1.1. Members will recall that the Special Session of the Committee on Trade and Development (Special Session) had received a submission from the G90 in September 2015 (JOB/DEV/29-JOB/TNC/51), containing textual proposals on 25 special and differential treatment (S&D) provisions.

1.2. Since then the Special Session has carried out intensive work on these proposals in both formal and informal meetings. More recently, the discussions have been taken forward in small group meetings where text-based negotiations have been taking place on some of the proposals.

1.3. These consultations have contributed to a better understanding of the underlying concerns flagged in the proposals and have led to text-based discussions on certain aspects of some proposals. The continued hard work put into this exercise by the proponents who have, at various stages of the process, submitted revised versions of some of the proposals is acknowledged. The commitment and constructive engagement adopted by other Members is also laudable.

1.4. The G90 recently tabled a list of 16 revised proposals that they would like to see as potential deliverables at Nairobi. This has been circulated as document (WT/MIN(15)/W/31). Some of these proposals are ones on which the text-based negotiations have advanced, although a lot more work is still required; on others gaps still remain.

1.5. This in my view is a commendable step forward. But we clearly still have to cover a lot of ground, if we are to bridge the remaining gaps. In particular there are three areas that we will have to collectively address to have tangible and concrete results at Nairobi.

1.6. One particular issue that we have been grappling with is the scope of the beneficiaries of the proposals. Some delegations feel that the flexibilities that are being sought can at best be provided to only the LDCs. Some other delegations feel that since the basic premise of S&D proposals is that they are applicable to all developing countries, any outcome on the tabled proposals, unless they are LDC-specific proposals, should not be limited to LDCs or any other category of developing countries. If progress is to be made, then this is an issue on which some common understanding would have to be reached.

1.7. Another generic issue that we have not been able to close is the perception of what is doable against the view of what is important. From the various meetings it is clear that there are some proposals that are very important to the G90. But it has also been made equally clear by some others that in their present form many of these proposals are not doable.

1.8. Some questions have also been raised on the future course of action with proposals that may not be harvested at Nairobi. What is to be done with them? I would like to encourage Members to find a mutually acceptable way forward on continuing consideration of the remaining S&D proposals, so that this too can be suitably reflected in the text.
1.9. In order to be able to find common ground, all delegations should therefore start seriously thinking of creative solutions that minimise concerns and find alternative ways of solving the problems highlighted in the proposals. Members will need to continue their efforts with an open mind and a sense of flexibility and accommodation that has been the hallmark of our work so far.

1.10. I envisage that from now on and in Nairobi the focus of our work will be on these 16 proposals that have been included in the most recent G90 submission.

1.11. I intend to continue meeting in a small group format, up to, and including Tuesday 8 December, with the aim of further fine tuning text and endeavouring to finalize a potential package for Nairobi. I remain committed to put in every effort to realize tangible results for Nairobi in this important area of our work.