PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR 2001-2002,
PRIORITIES AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION SYSTEM

-- Addendum: Results of Priority Votes --

This document contains a revision of the overview of the results of the prioritisation of the CLP Committee activities. It is circulated to delegates FOR INFORMATION.
OVERVIEW OF THE RESULTS OF THE PRIORITISATION OF
THE CLP COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Introduction

1. Delegations have been requested to indicate to the Secretariat the CLP priorities for 2001-2002 [see DAFFE/CLP(2000)10]. As of 21 June, responses were received from 28 delegations: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States and the European Commission. Detailed results by country are appended to the present note as Annex 1 (Priority Votes per country), and Annex 2 (Comments made by Delegations). A first version of this note has been considered at the last meeting of the CLP Committee (5 and 6 June 2000). The summary of the discussion is circulated separately as a confidential annex to the summary record of the meeting.

2. Countries’ priorities have been assembled and weighted in order to show differences clearly (high priority: 10 points; medium priority: 5 points; low priority: 1 point). Points obtained in each category have been divided by the number of votes, the global result being a weighted average per activity as shown in Table 1.

3. Graph 1 shows the weighted averages in a decreasing order of priority, the top priority being for best practices in competition policy (the CLP Roundtables). Liaison with OECD Structural Reviews (the EDRC reviews) has the lowest priority.

4. CLP Delegates, like delegates to all other OECD committees, have been asked how they would respond to a small percentage increase or decrease in total resources (the “plus or minus 3%” exercise). The results of this exercise are set forth in Table 2 (reductions) and Table 3 (increases). Delegates’ preferences to these hypothetical changes in total resources need not correspond to the overall priority order; Delegates could, for example, recommend reducing resources for a high priority activity if they felt it were overfunded. Not all countries participated in this part of the exercise.

General observations

5. The tabulation of Delegates’ priorities revealed the following:

- Three activities were ranked most highly: identifying best practices in competition policy, combating hard core cartels, and the in-depth peer review of national competition law and policy done under the regulatory reform project.
- Four activities also had strong rankings: law enforcement co-operation, merger review, best practices in sector regulation, and the regulatory reform review of national sector regulatory policy.
- Four activities were grouped as medium priorities: dissemination of CLP advice, trade and competition, best practices in crosscutting regulatory principles and reports in national competition policy developments.
- Finally, two “horizontal” activities were clearly lower priority than the rest: these are activities by the Secretariat working with other parts of the Organisation: liaison with sector specific committees and liaison with the EDRC country reviews.
• From the above, one sees a strong preference for activities in the CLP and its working parties. Horizontal work by the Committee with other committees is given lower priority. Horizontal work by the CLP Secretariat with other parts of the Organisation is given still lower priority.

• Resource issues stand out. The second, fourth and fifth-highest priority activities of the Committee, including the high-profile work on hard core cartels, have been significantly understaffed, and additional resources need to be found for that work. Yet resource shifts within the Secretariat could only come at the expense of other high priority CLP activities, as the Secretariat does not feel free to abandon other work in support of the overall mission of the Organisation as a whole. This tension between the priorities of the Committee and the resources required for horizontal work will be presented to the Council.

Hypothetical Changes in Resource Levels

6. If additional resources were available, Delegates’ would generally apply them to the activities of Working Party No. 3. The three activities of that working party (law enforcement co-operation, hard core cartels and merger review) appear among the top four activities that would receive additional resources if they were to become available. The activity on best practices in competition policy was also favoured for additional resources. Of course, the hypothetical increase of 3 percent of the total CLP Division budget yields only 183,000 FRF, considerably less than what would be needed per year to provide a staff person for WP3 (approximately 800,000 FRF).

7. Concerning new activities to be financed if additional resources were to become available, Korea would like to see a roundtable on e-commerce (the CLP will in fact hold such a roundtable in October 2000). A more general comment came from Australia under this item, suggesting that the human resource capacity of the OECD Secretariat should be increased.

8. If resources were reduced by 183,000 FRF, Delegates would generally cut the two activities that were lowest ranked in the priority exercise: liaison with sector specific committees and liaison with the EDRC country reviews.

9. One activity, the regulatory reform reviews of national sector regulatory policies, showed a split of opinion among delegates. Eight countries would cut resources for this activity but seven countries would increase its resources.

Voluntary Contributions in 2001-2002

10. Table 3 in the questionnaire requested indications of interest in providing voluntary contributions of resources in 2001-2002, it being understood that such indications would be considered preliminary only. The Secretariat was encouraged to see that several countries are willing to consider such contributions:

• Canada will continue to assist in the preparation of WP3 meetings and may do research or prepare one or more notes for the CLP and its working parties.
• The Czech Republic offers the possibility that one of its employees will participate in the preparation of Committee documents.
• Hungary might second a staff person under a co-financing arrangement.
• The Netherlands will consider a cash contribution
• Poland might provide additional staff under an internship arrangement.
• Portugal might make a cash contribution
• The United States might make staff available to help on a particular project.

11. The above expressions of interest are very much appreciated. The Secretariat has begun to follow up with these countries to see what concrete arrangements can be made.

Concluding the Exercise

12. The results of prioritisation exercise will be sent to the Council for their information and possible action.
## TABLE 1: POW 2001-2002 - RESULTS OF THE DELEGATIONS’ PRIORITIES VOTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Priority Votes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Planned Resources (FF)</th>
<th>No. of “High” votes</th>
<th>No. of “Medium” votes</th>
<th>No. of “Low” votes</th>
<th>Total No. of votes</th>
<th>Weighted Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Best Practices in Competition Policy</td>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>864K</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5. Combating Hard Core Cartels</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>165K</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2. Regulatory Reform Review of National Competition Laws and Policies</td>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>698K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4. Improving International Law Enforcement Co-operation</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>131K</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6. Enhancing Efficient Review of International Mergers</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>131K</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8. Best Practices in Sector Regulation</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>441K</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3. Regulatory Reform Review of National Sector Regulatory Policies</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>1118K</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11. Dissemination of CLP Advice</td>
<td>Sect.</td>
<td>544K</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7. Increasing the Coherence of Trade and Competition Policies</td>
<td>Joint Group</td>
<td>720K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10. Reports on National Competition Policy Developments</td>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>131K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12. Liaison with Sector-Specific OECD Committees</td>
<td>Sect.</td>
<td>222K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13. Liaison with OECD Structural Reviews (EDRC)</td>
<td>Sect.</td>
<td>189K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRAPH 1.: WEIGHTED AVERAGES (in decreasing order of priority)

1. Best Practices in Competition Policy ......................................................... 9.3
2. Regulatory Reform Review of National Competition Laws and Policies ....... 8.7
3. Regulatory Reform Review of National Sector Regulatory Policies .............. 6.6
4. Improving International Law Enforcement Co-operation ......................... 7.5
5. Combating Hard Core Cartels ................................................................. 9.0
6. Enhancing Efficient Review of International Mergers ............................ 7.5
8. Best Practices in Sector Regulation ........................................................ 6.9
10. Reports on National Competition Policy Developments ..................... 4.5
11. Dissemination of CLP Advice ............................................................... 5.1
12. Liaison with Sector-Specific OECD Committees .................................... 3.4
13. Liaison with OECD Structural Reviews (EDRC) ..................................... 3.1
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Comments: i) In case of non specified order, the order chosen by the country has been followed in this table; ii) these results should be read in conjunction with detailed comments by countries in Annex 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>As a first increase</th>
<th>Voting Countries</th>
<th>As a second increase</th>
<th>Voting Countries</th>
<th>As a third increase</th>
<th>Voting Countries</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Combating Hard Case Cartels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greece, Netherlands, Spain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Korea, Mexico, United States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ireland, European Commission</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Best Practices in Competition Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Ireland, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Germany, Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improving International Law Enforcement Cooperation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Belgium, Canada, Germany, Mexico, Poland, United States, European Commission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Netherlands, Norway</td>
<td>2 Japan, Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enhancing Efficient Review of International Mergers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spain, European Commission</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Canada, Czech Republic, Finland, Korea, Mexico, United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Regulatory Reform Review of National Sector Regulatory Policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Finland, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand</td>
<td>2 Germany, Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regulatory Reform Review of National Competition Laws and Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Finland, Hungary, Portugal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Liaison with OECD Structural Reviews (EDRC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Increasing the Coherence of Trade and Competition Policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Best Practices in Sector Regulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Best Practices in Cross-Cutting Regulatory Principles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dissemination of CLP Advice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reports on National Competition Policy Developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Liaison with Sector-Specific OECD Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: i) In case of non specified order, the order chosen by the country has been followed in this table; ii) these results should be read in conjunction with detailed comments by countries in Annex 2.
ANNEX 1: PRIORITY VOTES PER COUNTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL         | 25 | 4 | 22 | 6 | 11 | 16 | 2 | 16 | 11 | 23 | 6 | 11 | 16 |

- Best Practices in Competition Policy
- Regulatory Reform Review of National Competition Laws and Policies
- Regulatory Reform Review of National Sectoral Regulatory Policies
- Improving International Law Enforcement Co-operation
- Combating Hard Core Cartels
- Enhancing Efficient Review of International Merger
- Increasing the Coherence of Trade and Competition Policies
- Best Practices in Sector Regulation
- Best Practices in Cross-Cutting Regulatory Principles
- Reports on National Competition Policy Developments
- Examination of CLP Advice
- Liaisons with Sector Specific OECD Committees
- Liaisons with OECD Structural Reviews (ESRC)
ANNEX 2

DELEGATIONS’ COMMENTS ON CLP PROGRAMME PRIORITIES FOR 2001-2002

SCENARIO 1: If the budget were cut by 3%, which activities would you propose to reduce or eliminate in order to save FRF 183,000? Please list.

Australia
Activity No. 3: Still important, but a lower priority

Belgium
Activities No. 2 and 3: To reduce from four to two countries per year

Canada
Activity No. 8

Czech Republic
Activities No. 9, 12 and 13

Denmark
Activities No. 10 and 7 [in this order]

Finland
Activities No. 7 and 10

France
Activities No. 3 and 9

Germany
Activities No. 13, 12 and 10

Greece
Activities No. 6 and 9
Hungary

Activity No. 3: Although this activity also forms a priority for us on medium level, our point is that it is easier to cut an activity having relatively larger budget than another one having lower budget.

Ireland

Activities No. 12, 13 and 7

Italy

Activity No. 13

Japan

Activities No. 8 and 13

Korea

Activities No. 3, 4 [Survey of member’s assistance to non-Members] and 10 [Review of recent developments in x countries]

Mexico

Activity No. 10: The aim of this activity is best accomplished through activity No. 2
Activity No. 13: Competition policy aspects are usually insufficiently addressed

Netherlands

Activity No. 7: WTO is not going to move forward
Activity No. 10: Diminish number, rate
Activity No. 12: No sector-specific model agreements

New Zealand

Activities No. 12, 13 and 10 [in this order]

Norway

Activities No. 6 and 10

Poland

Activities No. 12 and 13: We feel that 3% reduction in the budget would not affect the possibilities to accomplish the tasks deriving from the above activities

Portugal

Activity No. 5 [This activity has been recently discussed]
Activities No. 12 and 13 [Priority to be given to competition specific issues]
Spain
Activities No. 3, 12 and 13

Switzerland
Activities No. 3 and 9 [No. 9 could be dealt with under activity No. 8]

Turkey
Activities No. 13, 12 and 7

United States
Activities No. 3, 7 and 11 [in this order]

European Commission
Activities No. 9, 12 and 13 [reduce each by approximately 30%]

SCENARIO 2: If the Committee were given a 3% increase (FRF 183,000) in resources, how would you propose to spend this amount

B. To put more resources into existing activities

Australia
Activity No. 13 [liaison within OECD]

Belgium
Activities No. 4 and 5

Canada
Activities No. 4, 5 and 6

Czech Republic
Activities No. 1, 5 and 6

Denmark
Activities No. 1 and 5

Finland
Activities No. 2, 3 and 6
France
Activities No. 1 and 5

Germany
Activities No. 4, 1 and 3

Greece
Activities No. 5, 1 and 2

Hungary
Activity No. 2

Ireland
Activities No. 1, 3 and 5

Italy
Activity No. 12 [Improve co-ordination with other OECD sectoral Committees]

Japan
Activities No. 1, 3 and 4

Korea
Activities No. 1, 5 [leniency program] and 6 [exchange of views on handling international mergers; Secretariat issues note and summary]

Mexico
Activities No. 4, 5 and 6

Netherlands
Activity No. 5: Optimal design of leniency programs
Activity No. 4: Confidentiality protection
Activity No. 9: Vertical separation/Integration

New Zealand
Activities No. 1, 3 and 7

Norway
Activities No. 1 and 4
Poland
Activity No. 4

Portugal
Activities No. 2, 3 and 4 [These activities are important to promote the reinforcement of the competition law’s application]

Spain
Activities No. 5, 6 and 11

Switzerland
Activity No. 1 [Identification of “Best practices” to fight against cartels and abuses of dominant position as well as for merger control]

Turkey
Activities No. 3, 8 and 4

United States
Activities No. 4, 5 and 6

European Commission
Activities No. 4, 6 and 5 [in this order; increase by 61,000 FRF each]

C. To finance new activities

Australia
Increase human resource capacity of the OECD staff Secretariat

Korea
Activity No. 8: Roundtable on E-Commerce

Switzerland
Activities No. 1 and 5 [Organisation of workshops]
United Kingdom

We have no specific suggestions in response to this question. Funds might be re-allocated in accordance with the priority order proposed by the United Kingdom in response to Question 1.

D. Voluntary Contributions

Canada

No cash contribution or secondee. With the Commissioner chair of WP3, we support the Secretariat by active involvement in its preparatory efforts for meetings. We will also consider conducting research, producing a paper or papers (e.g. a “Secretariat Note”) and otherwise contributing to the work of the CLP and its Working Parties electronically from Ottawa.

Czech Republic

We are offering a possibility of using one of our employees who could electronically participate at the preparation of Committee documents especially via electronic mail.

Hungary

One secondee, if a co-financing construction is possible

Korea

Activity No. 8: Roundtable on E-Commerce

Netherlands

Willingness to discuss regarding our priorities [Hard core cartels, International law enforcement, Regulatory principles]

Poland

Possibility of providing additional staff for internship

Portugal

In spite of the limited resources, Portugal would be very pleased to provide an extra-budgetary contribution to the CLP’s work in 2001.

United States

No cash, but the United States will consider, on a case-by-case basis, providing a “secondee” to work with the OECD Secretariat on a particular project or technical assistance venture, where CLP needs and U.S. agency personnel qualifications coincide and secondee can be spared.
Other Comments

Japan

Activity No. 1: Avoid duplication of work with other international organisations or institutions.