



**Asia-Pacific
Economic Cooperation**

2014/SOM1/CPLG/002

Agenda Item: 2

Summary Report of Competition Policy and Law Group Meeting 2013

Purpose: Information
Submitted by: CPLG Convenor



**Competition Policy and Law Group Meeting
Ningbo, China
21-22 February 2014**

APEC COMPETITION POLICY AND LAW GROUP MEETING FOR 2013
3-4 February, 2013

Jakarta, Indonesia

CONVENOR'S SUMMARY REPORT

The Competition Policy and Law Group (CPLG) held its meeting for 2013 on 3-4 February 2013 in Jakarta, Indonesia. The meeting was chaired by Mr Hu, Tzu-Shun of Chinese Taipei, and attended by Australia; Brunei Darussalam; Canada; Chile; the People's Republic of China;; Indonesia; Japan; Malaysia; Mexico; New Zealand; Papua New Guinea; the Philippines; the Russian Federation; Singapore; Chinese Taipei; Thailand; the United States of America; and Viet Nam.

The Chair's Assistant to the Economic Committee (EC) attended part of the meeting. The OECD also attended the meeting as a guest.

1. Convener's Opening Remarks

The CPLG Convener opened the meeting by welcoming the CPLG members to the meeting. The Convener expressed his appreciation to the CPLG members for electing him as the CPLG Convener, and Indonesia and the APEC Secretariat for their support to the meeting. The Convener also extended gratitude to the former Convener, Mr Yukinari Sugiyama, and Japan for their great contribution to the CPLG for the last seven years.

CPLG Convener noted that Indonesia was the birth place of Bogor Goals and highlighted that the Bogor Goal particularly emphasized the importance of cooperation. Noting that the CPLG would have a roundtable discussion on international enforcement cooperation in the afternoon, the Convener stressed the need for cooperation on competition among CPLG members as well as with the Economic Committee (EC) and other APEC fora.

2. Adoption of Agenda

The draft agenda for the meeting (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/001) was adopted.

3. Progress Reports on CPLG Projects in 2012

a. Project on *Survey on Information Exchange on Competition in APEC Region and Measures of Competition Development in APEC*

Russia reported on the outcomes of the CPLG project, *Survey on Information Exchange on Competition in APEC Region* (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/003). The objective of the project was to raise APEC economies' awareness of possibilities, rules and procedures of obtaining information that might be required for their antitrust enforcement actions, merger reviews and promotion of competition policies from other competitive authorities in APEC economies. Russia presented its finding based on answers provided by 14 APEC economies and desk research on information exchange rules and means in other APEC economies. The obstacles to information exchange, identified by Russia, included: economy's confidentiality and legal protection of information rules, difference in legal systems, lack of awareness of possibilities of information sharing and concerns about the use of information. Russia suggested areas for improvement both at agency level and bilateral level, including: i) at agency level, developing and upgrading internal procedures of information exchange, making these procedures transparent to other APEC competition authorities, and improving the agency procedures for safeguarding confidentiality of information; and ii) at bilateral level, streamlining the process for information exchange related to investigations and merger reviews and including information exchange mechanism in agency-to-agency and economy-to-economy agreements.

CPLG Convenor noted the importance of information change and encouraged members to consider how to cope with those obstacles to information exchange, identified by Russia.

b. Project on *Measures of Competition Development in APEC*

Russia reported on the outcomes of the CPLG project on *Measures of Competition Development in APEC* (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/042). The objective of the project was to gather the information on and identify and survey the most effective measures of competition development. The project focused on sharing experiences in the following key measures of competition development: i) institutional measures; ii) measures on competition advocacy; and iii) measures on market participants' access to infrastructure. The workshop was held in Vladivostok, Russia in September 2012, attended by 37 participants from 13 APEC economies. The conclusions that Russia noted from the workshop included: i) effective measures often involved the combination of multiple mechanisms; ii) individual economies could determine the most effective measures, as such measures should be tailored to economies' specific circumstances; iii) monitoring and streamlining the measures would be very important; and iv) streamlining the implementation of regional authorities' measures would be important for the effectiveness of the mechanism.

CPLG Convenor expressed his appreciation to Russia for undertaking the project and reminded members that the final report of the project was available at the APEC Publication website.

c. APEC Competition Policy and Law Database

Chinese Taipei reported on progress of the APEC Competition Policy and Law Database, which Chinese Taipei set up and maintained (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/004). Since its last report, Chinese Taipei noted that the database had received positive responses and acceptance by international community, with increased number of visitors to the database captured. Chinese Taipei noted that Australia, Singapore, Chinese Taipei and Viet Nam provided updated documents and information since its last report.

Emphasising the importance of ensuring that data was regularly updated, Chinese Taipei urged members to periodically update the information in the database. Members were also requested to retrieve information and publicise it to private sectors, scholars and other interested parties.

Chinese Taipei indicated its intention to redesign the website in the near future after conducting a survey to collect feedback from member economies and to assess ways to improve and enhance the function of the database.

CPLG Convenor expressed gratitude to Chinese Taipei on its efforts made to establish and maintain the database as well as consideration to redesign the website. He called on members to contribute to the database as much as possible by updating the relevant information by each economy and also providing feedbacks to Chinese Taipei to improve the website.

4. New Projects for 2013

a. APEC Priorities for 2013

Indonesia outlined the three priorities for 2013 under the overarching theme of "Resilient Asia-Pacific, Engine of Global Growth": i) attaining the Bogor Goals; ii) achieving sustainable growth with equity; and iii) promoting connectivity. The first priority of attaining the Bogor Goals would be pursued through three strategies, namely: i) support for the multilateral trading system; ii) enhancing regional economic integration; and iii) intensifying development cooperation which would be delivered through capacity building, especially on structural reform. The second priority of achieving sustainable growth with equity would have four focus areas: SMEs competitiveness, food security, financial inclusion and health. The work on the third priority of promoting connectivity would build on three pillars: i) physical connectivity, including infrastructure development and investment; ii) institutional connectivity; and iii) people to people connectivity, including travel facilitation initiative, emergency preparedness, and cross-border education services.

Indonesia noted the work of CPLG in promoting cooperation and capacity building on competition law and policy would contribute to supporting overall APEC objectives and priorities in 2013.

b. Project Approval Process for 2013

The APEC Secretariat Program Director (Ms Yoo Myung-hee) outlined the 2013 project approval process (document no. 2013/SOM1/CPLG/036), including the overview of projects funded in 2012, estimates of available funds in 2013, submission deadlines, detailed approval process and 2013 funding criteria. The APEC Secretariat informed that the CPLG had received one concept note in Session 1 2013 and that the EC would have to rank and prioritize the CPLG concept note, together with three EC concept notes submitted to Session 1 2013. Regarding the approval process, the APEC Secretariat highlighted the importance of ranking, as Rank 2 projects might not get approved due to limited availability of project funds. The APEC Secretariat urged project proponents to show a clear link to an upper rank to improve the chance of approval and also to make sure their economies would participate in the ranking and prioritization.

c. CPLG Work Plan and Collective Action Plan in 2013

CPLG Convenor presented the 2013 CPLG Work Plan (document no. 2013/SOM1/CPLG/007). The Work Plan covered four main activities: i) APEC Training Course on Competition Policy in 2013, to be held in Chinese Taipei in October 2013, with a focus on investigative techniques and effective remedies and settlements; ii) the Competition Policy and Law Database; iii) members' report/presentation on updates and development of competition policy; and iv) review of the CPLG Terms of Reference. In particular, recalling that the CPLG project had not been approved in 2012, CPLG Convenor encouraged members to actively participate and contribute in the project approval process.

CPLG Convenor also briefed the meeting on the Collective Action Plan in 2013, which included: i) to deepen dialogue between economies and relevant international organization; and ii) to encourage cooperation among the competition authorities of APEC economies.

d. APEC Training Course on Competition Policy in 2013

Chinese Taipei briefed members on the proposal of 2013 competition policy training course, co-proposed by Chinese Taipei and Japan (document no. 2013/SOM1/CPLG/008). The three-day training would take place in Chinese Taipei in October, with a focus on investigative techniques for anti-competitive practices and effective remedies and settlement. Chinese Taipei informed that it had already circulated the concept note of the proposal but would modify the cover page to show a strong link to the 2013 funding category and circulate the revised concept note to members for comments and endorsement. Chinese Taipei sought members' strong support for and active participation in the project.

Japan recalled that the 2012 training course proposal had not been approved by the BMC and expressed hope that the 2013 training course would be approved and implemented smoothly. Emphasizing that the competition policy training courses would be particularly helpful for the newly established and younger competition authorities to build capacity, Japan sought members' continued support as well as their cooperation with their respective economies' EC and BMC members for the approval of the project.

Expressing its support for the project, New Zealand stressed that the concept note should show a direct alignment with, and support for Rank 1 category, including trade and investment liberalization and facilitation, so that BMC members could understand the importance of the project.

Papua New Guinea expressed its support for the project and indicated its intention to participate in the project.

CPLG Convenor concluded the discussion by noting that Chinese Taipei would circulate a revised concept note and also seeking members' strong support for the concept note.

e. Any Other Projects

No other new project was proposed.

5. Terms of Reference of Competition Policy and Law Group

Japan briefed the meeting on the revised Terms of Reference (ToR) of the CPLG, which was drafted in close consultation with Chinese Taipei, the economy of the current Convenor (document no. 2013/SOM1/CPLG/008). Japan recognized the need for clear rules on the nomination process of the CPLG Convenor when the CPLG had to go through the election process in 2012 without such process provided in the ToR. Hence, the revised ToR would provide clear rules on the selection and terms of the Convenor and Vice-Convenor of the CPLG, among others. Japan noted that the revised ToR had been circulated to the CPLG members for comments and already reflected all the comments received from members.

CPLG Convenor noted that the revised ToR was endorsed by the CPLG and would be circulated to EC members via email for their endorsement.

6. Dialogue with the EC Chair and Coordinator of FotC on Competition Policy

Assistant to the EC Chair (Mr Raimonds Pavlovskis), on behalf of the EC Chair, outlined the key activities and priorities of the EC in 2013, including APEC New Strategy for Structural Reform (ANSSR), good regulatory practices (GRP), ease of doing business (EoDB) and APEC Economic Policy Report (AEPR). He noted that the EC was working on the ANSSR mid-term progress reporting, which would highlight members' achievement so far as well as challenges and areas for additional capacity building. With regard to GRP, a series of regulatory impact analysis (RIA) training for APEC developing economies were held during 2012, training 600 officials in 10 economies. In addition, the EC agreed that the GRP should be the focus on AEPR 2014, which would offer the opportunity to collaborate with other fora involved with GRP. Concerning EoDB, the EC discussed progress toward the EoDB target of 25 percent region-wide improvement by 2015. The EC members raised concerns over the methodology of the World Bank's EoDB ranking, which the EC Chair agreed to convey to the World Bank.

In regard to the CPLG-related work, Mr Pavlovskis noted that the EC members expressed concerns over the BMC's project approval process considering that the CPLG project had not been approved in 2012. He added that the APEC Secretariat PD informed the EC of detailed project approval process as well as the BMC's work plan to review the approval process in 2013. The EC Chair also undertook to convey the EC members' concerns to the BMC.

Australia, Coordinator of the EC FotC group on Competition Policy (CP) outlined the work plan of the FOTC on CP in EC (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/010). The work plan contained three components: i) assisting economies with the implementation of ANSSR plans with respect to competition policy; ii) policy discussion on competitive neutrality that took place at EC1 2013; and iii) a potential work to examine competition reform in key sectors such as infrastructure, energy and transportation, which could be pursued in close cooperation with the CPLG. She expressed hope to continue to work closely with the CPLG on competition matters.

CPLG Convenor suggested further discussing the competition reform in key sectors at the next CPLG meeting.

Australia, Coordinator of CP FotC, also briefed the meeting on the policy discussion on competitive neutrality that took place at EC1 2013. Australia explained the principle of competitive neutrality that state entities should not have competitive advantages over their competitors by virtue of government ownership. The objective of the policy discussion was to share members' experience in their implementation and development of competitive neutrality. The policy discussion consisted of presentation by the OECD on its recent report on competitive neutrality and presentations by three economies – Australia, Chinese Taipei and Viet Nam – on their competitive neutrality framework. It was noted that there was no single approach to address competitive neutrality but that each economy was adjusting its framework to suit the role of state enterprises and other policy objectives. In addition,

it was also noted that the generic concept of competitive neutrality, i.e., level playing field, was wide spread in APEC's other work including regulatory reform.

Russia noted that UNCTAD was also undertaking study on competitive neutrality. Russia raised the question whether competitive neutrality should be applied not only in regard to state enterprises but also in other public policies, such as public procurement.

7. Roundtable Discussion on International Enforcement Cooperation

CPLG Convenor opened the Roundtable discussion, noting that Bogor Goals particularly emphasized the importance of cooperation and that ICN and OECD also stressed the importance of cooperation on competition matters.

Session 1 of the Roundtable discussed international cooperation on competition enforcement from the International Competition Network (ICN) and OECD. Japan (Mr. Daisuke Takato, Japan Fair Trade Commission (JFTC)), on behalf of ICN Merger Working Group, briefed the meeting on the framework for merger review cooperation (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/013). Japan introduced the background and history of the International Cooperation Network Framework for Merger Review Cooperation. The establishment of such framework was proposed in the ICN Annual Conference in 2011 and the draft framework was endorsed in the ICN Annual Conference in 2012. Japan noted that the purpose of the framework was to facilitate effective and efficient cooperation between and among ICN member agencies. Japan added that the participation in the framework was open to all ICN member agencies responsible for reviewing mergers and that the framework was non-binding, not creating any legally binding rights or obligations. Japan noted that 51 member agencies joined the framework as of 3 February 2013.

Canada (Mr Mike Sullivan, Competition Bureau of Canada), on behalf of ICN Cartel Working Group, briefed the meeting on the work of ICN Cartel Working Group (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/012). The ICN was established in 2001 by 14 jurisdictions and grew into 125 member agencies from 111 jurisdictions currently. Canada outlined the work of the two subgroups of Cartel Working Group: i) Subgroup 1 on Legal Framework to address legal and conceptual challenges of anti-cartel enforcement, with a focus on examining policy-level issues of the institutional and investigative framework for the detection and punishment of hard-core cartel conduct; and ii) Subgroup 2 on Enforcement Techniques to improve the effectiveness of anti-cartel enforcement by identifying and sharing specific investigative technique. Canada elaborated on on-going and recent projects of the two subgroups as well as the ICN-OECD joint project on "Questionnaire on International Enforcement Cooperation."

The OECD (Mr. Antonio Capobianco, OECD Competition Division) briefed the meeting on the OECD perspective on international enforcement co-operation (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/011). He explained the reasons for international cooperation, including: the increase in the number of jurisdictions with competition law; globalization of the economy; internationalization of antitrust infringements; risk of divergent decisions; and needs to access information and evidence in other economies. He also elaborated on the OECD's work on the harmonization and convergence of competition policies undertaken through various roundtables, recommendations and capacity building activities. The OECD noted that the key issues and problems with international cooperation included: legal restrictions and absence of legal basis, constraints related to exchange of confidential information and limitations on admissibility and use of the information exchanged. Mr Capobianco briefed on the OECD international cooperation project launched in 2012, with a view to sharing experience on international cooperation among competition agencies. OECD and ICN were currently analysing the survey responses and would report the outcome of the survey in the coming weeks and discuss future directions for the project.

During the Q&A session, Russia noted that the international cooperation conducted so far had been reactive to certain violations or events, often triggered by leniency applications or cartel, but that it would be important for APEC to consider more proactive ways of cooperation. On this note, Russia suggested that it would be useful to conduct market study on certain sectors, such as transportation, where monopoly could hinder trade in the APEC region. The United States queried on the types of information that OECD/ICN joint survey was collecting. Taking note of the significant degree of informal cooperation compared to formal cooperation, Australia commented that formal cooperation

would be expanded over time as more and more economies were developing competition laws and authorities and that the work of OECD and ICN on this area would be important. Chinese Taipei asked how to encourage parties to provide a waiver to the competition authority.

In regard the OECD/ICN joint survey, the OECD responded that the questionnaire aimed to cover as many issues as possible, including legal basis for cooperation, regional cooperation, measurement of level of cooperation, problems and limitations in international cooperation, and solutions and improvement for those problems. Concerning the formal versus informal cooperation, the OECD agreed on Australia's comments and noted that its survey found a significant growth in the number of cases which involved international cooperation during the five years from 2007-2011. On waiver, Canada noted a growing tendency to be reluctant to give waivers in cartel area which would deal with illegal activities, while there was a strong incentive to allow a waiver in merger cases. Canada added that its competition authority was very transparent about its need to have waivers and provide additional credit for cooperation and positive incentives for parties to provide a waiver.

CPLG Convenor concluded the first session by expressing that the Convenor's Office would explore possible future work on competition reform in key sectors, as suggested by Russia.

Session 2 of the Roundtable focused on lessons learned from member economies. Australia briefed the meeting on its increasing international cooperation (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/041). In particular, Australia introduced the details of its formal cooperation through legislation, Section 155AAA of the Competition and Consumer Act (CCA) 2010. Section 155AAA was firstly intended to protect information given to the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCS) in confidence, but under certain circumstances it would allow the ACCS to provide information, including confidential information and documents, to other law enforcement bodies. Australia noted that Section 155AA was an effective unilateral way to overcome the obstacles of confidentiality, balancing rights of information provider and interests of anti-trust enforcement.

The United States presented on international enforcement cooperation in civil antitrust investigation (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/015), including benefits from agencies' cooperation, when information exchanges would matter, cooperation and confidentiality rules, waivers of confidentiality, how to cooperate, and the U.S. bilateral and multilateral instruments. The United States noted that, while some information must be kept confidential by law, such as information obtained from firms or third parties, merger filings and proposed remedies, a lot could be accomplished without sharing confidential information. The United States observed that effective cooperation happened every day, with and without a formal mechanism, and that cooperation did not take place only among developed countries but took place whenever common enforcement interests called for it.

The Philippines briefed the meeting on their experience in international enforcement cooperation (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/014). The Philippines' competition authority, Office for Competition (OFC), was established in June 2011. The Philippines international cooperation template MOU/MOA, which benchmarked that of OECD and ICN, consisted of three parts: technical assistance and information, case-specific procedural cooperation and substantive provisions relating to competition laws. The Philippines noted the usefulness of international cooperation in actual enforcement cases of cartels and mergers.

During the Q&A session, New Zealand updated the meeting on its law passed in October 2012, which would allow its Commerce Commission to share compulsorily acquired information with an overseas regulator if a co-operation agreement was in place between them. China asked whether there was international cooperation for enforcement of remedies. Japan queried how to persuade parties to give waiver in merger cases.

In response, the United States and Australia noted that there had been cooperation in coordinating or designing remedies but not often in enforcement of remedies. The United States added that cooperation for enforcement of remedies would require mutual legal and judicial assistance treaties, which would be broader than anti-trust cooperation mechanism. With respect to waiver, the United States and Australia noted that it would be prerogative of parties to decide whether to waive and that they would not seek to persuade parties on that matter. The United States reiterated its comments that a lot could be accomplished without sharing confidential information through waiver, including work products such as agency theories about harm, markets or remedies.

CPLG Convenor expressed appreciation to Australia, the Philippines and the United States for their valuable presentation. The Convenor noted that it was very useful to hear various perspectives on international cooperation from individual economies' competition agencies at different stages of development.

8. Members' Reports/ Presentations on Updates and Developments of Competition Policy

Economies updated the meeting on developments within their respective competition policy and legal frameworks. The presentations were made by Australia (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/16), Brunei Darussalam (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/017), Chile (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/019), China (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/020), Indonesia (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/022), Japan (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/023), Malaysia (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/025), Russia (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/031), Singapore (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/032), Chinese Taipei (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/033), Thailand (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/034) and the United States/FTC (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/035). The United States/DOJ submitted its presentation as meeting document (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/043). Updates were also provided by Canada, New Zealand, and Papua New Guinea. The presentations prompted a wide range of questions and good exchange of views among members on the different approaches that were taken by economies towards the enforcement of competition policy and law.

9. Members Dialogue on the Role of Competition Policy in Free Trade Agreement (FTA)

CPLG Convenor observed that an increasing number of economies had entered into bilateral FTAs in recent years and were also developing multilateral FTAs such as Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). The Convenor noted the importance of the competition chapter, which was included in most of the FTAs.

The Philippines, on behalf of the ASEAN Experts Group on Competition (AEGC), presented recent developments in competition policy and law (CPL) in ASEAN region (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/030), including CPL status in ASEAN members, challenges, way forward and direction. The way forward of AEGC included: proposals from midterm review of ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint to focus on capacity building and consider enforcement cooperation agreements; AEGC's key deliverables for 2013 such as updating of "Handbook on CPL in ASEAN for Business"; High Level Meeting on Competition; and the 3rd ASEAN Competition Conference to be held in Singapore in July 2013.

Canada briefed the meeting on its approach to competition policy in free trade negotiations (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/037). Canada considered it important to include general provisions on competition policy in its FTAs in order to ensure that the benefits of trade liberalization would not be offset by anticompetitive business conduct. Canada outlined the obligations that it sought to include in its FTA: to adopt and maintain measures to proscribe anticompetitive business conduct in the free trade areas; to discuss the effectiveness of those measures; to ensure that the measures would be consistent with the principles of transparency, non-discrimination and procedural fairness; and to exclude the competition policy provisions from all forms of dispute settlement under the FTA. Regarding FTA trends and issues, Canada noted the growing demand for competition related cooperation among FTA parties as well as increased focus on the complex role of state-owned enterprises.

The United States briefed the meeting on the role of competition policy in its free trade agreements, focusing on the "pure competition" provisions, not including designated monopolies or state enterprises (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/038). The United States provided detailed comparisons on the competition provisions in seven FTA which had a competition-related chapter. Most of them included provisions on: institutional/legal framework; cooperation in furtherance of competition law or competition law enforcement policy; entering into consultation; procedural requirements such as the right to a hearing and judicial review; and transparency.

During the Q&A session, Russia queried on the enforcement cooperation between the agencies of FTA parties. Canada responded that its cooperation agreement did not provide enforcement of foreign order while the judgment of Canadian court imposed on other jurisdiction could be possibly enforced through other ways such as Mutual Legal Assistant Treaty (MLAT) request.

10. Other Business

The APEC Secretariat Program Director (Ms Yoo Myung-hee) presented the APEC Secretariat report on APEC developments, which outlined 2013 APEC priorities and key developments in the committees and ministerial meetings as well as in the APEC Secretariat (document 2013/SOM1/CPLG/040).

The APEC Secretariat highlighted the outcome of recent BMC meeting held on 2 February 2013, where the BMC agreed to undertake to review and streamline the current project ranking and prioritization system. The APEC Secretariat expressed that CPLG members would be welcome to convey their suggestions on the APEC project approval process to their economies' BMC representatives or the APEC Secretariat.

11. Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting of the CPLG would take place back to back with the EC meeting on the margins of SOM1 in China in 2014.

12. Summary and Conclusion

The CPLG Convenor presented a summary of the meeting and made the following points:

- 2013 APEC Training Course on Competition Policy was endorsed by the CPLG and CPLG members were encouraged to cooperate with their EC colleagues so that the project could be approved by the BMC and successfully held in Chinese Taipei in 2013.
- Chinese Taipei would circulate a survey questionnaire on the APEC Competition Policy and Law Database in order to redesign the website and members were encouraged to provide their ideas to make the database more user-friendly and informative.
- The CPLG Terms of Reference (ToR) was endorsed by the CPLG and would be circulated to EC members for their endorsement.
- Members' report on updates and developments of competition policy was very useful and emphasized the importance of further cooperation among members.
- The roundtable discussion on international enforcement cooperation provided a valuable opportunity to learn the experience and best practices from international organizations and individual economies. Members were encouraged to consider best practices in international cooperation in the APEC region.
- Members' dialogue on the role of competition policy in FTA noted the important role that a competition chapter could play in FTAs and provided a momentum to consider how to best approach competition issues in FTAs.

CPLG Convenor thanked all participants and adjourned the meeting.
