



In our paper, we tried to be more conclusive. Based on our experience, there are a lot of economic factors that we've been addressing – labor, investment, IP.

The idea behind this is to place the factors of this relationship in a definitive manner. Our approach is simply more comprehensive; saying "FTA" alone ignores the fact of our past relationship.

Regarding the transitional period, you require the Interim Agreement to persist in full.

TV: But is chaos what you want?

MM: Of course not. For example, why should I not be able to import from Saudi Arabia? I'm prevented from doing that now. Not everything in the Paris Protocol is dependent on the existence of borders.

I would say I'm not going to change my tariffs during the Interim Period. Why shouldn't I, upon agreement between two sovereign entities, be able to make all other decisions?

With regard to border crossings, you still haven't given us what we agree to in Paris!

ABB: Keeping interim arrangements is most practical. Signing new agreements would be time-consuming.

TV: In the transitional period, how does Maher's importation of tiles from Saudi Arabia affect you adversely?

TN: If the PA wants to add to the lists, it can.

JW: The question Toni asks is whether it's possible to introduce changes to the agreements that don't affect you adversely.

[Additional discussion, not transcribed.]

MM: What we want is for our people to feel that things are improving on the ground. That is essential.