chinese Taipei (2)</b></li> <li>• <b>Fiji</b></li> <li>• <b>Hong Kong</b></li> <li>• <b>Malaysia</b></li> <li>• <b>Papua New Guinea</b></li> <li>• <b>South Africa</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>South Africa (3)</b></li> <li>• <b>Thailand</b></li> <li>• Indonesia (3)</li> <li>• Thailand</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Chinese Taipei (2)</b></li> <li>• <b>Samoa</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>South Africa (3)</b></li> <li>• <b>People's Republic of China (2)</b></li> <li>• <b>Papua New Guinea (2)</b></li> <li>• <b>Barbados</b></li> <li>• <b>Chinese Taipei</b></li> <li>• <b>Fiji</b></li> <li>• <b>Kenya</b></li> <li>• <b>Malaysia</b></li> <li>• <b>Zimbabwe</b></li> <li>• People's Republic of China (16)</li> <li>• Vietnam (5)</li> <li>• Fiji (3)</li> <li>• Chinese Taipei (2)</li> <li>• Indonesia (2)</li> <li>• Malaysia (2)</li> <li>• Philippines (2)</li> <li>• Singapore (2)</li> <li>• South Africa (2)</li> <li>• Egypt</li> <li>• Hong Kong</li> <li>• Pakistan</li> <li>• Bangladesh</li> <li>• Cambodia</li> <li>• Papua New Guinea</li> <li>• Thailand</li> </ul>	

<b>TYPE OF ACTIVITY→</b>	<b>Conference</b>	<b>Seminar</b>	<b>Long-term resident advisor</b>	<b>Short-term consultation</b>	<b>Internship</b>	<b>Study visit</b>	<b>Miscellaneous</b>
<b>PROVIDERS↓</b>							
<b>Canada</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brazil (2)</li> <li>• APEC Countries (OECD)</li> <li>• Vietnam</li> <li>• Asia-Pacific countries</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dominican Republic</li> <li>• Nicaragua</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People's Republic of China (2)</li> <li>• Chinese Taipei</li> <li>• Jamaica</li> <li>• Morocco</li> <li>• South Africa</li> <li>• Thailand</li> <li>• Vietnam</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indonesia (2 short visits in preparation of a long-term program)</li> </ul>
<b>Czech Republic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central and East European countries</li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Croatia</li> <li>• Estonia</li> <li>• Romania</li> <li>• Russia</li> </ul>	
<b>Denmark</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slovenia</li> <li>• Russia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenland</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slovenia (2)</li> <li>• Bulgaria</li> <li>• Lithuania</li> <li>• Malaysia</li> </ul>	

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→ PROVIDERS↓	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
European Commission		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Russia (several)</li> <li>• Slovenia (training on EC competition policy carried out by Austrian private contractor)</li> <li>• CIS, CEEC, South-East European countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latvia (partly on state aids)</li> <li>• Lithuania</li> <li>• Romania (carried out by Germany and Italy)</li> <li>• Slovenia (on state aids carried out by France and Austria)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estonia (carried out by the Swedish Competition Authority to advise amendments to merger rules)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estonia (to OFT on merger control)</li> <li>• Russia (several)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Russia (assistance in legal drafting, studies, steel sector project with competition and state aid components)</li> <li>• Bulgaria (institution-building project related to competition and state aids, including training and information activities)</li> <li>• Estonia (translation of EC merger rules)</li> <li>• Slovenia (training assistance on EC-conform legislation carried out by German private contractor)</li> </ul>
Finland	• Russia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estonia (6)</li> <li>• Russia (OECD)</li> </ul>			• Estonia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estonia (5)</li> <li>• Russia (3)</li> </ul>	

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→ PROVIDERS↓	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
Italy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North African countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulgaria</li> <li>• Estonia, Slovenia</li> <li>• Lithuania</li> <li>• People's Republic of China (OECD)</li> <li>• Central and East European countries</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kenya</li> <li>• Mozambique</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Romania (preparatory meetings for sending a long-term resident advisor under the EC twinning program)</li> <li>• Russia (preparatory work)</li> </ul>
Japan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indonesia</li> <li>• People's Republic of China</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People's Republic of China (2)</li> <li>• APEC (2)</li> <li>• Azerbaijan, Estonia, Indonesia, Kenya, Laos, Malaysia, Morocco, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Zambia (training at the JFTC)</li> <li>• Chile, Honduras, India, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Peru, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Uzbekistan (training at the JFTC)</li> <li>• Russia</li> <li>• Asia</li> <li>• Chinese Taipei (2)</li> <li>• Costa Rica</li> <li>• India</li> <li>• People's Republic of China (OECD)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Malaysia (2)</li> <li>• Thailand (2)</li> <li>• Latvia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vietnam</li> <li>• Chinese Taipei</li> </ul>			

<b>TYPE OF ACTIVITY→</b>	<b>Conference</b>	<b>Seminar</b>	<b>Long-term resident advisor</b>	<b>Short-term consultation</b>	<b>Internship</b>	<b>Study visit</b>	<b>Miscellaneous</b>
<b>PROVIDERS↓</b>							
<b>Korea</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APEC (World Bank)</li> <li>• APEC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APEC, Romania (2) (OECD)</li> </ul>					
<b>Mexico</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costa Rica</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costa Rica</li> <li>• Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Peru, South Africa</li> <li>• Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Jamaica, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela</li> <li>• APEC</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nicaragua</li> <li>• Panama</li> <li>• Peru</li> </ul>		
<b>Norway</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Africa</li> <li>• Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia (OECD)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Africa</li> </ul>				
<b>Poland</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia (OECD)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Russia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Russia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Russia</li> </ul>	
<b>Switzerland</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Russia</li> </ul>					
<b>Turkey</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Asia, South-East Europe (Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia Herzegovina, Cyprus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, FYROM, Moldavia, Mongolia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)</li> <li>• various countries (2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Asia, South-East Europe (Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia Herzegovina, Cyprus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, FYR of Macedonia, Moldavia, Mongolia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)</li> </ul>					

<b>TYPE OF ACTIVITY→</b>	<b>Conference</b>	<b>Seminar</b>	<b>Long-term resident advisor</b>	<b>Short-term consultation</b>	<b>Internship</b>	<b>Study visit</b>	<b>Miscellaneous</b>
<b>PROVIDERS↓</b>							
<b>United States</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>India (several)</b></li> <li>• Bosnia Herzegovina, Croatia, FYR of Macedonia, Russia, Slovenia</li> <li>• Bulgaria, Romania</li> <li>• Russia</li> <li>• South Africa</li> <li>• Ukraine</li> <li>• CARICOM</li> <li>• Central and East European countries, CIS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ukraine (2) (JV with the OECD)</b></li> <li>• CIS (3)</li> <li>• Central and East European countries, CIS, South-East European countries (2)</li> <li>• Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Jamaica, Panama, Peru (OECD)</li> <li>• APEC</li> <li>• CARICOM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Romania</b></li> <li>• <b>South Africa</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>India (several)</b></li> <li>• <b>South Africa (6)</b></li> <li>• <b>Romania (5)</b></li> <li>• <b>Brazil</b></li> <li>• <b>Argentina</b></li> <li>• <b>Lithuania</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Romania</b></li> </ul>		
<b>UNCTAD</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIS</b></li> <li>• <b>CIS, CEEC</b></li> <li>• CIS (2)</li> <li>• CIS, Bulgaria, Mongolia, FYR of Macedonia, India</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Zambia (2)</b></li> <li>• <b>South Asia (2)</b></li> <li>• <b>Burkina Faso</b></li> <li>• <b>South Asia</b></li> <li>• <b>Madagascar</b></li> <li>• <b>Mali</b></li> <li>• <b>Thailand</b></li> <li>• <b>Vietnam</b></li> <li>• <b>CARICOM</b></li> <li>• <b>COMESA</b></li> <li>• <b>COMESA, SADC</b></li> <li>• <b>Latin America, Caribbean</b></li> <li>• <b>Northern Africa</b></li> <li>• Guadeloupe</li> <li>• APEC</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Botswana</b></li> <li>• Thailand</li> </ul>			

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→ PROVIDERS↓	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
WORLD BANK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South and South-East Asia (2) (JV with OECD)</li> </ul>						assistance programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Croatia</li> <li>• Colombia</li> <li>• Guatemala</li> <li>• Nicaragua</li> <li>• Panama</li> <li>• El Salvador</li> <li>• Thailand</li> </ul>
OECD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baltics (2)</li> <li>• 50 countries from Europe, North and South America, Asia and Oceania (Trade &amp; Competition)</li> <li>• Brazil, Chinese Taipei, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, People's Republic of China, Russia (JV with World Bank)</li> <li>• Chinese Taipei</li> <li>• Chinese Taipei, various</li> <li>• Russia</li> <li>• South Africa</li> <li>• Ukraine</li> <li>• North Africa (UNCTAD)</li> <li>• South-East Asia</li> <li>• India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, Singapore, Thailand (JV with World Bank)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Russia (4)</li> <li>• Ukraine (3) (with USFTC)</li> <li>• APEC (3) (with KFTC)</li> <li>• Baltics, Russia (2)</li> <li>• CIS (2)</li> <li>• CIS, CEEC, South-East Europe (2)</li> <li>• South-East Asia (2) (with CTFTC)</li> <li>• Brazil</li> <li>• Argentina, Brazil, Jamaica, Panama, Peru, South America</li> <li>• Latin America</li> <li>• People's Republic of China</li> <li>• APEC (2)</li> <li>• Thailand</li> <li>• South Africa, SADC</li> <li>• South-East Asia</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Africa</li> <li>• Vietnam</li> <li>• Croatia (writing study on competition law developments)</li> <li>• Brazil (fact -finding mission)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baltics (2 annual reports on each Baltic country's competition policy developments)</li> </ul>

## ANNEX D

**INVENTORY OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS, OTHER MAJOR PROVIDERS AND OECD OUTREACH  
IN 1999-2000 BY BENEFICIARY AND TYPE OF ACTIVITY**

(Assistance shared with other beneficiaries are in italics. Assistance sponsored and/or organised by the provider is highlighted in bold.  
The numbers in brackets following the individual providers indicate the number of activities in the 1999-2000 period.)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
<b>BENEFICIARIES↓</b>							
<b>Albania</b>	▪ <i>Turkey</i>	▪ <i>Turkey</i>					
<b>Argentina</b>		▪ <i>OECD</i> ▪ <i>Mexico (2)</i> ▪ <i>United States</i>		▪ <b>United States</b>			
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	▪ <i>Turkey</i>	▪ <i>Japan</i> ▪ <i>Turkey</i>					
<b>Bangladesh</b>	▪ <b>Australia</b>	▪ <b>UNCTAD</b>				▪ <b>Australia</b>	
<b>Barbados</b>						▪ <b>Australia</b>	
<b>Bosnia Herzegovina</b>	▪ <i>Turkey</i> ▪ <i>United States</i>	▪ <i>Turkey</i>					
<b>Botswana</b>				▪ <b>UNCTAD</b>			
<b>Brazil</b>		▪ <b>OECD</b> ▪ <i>OECD (2)</i> ▪ <i>Canada (2)</i> ▪ <i>Mexico (2)</i> ▪ <i>United States</i>		▪ <b>United States</b> ▪ <b>OECD (fact-finding mission)</b>			
<b>Bulgaria</b>	▪ <i>United States</i> ▪ <i>UNCTAD</i>	▪ <i>Italy</i>				▪ <b>Denmark</b>	▪ <b>European Commission (institution-building project related to competition and state aids, including training and information activities)</b>

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
<b>BENEFICIARIES↓</b>							
<b>Burkina Faso</b>		▪ UNCTAD					
<b>Cambodia</b>						▪ Australia	
<b>Chile</b>		▪ <i>Japan</i> ▪ <i>Mexico (2)</i> ▪ <i>United States</i>					
<b>Chinese Taipei</b>	▪ <i>OECD</i> ▪ <i>OECD</i> ▪ <i>OECD</i>	▪ <i>Japan (2)</i> ▪ <i>Canada</i>	▪ <i>Australia (2)</i>	▪ <i>Japan</i>	▪ <i>Australia (2)</i>	▪ <i>Australia</i> ▪ <i>Canada</i> ▪ <i>Australia (2)</i>	
<b>Costa Rica</b>	▪ <i>Mexico</i>	▪ <i>Mexico</i> ▪ <i>Japan</i>					
<b>Colombia</b>							▪ <i>World Bank (assistance program)</i>
<b>Croatia</b>	▪ <i>United States</i>			▪ <i>OECD (writing study on competition law developments)</i>		▪ <i>Czech Republic</i>	▪ <i>World Bank (assistance program)</i>
<b>Cyprus</b>	▪ <i>Turkey</i>	▪ <i>Turkey</i>					
<b>Dominican Republic</b>				▪ <i>Canada</i>			
<b>Ecuador</b>		▪ <i>Mexico</i>					
<b>Egypt</b>						▪ <i>Australia</i>	
<b>Estonia</b>		▪ <i>Finland (6)</i> ▪ <i>OECD (2)</i> ▪ <i>Japan</i> ▪ <i>Norway</i> ▪ <i>Poland</i>	▪ <i>Italy</i>	▪ <i>European Commission (carried out by the Swedish competition authority to advise amendments to merger rules)</i>	▪ <i>Finland (5)</i> ▪ <i>European Commission (to OFT on merger control)</i>	▪ <i>Finland (5)</i> ▪ <i>Czech Republic</i>	▪ <i>European Commission (translation of EC merger rules)</i>
<b>Fiji</b>			▪ <i>Australia</i>			▪ <i>Australia</i> ▪ <i>Australia (3)</i>	
<b>Georgia</b>	▪ <i>Turkey</i>	▪ <i>Turkey</i>					
<b>Greenland</b>			▪ <i>Denmark</i>				
<b>Guadeloupe</b>		▪ UNCTAD					

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
<b>BENEFICIARIES↓</b>							
<b>Guatemala</b>							▪ <b>World Bank (assistance program)</b>
<b>Honduras</b>		▪ <i>Japan</i>					
<b>Hong Kong</b>		▪ <i>UNCTAD</i>	▪ <b>Australia</b>			▪ <b>Australia</b>	
<b>India</b>	▪ <b>United States (several)</b> ▪ <b>World Bank</b> ▪ <b>Australia</b> ▪ <i>OECD</i> ▪ <i>UNCTAD</i>	▪ <i>Japan</i> ▪ <i>UNCTAD (2)</i> ▪ <b>Japan</b>		▪ <b>United States (several)</b>			
<b>Indonesia</b>	▪ <b>Japan</b> ▪ <b>World Bank</b> ▪ <i>OECD</i>	▪ <b>OECD</b> ▪ <i>Japan</i> ▪ <b>Australia</b>		▪ <b>Australia (3)</b>		▪ <b>Australia(2)</b>	▪ <b>World Bank (assistance program)</b> ▪ <b>Canada (2 short visits in preparation of a long-term program)</b>
<b>Jamaica</b>		▪ <i>OECD</i> ▪ <i>Mexico (2)</i> ▪ <i>United States</i>				▪ <b>Canada</b>	
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	▪ <i>Turkey</i>	▪ <i>Japan</i> ▪ <i>Turkey</i>					
<b>Kenya</b>		▪ <i>Japan (2)</i>			▪ <b>Italy</b>	▪ <b>Australia</b>	
<b>Kyrgyzstan</b>	▪ <i>Turkey</i>	▪ <i>Turkey</i>					
<b>Laos</b>		▪ <i>Japan</i>					
<b>Latvia</b>		▪ <i>OECD (2)</i> ▪ <i>Norway (OECD)</i> ▪ <i>Poland (OECD)</i>	▪ <b>European Commission (twinning partly on state aids)</b> ▪ <b>Japan</b>				

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
<b>BENEFICIARIES↓</b>							
<b>Lithuania</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>OECD (2)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Norway (OECD)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Poland (OECD)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>European Commission (twinning, including assistance on legislation, administrative and judicial enforcement, advocacy, information and documentation technology)</b></li> <li>▪ <i>Italy</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>United States</b></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Denmark</b></li> </ul>	
<b>FYR of Macedonia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Turkey</i></li> <li>▪ <i>United States</i></li> <li>▪ <i>UNCTAD</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Turkey</i></li> </ul>					
<b>Madagascar</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>UNCTAD</b></li> </ul>					
<b>Malaysia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>OECD</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>OECD</i></li> <li>▪ <i>JAPAN</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Canada</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Japan (2)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Australia</b></li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Australia</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Denmark</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Australia (2)</b></li> </ul>	
<b>Mali</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>UNCTAD</b></li> </ul>					
<b>Moldavia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Turkey</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Turkey</i></li> </ul>					
<b>Mongolia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Turkey</i></li> <li>▪ <i>UNCTAD</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Turkey</i></li> </ul>					
<b>Morocco</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>UNCTAD</i></li> <li>▪ <i>France</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Germany</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Italy</i></li> <li>▪ <i>OECD</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Japan</i></li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Canada</b></li> </ul>	
<b>Mozambique</b>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Italy</b></li> </ul>		
<b>Nepal</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>UNCTAD (2)</i></li> </ul>					

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
<b>BENEFICIARIES↓</b>							
Nicaragua				▪ Canada	▪ Mexico		▪ World Bank (assistance program)
Pakistan		▪ UNCTAD (2) ▪ Canada				▪ Australia	
Panama		▪ OECD ▪ Mexico (2) ▪ United States			▪ Mexico		▪ World Bank (assistance program)
Papua New Guinea		▪ OECD (with KFTC) ▪ Canada (OECD)	▪ Australia			▪ Australia (2) ▪ Australia	
People's Republic of China	▪ Japan ▪ OECD ▪ Australia	▪ Japan (2) ▪ OECD ▪ UNCTAD ▪ Canada				▪ Australia (2) ▪ Canada (2) ▪ Australia (16)	
Peru		▪ OECD ▪ Japan ▪ Mexico (2) ▪ United States			▪ Mexico		
Philippines		▪ OECD (with KFTC) ▪ Canada (OECD)				▪ Australia (2)	
Romania	▪ United States	▪ Canada	▪ European Commission (twinning carried out by Germany and Italy) ▪ United States	▪ United States (5)	▪ United States	▪ Czech Republic	▪ Italy (preparatory meetings for sending a long-term resident advisor jointly with Germany under the EC twinning program)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
<b>BENEFICIARIES↓</b>							
<b>Russia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Finland</b></li> <li>▪ <b>OECD</b></li> <li>▪ United States</li> <li>▪ OECD</li> <li>▪ <i>United States</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>European Commission (several)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>OECD (4)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Japan</b></li> <li>▪ <b>OECD (2)</b></li> <li>▪ Denmark</li> <li>▪ Finland</li> <li>▪ Switzerland</li> <li>▪ <i>Canada</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Norway</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Poland</i></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Poland</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>European Commission (several)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Poland</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Finland (3)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Czech Republic</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Poland</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>European Commission (assistance in legal drafting, studies, steel sector project with competition and state aid components)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Italy (preparatory work for future program)</b></li> </ul>
<b>El Salvador</b>							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>World Bank (assistance program)</b></li> </ul>
<b>Samoa</b>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Australia</b></li> </ul>		
<b>Singapore</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>OECD</b></li> <li>▪ <i>Canada (OECD)</i></li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Australia (2)</li> </ul>	
<b>Slovenia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>United States</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Denmark</b></li> <li>▪ <b>European Commission (training on EC competition law carried out by Austrian private contractor)</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>European Commission (twinning on state aids carried out by France and Austria)</b></li> <li>▪ <i>Italy</i></li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Denmark (2)</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>European Commission (training assistance on EC-conform legislation carried out by German private contractor)</b></li> </ul>
<b>South Africa</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Australia</li> <li>▪ United States</li> <li>▪ OECD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Australia</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Norway</b></li> <li>▪ Australia (2)</li> <li>▪ <i>Mexico</i></li> <li>▪ <b>OECD</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Australia</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Norway</b></li> <li>▪ <b>United States</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>United States (6)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Australia (3)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>OECD</b></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Australia (3)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Canada</b></li> <li>▪ Australia (2)</li> </ul>	

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
<b>BENEFICIARIES↓</b>							
<b>Sri Lanka</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Japan (2)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>UNCTAD (2)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Canada</i></li> </ul>					
<b>Tanzania</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Japan</i></li> </ul>					
<b>Thailand</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>UNCTAD</b></li> <li>▪ <i>Japan</i></li> <li>▪ <i>OECD</i></li> <li>▪ <i>OECD</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Canada</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Japan (2)</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Australia</b></li> <li>▪ <i>Australia</i></li> <li>▪ <i>UNCTAD</i></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Canada</b></li> <li>▪ <i>Australia</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>World Bank (assistance program)</b></li> </ul>
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Turkey</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Turkey</i></li> </ul>					
<b>Ukraine</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>United States</i></li> <li>▪ <i>OECD</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>OECD (3)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>United States (2)</b></li> </ul>					
<b>Uruguay</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Mexico</i></li> </ul>					
<b>Uzbekistan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Turkey</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Japan</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Turkey</i></li> </ul>					
<b>Venezuela</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Mexico</i></li> </ul>					
<b>Vietnam</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>UNCTAD</b></li> <li>▪ <i>Canada</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Canada</i></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Japan</b></li> <li>▪ <b>OECD</b></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Australia</b></li> <li>▪ <i>Canada</i></li> </ul>	
<b>Zambia</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>UNCTAD (2)</b></li> <li>▪ <i>Japan</i></li> </ul>					
<b>Zimbabwe</b>						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Australia</b></li> </ul>	
<b>APEC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Korea (World Bank)</b></li> <li>• <b>Korea</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>OECD (3)</b></li> <li>• <b>Korea (2) (OECD)</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Japan (2)</b></li> <li>▪ <i>Australia (6)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>OECD (2)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Mexico</i></li> <li>▪ <i>United States</i></li> <li>▪ <b>UNCTAD</b></li> </ul>					
<b>ASEAN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Australia</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Australia</b></li> </ul>					
<b>Asia</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Japan</b></li> </ul>					

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
<b>BENEFICIARIES↓</b>							
<b>Asia-Pacific</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Australia (2)</li> <li>▪ Canada</li> </ul>					
<b>Baltics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>OECD (2)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>OECD (2)</i></li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>OECD (2 annual reports on each country's competition policy developments)</b></li> </ul>
<b>Caribbean</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>UNCTAD</i></li> </ul>					
<b>CARICOM (Caribbean Community)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ United States</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>UNCTAD</b></li> <li>▪ United States</li> </ul>					
<b>Central and East Europe</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Czech Republic</b></li> <li>▪ <i>UNCTAD</i></li> <li>▪ <i>United States</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>OECD (2)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>United States (2)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Italy</li> </ul>				
<b>COMESA (Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>UNCTAD</b></li> <li>▪ <i>UNCTAD</i></li> </ul>					
<b>Commonwealth of Independent States</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>UNCTAD</b></li> <li>▪ <i>UNCTAD</i></li> <li>▪ UNCTAD (2)</li> <li>▪ <i>United States</i></li> <li>▪ <i>UNCTAD</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>OECD (2)</b></li> <li>▪ <i>OECD (2)</i></li> <li>▪ United States (3)</li> <li>▪ <i>United States (2)</i></li> </ul>					
<b>Latin America</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>OECD</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>UNCTAD</i></li> </ul>					
<b>North Africa</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Italy</li> <li>▪ OECD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>UNCTAD</b></li> </ul>					
<b>South America</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>OECD</i></li> </ul>					
<b>South and South-East Asia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Australia</li> <li>▪ OECD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>OECD (2)</b></li> <li>▪ OECD</li> </ul>					

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
<b>BENEFICIARIES↓</b>							
South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation (SAARC)		▪ <i>UNCTAD</i>					
South-East Europe		▪ <i>OECD (2)</i> ▪ <i>United States (2)</i>					
Southern African Development Community (SADC)		▪ <i>UNCTAD</i> ▪ <i>OECD</i>					
50 countries from Europe, North America, Asia and Oceania (Trade and Competition)	▪ <i>OECD</i>						
18 Asian and Oceanic economies	▪ <i>Australia</i>						
Various countries	▪ <i>Turkey</i> ▪ <i>OECD</i>						

## ANNEX E

**PLANNED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS, OTHER PROVIDERS AND OECD OUTREACH  
IN 2001 BY PROVIDERS AND TYPE OF ACTIVITY**

(Assistance sponsored and/or organised by the provider are in bold, participation in assistance organised and sponsored by others is not highlighted.  
The numbers in brackets following the individual beneficiaries indicate the number of activities in 2001.)

<b>TYPE OF ACTIVITY→</b>	<b>Conference</b>	<b>Seminar</b>	<b>Long-term resident advisor</b>	<b>Short-term consultation</b>	<b>Internship</b>	<b>Study visit</b>	<b>Miscellaneous</b>
<b>PROVIDERS↓</b>							
<b>Australia</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Egypt (several)</b></li> <li>• <b>Indonesia (several)</b></li> <li>• <b>Thailand (several)</b></li> <li>• <b>APEC (2)</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Chinese Taipei</b></li> <li>• <b>Papua New Guinea</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Egypt (several)</b></li> <li>• <b>Indonesia (several)</b></li> <li>• <b>Thailand (several)</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Chinese Taipei</b></li> <li>• <b>Papua New Guinea</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hong Kong</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Southern &amp; Central Africa (scoping study and needs analysis)</b></li> </ul>
<b>Czech Republic</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CEEC</b></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CEEC</b></li> </ul>		
<b>Denmark</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Greenland</b></li> </ul>				
<b>European Commission</b>							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ukraine ("Application of Foreign Trade Regime" project with a third dedicated to competition policy)</b></li> <li>• <i>Ukraine (steel related with elements of competition policy)</i></li> </ul>
<b>Finland</b>							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Estonia (continuing assistance)</b></li> <li>• <b>Russia (continuing assistance)</b></li> </ul>
<b>Italy</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Romania</b></li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Russia (assistance project)</i></li> </ul>
<b>Korea</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>APEC (OECD)</b></li> </ul>					
<b>Netherlands</b>						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Estonia</b></li> </ul>	

<b>TYPE OF ACTIVITY→</b>	<b>Conference</b>	<b>Seminar</b>	<b>Long-term resident advisor</b>	<b>Short-term consultation</b>	<b>Internship</b>	<b>Study visit</b>	<b>Miscellaneous</b>
<b>PROVIDERS↓</b>							
<b>Norway</b>					• <b>South Africa</b>		
<b>United States</b>			• <b>South Africa (several)</b>	• <b>South Africa (several)</b>			• <b>MERCOSUR (non-specified activities)</b> • <b>South-East Europe</b>
<b>OECD</b>	• <b>People's Republic of China</b>	• <b>Russia (8)</b> • <b>Brazil</b> • <b>South-East Asia with (with CTFTC)</b> • <b>Asia (with KFTC)</b> • <b>Baltics</b> • <b>CIS, Central and East Europe and South East Europe (2 weeks)</b> • <b>People's Republic of China</b> • <b>APEC</b> • <b>South-East Europe (3)</b> • <b>South Africa (4)</b>		• <b>Baltics</b> • <b>Russia</b>		• <b>People's Republic of China</b>	• <b>Global Forum on Competition (beneficiaries to be defined by CLP)</b> • <b>People's Republic of China (study on the domestic implications of trade and investment liberalisation)</b> • <b>preparatory missions and conference to launch a Regional Flagship Initiative on competition law and policy for South-East European countries</b>

TYPE OF ACTIVITY→	Conference	Seminar	Long-term resident advisor	Short-term consultation	Internship	Study visit	Miscellaneous
<b>PROVIDERS↓</b>							
<b>UNCTAD</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Azerbaijan</li> <li>• Burkina Faso, Mali</li> <li>• Cuba</li> <li>• African countries</li> <li>• CEMAC</li> <li>• CIS</li> <li>• COMESA</li> <li>• APEC</li> </ul>					
<b>WORLD BANK</b>							<i>initial dialogue possibly leading to formal assistance:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dominican Republic</li> <li>• Ecuador</li> <li>• Vietnam</li> <li>• UEMOA (Economic Community of West African Countries)</li> <li>• COMESA</li> </ul>

**Notes**

- <sup>1</sup> Response by the United States [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)9], at p. 2.
- <sup>2</sup> Response by Mexico [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)7], at p. 2.
- <sup>3</sup> Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at p. 4.
- <sup>4</sup> The UNCTAD stresses its support for increased technical assistance “as was agreed at UNCTAD X and 4th Review Conference.” Response by UNCTAD [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)13], at p. 3.
- <sup>5</sup> Response by Italy [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)5], at p. 1.
- <sup>6</sup> See Response by Japan [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)6], at p. 1.
- <sup>7</sup> Response by Mexico [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)7], at p. 2.
- <sup>8</sup> Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 2.
- <sup>9</sup> Response by the European Commission [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)12], at pp. 3-4. [emphasis added].
- <sup>10</sup> See Response by Japan [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)6], at p. 1.
- <sup>11</sup> See Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 4.
- <sup>12</sup> Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at p. 4.
- <sup>13</sup> Response by Japan [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)6], at p. 1.
- <sup>14</sup> Response by the European Commission [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)12], at p. 5.
- <sup>15</sup> Response by Italy [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)5], at p. 2.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid., at p. 2.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid., at p. 2.
- <sup>18</sup> Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at p. 4.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid., at p. 4.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid., at p. 4.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid., at p. 7.
- <sup>22</sup> Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 4.

- 23 Response by Mexico [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)7], at p. 2.
- 24 Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at p. 4.
- 25 Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 4.
- 26 Communication from the European Community and Its Member States to the WTO Working Group on the Interaction between Trade and Competition Policy [WT/WGTCP/W/140], 8 June 2000, at p. 11.
- 27 Response by Japan [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)6], at p. 1.
- 28 Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at p. 5.
- 29 See Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 5.
- 30 Response by UNCTAD [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)13], at p. 4.
- 31 Response by Finland [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)10], at p. 3.
- 32 See Competition Policy Outreach Activities: Stocktaking, Challenges and Future Directions [DAFFE/CLP(99)30], para. 31. at pp. 8-9.
- 33 Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 5.
- 34 See Response by Mexico [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)7], at p. 3.
- 35 Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at p. 5.
- 36 Response by Mexico [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)7], at p. 3.
- 37 See Competition Policy Outreach Activities: Stocktaking, Challenges and Future Directions [DAFFE/CLP(99)30], para. 28 at p. 8.
- 38 Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 6.
- 39 See Response by Japan [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)6], at p. 1.
- 40 Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at pp. 5-6.
- 41 Response by Finland [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)10], at p. 4.
- 42 Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 6.
- 43 See Response by Finland [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)10], at p. 3.
- 44 See Response by Italy [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)5], at p. 2.
- 45 See Response by the United States [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)9], at p. 2.
- 46 See Response by the European Commission [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)12], at p. 7.

- 47 Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at pp. 5-6.
- 48 See Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 6.
- 49 Response by the United States [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)9], at p. 1.
- 50 See Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 2.
- 51 Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at pp. 5-6.
- 52 See Response by the European Commission [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)12], at p. 7.
- 53 Canada tries to enhance the efficiency of technical assistance with greater nationwide coordination of technical assistance providers. Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 8.
- 54 "GOJ has not provided technical assistance together with other OECD countries and/or international organizations. GOJ has a program under the APEC, which is a regional group of countries." Response by Japan [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)6], at p. 1.
- 55 Response by Italy [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)5], at pp. 2-3.
- 56 Response by Mexico [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)7], at p. 4.
- 57 Response by UNCTAD [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)13], at p. 6.
- 58 See Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at pp. 6-7.
- 59 See Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 8.
- 60 See Response by the Czech Republic [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)3], at pp. 2-3.
- 61 See Response by Denmark [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)4], at p. 1.
- 62 See Response by Italy [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)5], at pp. 2-3.
- 63 See Response by Japan [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)6], at p. 1.
- 64 See Response by Norway [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)14], at p. 2.
- 65 Response by the Czech Republic [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)3], at pp. 2-3.
- 66 Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at pp. 7-8.
- 67 Response by Denmark [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)4], at p. 1.
- 68 Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at pp. 7-8.
- 69 Response by UNCTAD [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)13], at p. 6.
- 70 Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at pp. 6-7.

- 71 Ibid., at pp. 6-7.
- 72 Ibid., at pp. 6-7.
- 73 Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at pp. 7-8.
- 74 Ibid., at pp. 7-8.
- 75 Ibid., at p. 3.
- 76 Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at pp. 6-7.
- 77 Response by Finland [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)10], at p. 6.
- 78 Response by the Czech Republic [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)3], at pp. 2-3.
- 79 Ibid., at pp. 2-3.
- 80 See Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 3.
- 81 Ibid., at pp. 8-9.
- 82 Ibid., at p. 3.
- 83 Ibid., at pp. 8-9.
- 84 Communication from the European Community and Its Member States to the WTO Working Group on the Interaction between Trade and Competition Policy [WT/WGTCP/W/140], 8 June 2000, at p. 11.
- 85 Ibid., at pp. 11-12.
- 86 Response by UNCTAD [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)13], at p. 6.
- 87 Response by the Czech Republic [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)3], at pp. 2-3.
- 88 Response by Denmark [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)4], at p. 1.
- 89 Response by Australia [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)1], at pp. 6-7.
- 90 Response by UNCTAD [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)13], at p. 6.
- 91 Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 9.
- 92 Draft Report of the Fourth United Nations Conference to Review All Aspects of the Set of Multilaterally Agreed Equitable Principles and Rules for the Control of Restrictive Business Practices, Agenda Item 6, TD/RBP/CONF.5/L.1/Add.2, at p. 2.
- 93 "Mexico is providing training to competition officials of some Latin American countries; specifically to our main commercial partners in the Central America area." Response by Mexico [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)7], at p. 2.

94 "During 1999 and 2000 most (eight out of 17) of the technical assistance activities undertaken by Mexico were directed to Latin American and Caribbean countries, by means of the participation of Mexican officials as experts in seminars and through the provision of internships. Seminars included case study seminars and those dealing with competition issues arising in specific sectors. Internships were provided to competition officials from Costa Rica, Panama and Peru." Response by Mexico [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)7], at p. 1. See also response by Italy [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)5] and Response by Finland [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)10], at p. 4.

95 See Response by the Czech Republic [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)3], at p. 1., Response by Finland [[DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)10], and Response by Poland, e-mail by Ewa Soliwoda of January 19, 2001.

96 See Response by Turkey [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)15].

97 Response by Canada [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)2], at p. 1.

98 Beyond the extensive technical assistance activities of ACCC in the field of competition law and policy, AusAID also funds a broader program of technical cooperation and policy dialogue with developing countries aimed at strengthening their capacity to participate in global and regional trading arrangements and take advantage of new trade opportunities. Trade-related development assistance projects (including projects relating to competition law and policy development) worth around A\$100 million are currently underway, with about A\$20 million estimated to have been spent in 1999-2000.

99 Response by Japan, p. 1.

100 Response by Norway [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)14], at p. 1.

101 Ibid., at p. 2.

102 See Response by Poland, e-mail by Ewa Soliwoda of January 19, 2001.

103 See International Competition Policy Advisory Committee (ICPAC) Final Report to the Attorney General and Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust, 2000 ([www.usdoj.gov/atr/icpac/finalreport.htm](http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/icpac/finalreport.htm)), Annex 6-A.

104 Response by the United States, p. 2.

105 Response by UNCTAD [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)13], at p. 3.

106 Ibid., at p. 4.

107 Response by the Czech Republic [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)3], at p. 2.

108 Denmark explicitly states that "there are no likely change of policy or priorities for the year 2001." Response by Denmark [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)4], at p. 1.

109 Response by Finland [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)10], at p.3.

110 Response by Mexico [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)7], at p. 1.

- <sup>111</sup> Response by Norway [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)14], at p. 1.
- <sup>112</sup> See Response by the European Commission [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)12], at p. 3.
- <sup>113</sup> See *ibid.*, at p. 3.
- <sup>114</sup> Response by Switzerland [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)11], at p. 1.
- <sup>115</sup> Response by the United States [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)9], at p. 1.
- <sup>116</sup> Response by the UNCTAD [DAFFE/CLP/WP3/WD(2001)13], at p. 3.