



KAGISANO

CHE HIGHER EDUCATION DISCUSSION SERIES

THE GENERAL AGREEMENT on TRADE IN SERVICES and SOUTH AFRICAN
HIGHER EDUCATION:
WHAT SHOULD SOUTH AFRICA DO?

COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Kagisano Issue Number 3 (Autumn 2003)

Published by the Council on Higher Education
P.O Box 13354
The Tramshed
0126

ISSN 1681-5149

Website : <http://www.che.ac.za>

CONTENT

	PAGE
Preface	iii
Acknowledgement	v
Introduction <i>Saleem Badat</i>	1
Trade in Higher Education Services: The Implications of GATS <i>Jane Knight</i>	5
Discussant Piece to Jane Knight article <i>Pundy Pillay</i>	38
Address to the Portfolio Committee on Trade and Industry on the Implications of the General Agreement on Trade in Services on Higher Education (4 March 2003) <i>Minister of Education, Professor Kader Asmal</i>	47
Bibliography on GATS and higher education <i>Mymoona Adriaanse</i>	54



Published by the Council on Higher Education
Didacta Building, 211 Skinner Street, Pretoria
P.O. Box 13354, The Tramshed, 0126
[www. http://www.che.ac.za](http://www.che.ac.za)

CONTENTS

PAGE

Preface	iii
Acknowledgement	v
Introduction <i>Saleem Badat</i>	1
Trade in Higher Education Services: The Implications of GATS <i>Jane Knight</i>	5
Discussant Piece to Jane Knight article <i>Pundy Pillay</i>	38
Address to the Portfolio Committee on Trade and Industry on the Implications of the General Agreement on Trade in Services on Higher Education (4 March 2003) <i>Minister of Education, Professor Kader Asmal</i>	47
Bibliography on GATS and higher education <i>Mymoena Adriaanse</i>	54

PREFACE

The (South African) Council on Higher Education (CHE) is an independent, statutory body established by the Higher Education Act of 1997. Its responsibilities are diverse and include:

- Advising the Minister of Education on all matters related to higher education
- Producing an annual report for the South African parliament on the state of higher education
- Monitoring the achievement of policy goals and objectives
- Assuming responsibility for quality assurance in higher education through the accreditation of programmes and institutions, audits of the internal quality management systems of institutions and quality promotion and capacity building initiatives
- Convening an annual consultative conference of national stakeholders
- Contributing to the development of higher education through publications and conferences.

In accordance with the last-noted responsibility, and as one of its range of publications, the CHE has initiated *Kagisano* as a *Higher Education Discussion Series* to stimulate discussion and debate around important issues related to the development of higher education.

'Kagisano' is a Sotho/Tswana term, which means 'to build each other' or 'to collaborate'. We hope that this publication will serve as a mechanism for collaboration in building our knowledge base on and around higher education and each other intellectually.

The CHE will, when necessary, also establish national or regional *CHE Discussion Forums* to stimulate discussion and debate related to the themes of *Kagisano* and other higher education issues. To date, three *CHE Discussion Forums* have been held, all in Pretoria:

1. *Key Global and International Trends in Higher Education: Challenges for South Africa and Developing Countries* with Prof. Philip G. Altbach, Director, Centre For International Higher Education, Boston College, Massachusetts, United States
2. *Globalisation, National Development and Higher Education*, with Prof. Manuell Castells, Professor of Sociology, and Professor of City & Regional Planning, University of California at Berkeley.

3. *A Decade of Higher Education Reform in Argentina: What Balance*, with Dr Marcela Mollis, Director of the Research Programme on Comparative Higher Education at the Research Institute of Education at the School of Philosophy and Literature, at the University of Buenos Aires, Argentina

Readers are invited to comment on any aspect of ***Kagisano*** and forward these to: kagisano@che.ac.za

Unless otherwise indicated, the contents of ***Kagisano*** may be freely reproduced with acknowledgement of the source of the material.

The views contained in ***Kagisano*** are those of the authors/contributors alone and do not necessarily reflect those of the CHE.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The paper by Dr. Jane Knight was written for the *Observatory on Borderless Higher Education*, an international strategic information service for policy-makers and leaders in higher education.

It was first published in March 2002. Copyright for the paper is held with the *Observatory*.

Further information on the *Observatory* can be found at: www.obhe.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

Saleem Badat

Historically, international agreements between countries on higher education matters have been developed through bilateral agreements or through organisations like the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO).

Increasingly, there is a trend on the part of some highly developed countries to define higher education as a service like any other. Higher education is viewed as a major industry that could yield potentially good returns on private investments. In this context, higher education has become an issue for the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) and the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is becoming a forum for brokering agreements on higher education matters.

According to Knight,

some view GATS as a positive force, accelerating the influx of private and foreign providers of higher education into countries where domestic capacity is inadequate. Others take a more negative view, concerned that liberalisation may compromise important elements of quality assurance and permit private and foreign providers to monopolise the best students and most lucrative programmes. Many aspects of GATS are open to interpretation, and many nations have yet to fully engage in the process, at least in respect of the potential implications for education (Knight, J. *Trade in Higher Education Services: The Implications of GATS*, Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, March 2002).

Knight also notes that

who benefits is key and a very important (issue) to analyze. There are many stakeholders involved in the trade of educational services. As a result there are different agendas at play... As educators we immediately want to ask what are the benefits to the students, the scholars and the society at large. Private for-profit providers are clearly going to have different priorities, but this is the case whether they are domestic or foreign providers. The role of government, public institutions and private providers varies enormously from country to country. If trade is monitored and managed in a strategic manner, it may well help a country to better meet the national policy objectives and help with capacity issues. For instance, a country without the

capacity to train all of its medical personnel may choose to send their medical students to other countries for specialized education and training. In other countries, trade in higher educational services may pose major threats or risks to quality, access and national policy objectives and if this is the case that country needs to be extremely careful about the commitments it makes re trade in education services. Therefore, to say who benefits or who doesn't benefit is not straightforward. (T)here are important qualifications to consider before one can make general statements about who does or doesn't benefit from trade in education and at what cost! (*Observatory on Borderless Higher Education Online Discussion*, 14 April 2002).

It is vital that the key issues and challenges that GATS raises in relation to higher education and its possible implications, benefits and drawbacks for developing countries and for different stakeholders are analysed and debated so that informed and considered policy positions can be developed by governments and stakeholders.

In this context the Council on Higher Education (CHE) has commissioned an investigation to assist it to advise the Minister of Education on

- The formulation of a South African country position on GATS with respect to higher education, and
- Responding specifically to the claims that have been made on South Africa at the WTO by a small number of countries.

The specific aims of the investigation are to:

1. Identify the critical issues and key challenges of principle, strategy, policy and practice that GATS raises in relation to higher education and the implications it has for South African higher education policymakers, regulators (Ministry and the CHE as far as quality assurance is concerned) and providers (public and private higher education institutions)
2. Describe and analyse the claims being made in the context of GATS at the WTO by some countries on the South African government with respect to higher education
3. Advance approaches and strategies and possible policy options and recommendations with regard to 1 and 2 above.

The investigation is framed by the values and principles - equity and redress, quality, development, democratisation, academic freedom, institutional autonomy, effective-

ness and efficiency and public accountability - that inform higher education in South Africa. It is also informed by the various purposes and goals that have been defined for higher education in various policy documents, which include

- Promoting equity of access and fair chances of success to all who are seeking to realise their potential through higher education, while eradicating all forms of unfair discrimination and advancing redress for past inequalities
- Meeting, through well-planned and co-ordinated teaching, learning and research programmes, national development needs, including the high skilled employment needs presented by a growing economy operating in a global environment
- Supporting a democratic ethos and a culture of human rights by educational programmes and practices conducive to critical discourse and creative thinking, cultural tolerance, and a common commitment to a humane, non racist and non-sexist social order
- Contributing to the advancement of all forms of knowledge and scholarship, and in particular addressing the diverse problems and demands of the local, national southern African and African contexts, and uphold rigorous standards of academic quality.

At the same time, higher education is also required to contribute to the realization of the primary purposes of the *National Plan for Higher Education*, which are to ensure that

- The higher education system achieves the transformation objectives set out in the White Paper and is responsive to societal interests and needs
- There is coherence with regard to the provision of higher education at the national level
- Limited resources are used efficiently and effectively and there is accountability for the expenditure of public funds.
- The quality of academic programmes, including teaching and research, is improved across the system.

This issue of *Kagisano* comprises:

- A seminal article by Dr. Jane Knight on *Trade in Higher Education Services: The Implications of GATS*. Dr. Knight of the Ontario Institute for the Study of Education, University of Toronto, Canada, is the author of several studies on internationalization and higher education. Her publications include *Progress and Promise: The AUCC Report on Internationalization at Canadian Universities* (AUCC, 2000) and *Quality and Internationalisation in Higher Education* (IMHE/OECD, 1999). Currently, the focus of her research is the impact of globalization on higher education, with a special interest in trade liberalization, quality and governance.
- A discussion of the Knight article by Dr. Pundy Pillay, who has been commissioned by the CHE to undertake its investigation into GATS and its implications for South African higher education. Dr. Pillay is the Executive Director of the Sizanang Centre for Research and Development, which is a recently established not-for-profit policy research organisation.
- A recent address by the Minister of Education, Prof. Kader Asmal, to the Trade and Industry Portfolio Committee in Parliament, which sets out his initial thinking on the issue of GATS and higher education.
- A Bibliography on GATS and higher education especially commissioned from the Education Policy Unit at the University of Western Cape for this issue of *Kagisano* and produced by the EPU Assistant Librarian, Ms. Mymoena Adriaanse.

We hope that this third issue of *Kagisano* will be a stimulus to greater writing, discussion and debate around GATS and higher education, especially in developing countries and South Africa, and specifically in relation to its prospects for the reform and/or transformation of higher education and the erosion of unequal relation between developed and developing countries.

TRADE IN HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES: THE IMPLICATIONS OF GATS

Jane Knight

Abstract

Trade in higher education services is a billion dollar industry, including recruitment of international students, establishment of university campuses abroad, franchised provision and online learning. The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) is currently being negotiated under the auspices of the World Trade Organisation (WTO). GATS is designed to increase trade liberalisation internationally, and includes 'education' as a service sector. Examples of perceived 'barriers' in the trade in higher education services might include visa restrictions, taxation that disadvantages foreign institutions and accreditation arrangements that privilege domestic institutions and qualifications. Some view GATS as a positive force, accelerating the influx of private and foreign providers of higher education into countries where domestic capacity is inadequate. Other take a more negative view, concerned that liberalisation may compromise important elements of quality assurance and permit private and foreign providers to monopolise the best students and most lucrative programmes. Many aspects of GATS are open to interpretation, and many nations have yet to fully engage in the process, at least in respect of the potential implications for education. In this report, Dr Jane Knight of the University of Toronto, an expert in the internationalisation of higher education, sets out a clear overview of the GATS agenda, and considers a wide range of issues that may affect developing and developed countries.

INTRODUCTION

This report is about the impact of trade liberalization on higher education services. Particular emphasis is placed on the implications of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) on borderless or transnational education. The paper focuses more on the education policy implications emanating from the GATS, than on the actual trade issues. The primary audience is higher education institutions in the Commonwealth.

The purpose of the report is to focus attention on GATS and higher education. The liberalization of trade in education services is high on the agenda of trade negotiators but is only just appearing on the radar screen of higher education managers and policy makers. This report aims to

- to position trade in higher education services on the agenda of educators
- to provide information on the GATS and raise awareness about potential policy implications
- to stimulate debate and analysis of the risks and opportunities of increased trade in education services

There are definite limits to the scope and depth of analysis such a report can bring to the complex issue of trade in higher education services, especially given the diversity of countries in the Commonwealth. The objective for preparing such a report will be met if readers are stimulated to think about the potential positive and negative outcomes of increased trade in higher education services and enter informed debate on the policy implications for higher education.

CONTEXT

The demand for higher and adult education, especially professionally related courses and non-traditional delivery modes, is increasing in most countries. This is due to: the growth of the knowledge economy, movement to lifelong learning and changing demographics. While demand is growing, the capacity of the public sector to satisfy the demand is being challenged. This is due to budget limitations, the changing role of government, and increased emphasis on market economy and privatization.

At the same time, innovations in information and communication technologies are providing alternate and virtual ways to deliver higher education.¹ New types of providers such as corporate universities, for-profit institutions, media companies are emerging. This scenario is changing further by providers - public and private, new and traditional - delivering education services across national borders to meet the need in other countries.² Alternative types of cross border program delivery such as branch cam-

puses, franchise and twinning arrangements are being developed. As a result, an exciting but rather complex, picture of higher education provision is emerging. So what?

It is important to ask 'so what'. Many educators would point out that demand for higher education has been steadily increasing for years and that academic mobility for students, scholars, teachers and knowledge has been an integral aspect of higher education for centuries. This is true. But the picture is changing. Now, not only are more people moving; academic programs and providers are also moving across borders. Economic rationales are increasingly driving a large part of the international or cross border supply of education. This commercial or profit motive is a reality today, and applies to both private providers and in some cases public institutions. In short, the business side of borderless education is growing and is a target of the GATS. It is therefore important that educators are cognizant of the impact of trade liberalization on higher education and are taking steps to maximize the benefits and minimize the threats to a robust and quality higher education system.

TERMINOLOGY

Transnational³ and borderless education are terms that are being used to describe real or virtual movement of students, teachers, knowledge and academic programs from one country to another. While there may be some conceptual differences between these terms, they are often used interchangeably. For the purposes of this discussion, borderless⁴ education will be used in its broadest sense. The term cross border education is also used because in many cases it is necessary to capture the importance and relevance of geographic and jurisdictional borders.

The term internationalization refers to the process of integrating an international dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of higher education institutions⁵ Its use has been more closely linked to the academic value of international activities than to the economic motive. In fact, recently the term 'non-profit' internationalization' has been coined to distinguish international education from trade in education services. The liberalization of trade is interpreted to mean the removal of barriers to promote increased cross border movement of educational services. Finally, in this report higher education refers to post secondary degree, certificate and diploma level of education.

ABOUT THE REPORT

The report is intended for university managers, administrators and academics who want a shorthand version of what GATS is about and how it can affect higher education. The current debate on the impact of GATS is rather polarized. Critics focus on the

threat to the government role, 'public good' and quality aspects of higher education. Supporters highlight the benefits that more trade can bring in terms of innovation through new delivery systems and providers, greater student access and economic value. This report tries to take a balanced approach by identifying both the risks and opportunities that GATS can bring to the higher education sector. The emphasis is on policy issues and implications rather than the size of the market, trade issues per se or the legal and technical aspects of the agreement itself. All members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) are involved which means that 144 countries are covered by the GATS. Clearly countries are affected differently.

The report is divided into the following sections:

1.0 Overview of GATS:

This section gives a brief introduction to the structure, principles and purpose of GATS. As the GATS is legally and technically a complex agreement, readers are urged to refer to the web sites noted at the end of the report for more information on GATS itself.

2.0 Commitments to date:

A review of the current commitments countries have made to liberalize trade in education services is presented in part two. A brief analysis of the negotiating proposals submitted by Australia, New Zealand and the United States is included.

3.0 Trade barriers:

The aim of the GATS is to promote trade. This involves eliminating or decreasing measures that inhibit the flow of services. Section three discusses some of the major barriers identified as impediments to trade in education services.

4.0 Policy Implications:

This section focuses on policy issues related to trade in higher education services. This includes - the role of government, student access, funding, regulation of providers, quality assurance and intellectual property.

5.0 Moving forward:

Several international governance bodies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are taking steps to deal with the implications of GATS. The last section highlights these actions, provides a summary of the significant dates and activities in the official GATS negotiations and urges educators to be better informed on the opportunities and risks associated with trade in higher education services.

1.0 OVERVIEW OF GATS

It is easy to be overwhelmed with the legal and technical complexities of the GATS. The purpose of this section is to provide a clear and concise explanation of GATS and to review some of the key and more controversial articles of the agreement. Readers who are familiar with the basic structure and principles of GATS may want to skip the first four sections that provide background information and focus on section 1.5 that addresses the more controversial aspects of the agreement.

1.1 Structure and purpose of GATS

The GATS is the first ever set of multilateral rules covering international trade in services. Previous international trade agreements covered trade in products, but never services. The GATS was negotiated in the Uruguay Round and came into effect in 1995. It is administered by the World Trade Organization (WTO) which is made up of 144 member countries. The World Trade Organization (WTO) is the only global international organization dealing with the rules of trade between nations. At its heart are the WTO agreements, negotiated and signed by the majority of the world's trading nations and ratified in their parliaments. The GATS is one of these key agreements and is a legally enforceable set of rules.⁶

The GATS has three parts. The first part is the framework that contains the general principles and rules. The second part consists of the national schedules that list a country's specific commitments on access to their domestic market by foreign providers. The third part consists of annexes which detail specific limitations for each sector can be attached to the schedule of commitments. This will be discussed in more detail later, but first it is essential to understand what kind of education services will be covered by GATS and what is meant by higher education services.

1.2 Modes of trade in services

The GATS defines four ways in which a service can be traded, known as 'modes of supply'.⁷ These four modes of trade apply to all service sectors in GATS. Chart One provides a generic definition for each mode, applies them to the education sector and comments on the relative size of the market supply and demand. It is important to note that the current use of the term 'borderless education' covers all four modes of supply.

Chart One: Mode of Supply

Mode of Supply According to GATS	Explanation	Examples in Higher Education	Size /Potential of market
Cross Border Supply	- the provision of a service where the service crosses the border (does not require the physical movement of the consumer)	- distance education - e-learning - virtual universities	- currently a relatively small market - seen to have great potential through the use of new ICTs and especially the Internet
Consumption Abroad	- provision of the service involving the movement of the consumer to the country of the supplier	- students who go to another country to study	- currently represents the largest share of the global market for education services
Commercial Presence	- the service provider establishes or has presence of commercial facilities in another country in order to render service	- local branch or satellite campuses - twinning partnerships - franchising arrangements with local institutions	- growing interest and strong potential for future growth - most controversial as it appears to set international rules on foreign investment
Presence of Natural Persons	- persons travelling to another country on a temporary basis to provide service	- professors, teachers, researchers working abroad	- potentially a strong market given the emphasis on mobility of professionals

1.3 CATEGORIES OF EDUCATION SERVICES

Trade in education is organized into five categories or sub-sectors of service. These categories are based on the United Nations Provisional Central Product Classification (CPC)⁸ and are described in Chart Two. The three categories that are most relevant to this report are 'higher', 'adult' and 'other'. The four modes of service described above apply to each of the categories.

Chart Two: Classification system for education services

Category of education service	Education activities included in each category	Notes
Primary Education (CPC 921)	- pre-school and other primary education services -does not cover child-care services	
Secondary Education (CPC 922)	- general higher secondary - technical and vocational secondary - also covers technical and vocational services for the disabled	
Higher Education (CPC 923)	- post secondary technical and vocational education services - other higher education services leading to university degree or equivalent	- types of education (i.e., business, liberal arts, science) are not specified - assumes that all post secondary training and education programs are covered
Adult Education (CPC 924)	- covers education for adults outside the regular education system	- further delineation is needed
Other Education (CPC 929)	- covers all other education services not elsewhere classified - excludes education services related to recreation matters	- needs clarification re coverage and differentiation from other categories - for example- are education and language testing services, student recruitment services, quality assessment covered?

Critics of this classification system believe that it does not reflect the reality of today where non-traditional and private providers exist and alternate forms of delivery using new technologies are being used. However, countries are able to add their own qualifications or supplements to the UN CPC classification scheme and therefore, in principle, should not be limited by the scheme.

1.4 Key elements and rules of the GATS

The overall framework contains a number of general obligations applicable to all trade in services regardless of whether a country has made a specific commitment to sectors or not. These are called unconditional obligations. Fundamental to this discussion is the Most Favoured Nation (MFN) rule.

Each WTO member lists in its national schedules those services for which it wishes to provide access to foreign providers. In addition to choosing which service sector/s will be committed, each country determines the extent of commitment by specifying the level of market access and the degree of national treatment they are prepared to guarantee. The following chart lists the key elements⁹ of the GATS and provides brief explanatory notes.

Chart Three: Key Elements and Rules

GATS Element or Rule	Explanation	Application	Issues
Coverage	All internationally traded services are covered in the 12 different service sectors. (e.g. education, transportation, financial, tourism, health, construction)	Applies to all services- with two exceptions: i) services provided in the exercise of governmental authority ii) air traffic rights	Major debate on what the term "exercise of governmental authority" means.
Measures	All laws, regulations and practices from national, regional or local government that may affect trade	A generic term that applies to all sectors	
General or Unconditional obligations	Four unconditional obligations exist in GATS. · most favoured nation (mfn) · transparency · dispute settlement · monopolies	They apply to all service sectors regardless of whether it is a scheduled commitment or not	Attention needs to be given to "most favoured nation"

GATS Element or Rule	Explanation	Application	Issues
Most favoured nation (MFN) treatment	<p>Requires equal and consistent treatment of all foreign trading partners</p> <p>MFN means treating one's trading partners equally. Under GATS, if a country allows foreign competition in a sector, equal opportunities in that sector should be given to service providers from all WTO members. This also applies to mutual exclusion treatment</p> <p>For instance, if a foreign provider establishes branch campus in Country A, then Country A must permit all WTO members the same opportunity/ treatment. Or if Country A chooses to exclude Country B from providing a specific service, then all WTO members are excluded.</p>	<p>May apply even if the country has made no specific commitment to provide foreign access to their markets.</p> <p>Exemptions, for a period of 10 years, are permissible</p>	<p>MFN has implications for those countries who already are engaged in trade in educational services and/or who provide access to foreign education providers</p> <p>MFN is not the same as national treatment</p>
Conditional obligations	<p>There are a number of conditional obligations attached to national schedules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -market access -national treatment 	<p>Only applies to commitments listed in national schedules</p> <p>Degree and extent of obligation is determined by country</p>	<p>GATS supporters believe that a country's national educational objectives are protected by these two obligations</p>

GATS Element or Rule	Explanation	Application	Issues
National Treatment	<p>Requires equal treatment for foreign and domestic providers</p> <p>Once a foreign supplier has been allowed to supply a service in one's country there should be no discrimination in treatment between the foreign and domestic providers.</p>	<p>Only applies where a country has made a specific commitment</p> <p>Exemptions are allowed</p>	<p>GATS critics believe that this can put education as a 'public good' at risk.</p>
Market Access	<p>Means the degree to which market access is granted to foreign providers in specified sectors</p> <p>Market access may be subject to one or more of six types of limitations defined by GATS agreement</p>	<p>Each country determines limitations on market access for each committed sector</p>	
Progressive Liberalization	<p>GATS has a built in agenda which means that with each round of negotiations there is further liberalization of trade in service. This means more sectors are covered and more trade limitations are removed.</p>	<p>Applies to all sectors and therefore includes education</p>	

GATS Element or Rule	Explanation	Application	Issues
Bottom-up and Top-down approach	<p>Bottom up approach refers to the fact that each country determines the type and extent of its commitments for each sector</p> <p>Top down approach refers to the main rules and obligations as well as the progressive liberalization agenda, there will be increasing pressure to remove trade barriers.</p>		Sceptics maintain that the top down approach will have increasing importance and impact thereby increasing pressure to liberalize

1.5 Controversial Questions and issues related to higher education

The GATS is described as a voluntary agreement because countries can decide which sectors they will agree to cover under GATS rules. This is done through the preparation of their national schedules of commitments and through the 'request-offer' negotiation rounds. However, there are aspects of the agreement that question its voluntary nature, notably the built-in progressive liberalization agenda and other elements described in this section.

- *Which education services are covered or exempted?*

Probably, the most controversial and critical issue related to the agreement is the meaning of Article 1.3.¹⁰ This article defines which services are covered or exempted.

According to the WTO, the agreement is deemed to apply to all measures affecting services *except* "those services supplied in the exercise of governmental authority". But what does 'exercise of governmental authority' mean? GATS supporters maintain that education provided and funded by the government is therefore exempted. Sceptics question the broad interpretation of the clause and ask for more a detailed analysis. The agreement states that "in the exercise of governmental authority" means the service is provided on a 'non-commercial basis' and 'not in competition' with other service sup-

pliers. This begs the follow-up question - what is meant by non-commercial basis and not in competition? These issues are at the heart of much of the debate about which services are covered.

Education critics of the GATS maintain that due to the wide-open interpretation of 'non-commercial' and 'not in competition' terms, the public sector/government service providers may not in fact be exempt. The situation is especially complicated in those countries where there is a mixed public/private higher education system or where a significant amount of funding for public institutions in fact comes from the private sector. Another complication is that a public education institution in an exporting country is often defined as private/commercial when it crosses the border and delivers in the importing country. Therefore, one needs to question what 'non-commercial' really means in terms of higher education trade.

The debate about what 'not in competition' means is fuelled by the fact that there does not appear to be any qualifications or limits on the term.¹¹ For instance, if non-government providers (private non-profit or commercial) are delivering services, are they deemed to be in competition with government providers? In this scenario, public providers may be defined as being 'in competition' by the mere existence of non-governmental providers. Does the method of delivery influence or limit the concept of 'in competition'? Does the term cover situations where there is a similar mode of delivery, or for instance, does this term mean that public providers using traditional face-to-face classroom methods could be seen to be competing with foreign for-profit e-learning providers?

There are many unanswered questions that need clarification. Supporters of the GATS emphasize that education is to a large extent a government function and that the agreement does not seek to displace the public education systems and the right of government to regulate and meet domestic policy objectives. Others express concern that the whole question of the protection of public services is very uncertain and potentially at risk in view of the narrow interpretation of what governmental authority means and a wide-open interpretation of what 'not in competition' and 'non-commercial basis' mean. Clearly, the question - which higher and adult education 'services exercised in governmental authority' are exempted from GATS - needs to be front and centre in the debate on the risks and opportunities associated with the agreement.

- *What does the principle of progressive liberalization mean?*

GATS is not a neutral agreement. It aims to promote and enforce the liberalization of trade in services. The process of progressive liberalization involves two aspects - extending GATS coverage to more service sectors and decreasing the number and

extent of measures that serve as impediments to increased trade. Therefore, in spite of the right of each country to determine the extent of its commitments, with each new round of negotiations, countries are expected to add sectors or sub-sectors to their national schedules of commitments and to negotiate the further removal of limitations on market access and national treatment.

The intention of GATS is to facilitate and promote ever-more opportunities for trade. Therefore, countries that are not interested in either the import or export of education services will most likely experience greater pressures to allow market access to foreign providers. GATS is a very new instrument and it is too soon to predict the reality or extent of these potential opportunities or risks.

- *What are the implications of negotiating across sectors?*

At the 'request-offer' stage of the process, there are bilateral negotiations on market access and national treatment commitments. The key point at this step, is that sectors for which access is sought do not have to correspond to those for which requests are made. So country A may request of Country B greater access to transportation services. Country B can respond by requesting access to education services. It is up to each country as to where they are willing to make concessions on foreign access to domestic markets. This situation applies to all sectors and may be of greatest concern to countries, developing or developed, who have not made commitments to open up education services and might therefore consider their education service sector vulnerable to negotiating deals across sectors.

These issues relate to the mechanics and legalities of the agreement itself. Each one raises questions that need further clarification and analysis and collectively they serve to wave the red flag that more attention needs to be given to these matters.

There are other aspects of the GATS, such as the dispute mechanism, subsidies, treatment of monopolies which are controversial and apply to all sectors and which need further study. Article 6.4, which addresses measures relating to qualification requirements and procedures, technical standards and licensing requirements may have serious implications for education and requires further clarification. It must be remembered that GATS is still an untested agreement and a certain amount of confusion exists on how to interpret the major rules and obligations. It took many years to iron out the inconsistencies in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the same will likely be true for GATS. While trade specialists and lawyers need to review the technical and legal aspects of the agreement, it is educators who need to study how the agreement applies to and impacts education services.

2.0 COMMITMENTS TO TRADE IN EDUCATION SERVICES

2.1 Extent of country commitments

The education sector is one of the least committed sectors. The reason is not clear, but perhaps it can be attributed to the need for countries to strike a balance between pursuing domestic education priorities and exploring ways in which trade in education services can be further liberalized. Or it could be linked to the fact that to date, education, in general, has taken a very low priority in the major bilateral agreements and rightly or wrongly, the same may be true for the GATS.

Only 44 of the 144 WTO Members have made commitments to education, and only 21 of these have included commitments to higher education¹² It is interesting to note that Congo, Lesotho, Jamaica and Sierra Leone have made full unconditional commitments in higher education, perhaps with the intent of encouraging foreign providers to help develop their educational systems. Australia's commitment for higher education covers provision of private tertiary education services, including university level. The European Union has included higher education in their schedule with clear limitations on all modes of trade except 'consumption abroad', which generally means foreign tuition paying students. Only three (USA, New Zealand, Australia) of the 21 countries with higher education commitments have submitted a negotiating proposal outlining their interests and issues. The next section provides a brief summary of key elements of the three proposals.

2.2 Analysis of negotiating proposals

The purpose of Chart Four is to provide a comparison of some of the key issues identified by the three countries. It is interesting to note that all three acknowledge the role of government as funder, regulator and provider of education services. A comparison of the rationales and benefits of freer trade in education services reveals different perspectives and raises key issues.

Chart Four: Highlights of Negotiation Proposals

	Australia ¹³	New Zealand ¹⁴	United States ¹⁵
Role of Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - government has a role in the financing, delivery and regulation of higher education - either alone or in partnership with individuals, NGOs and private education - governments must retain their sovereign right to determine own domestic funding and regulatory policies/measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - international trade in education services can supplement and support national education policy objectives (i.e. reduce the infrastructure commitments required of governments and so free resources for other aspects of education policy) - the reduction of barriers does not equate to an erosion of core public education systems and standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the principle that governments should retain the right to regulate to meet domestic policy objectives should be respected - in education service sector, governments will continue to play important roles as suppliers of service - "education to a large extent is a government function and it does not seek to displace public education systems. It seeks to supplement public education systems"
Rationale/purpose of trade liberalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - means of providing individuals in all countries with access to wide range of education options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - education as a role in economic and social development - in New Zealand, education exports are the fourth largest service sector export earner and fifteenth largest foreign exchange earner overall. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - help upgrade knowledge and skills through training and education, while respecting each country's role in prescribing and administering appropriate public education for its citizens.

	Australia ¹³	New Zealand ¹⁴	United States ¹⁵
Benefits of trade liberalization	<p>- increased access to education in qualitative and quantitative terms that would otherwise not be available in country of origin</p> <p>- competitive stimulus with flow-on benefits to all students</p> <p>- efficient encouragement of internationalization and flow of students.</p>	<p>- in addition to generating revenue for private and state sector education institutions and Member economies, there are benefits at individual, institutional and societal level through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - academic exchange - increased cross-cultural linkages - technological transfer - increased access for members 	<p>- these services constitute a growing, international business, supplementing the public education system and contributing to global spread of the modern "knowledge economy"</p> <p>- benefits of this growth help to develop more efficient work force, leading countries to an improved competitive position in the world economy</p>
Public/Private Mix		<p>least committed service sectors due to recognition of its "public good" element and the high degree of government involvement in its provision</p>	<p>- private education co-exists with public domain</p> <p>- private education and training will continue to supplement, not displace public education systems</p>

● *Role of government*

It is clear that all three proposals acknowledge the central role government plays in higher education. Perhaps the controversy about which public services are exempted from the GATS has prompted this explicit recognition of the government role. Some are comforted and appeased by these statements. Others are even more concerned about the potential erosion of the role of government in higher education provision and the setting of domestic policy objectives.

In some countries, education is decentralized from national to provincial or state governmental bodies. Private education, though nominally under state authority, may not be primarily governed or regulated by a government. These situations further illustrate the complexities involved in determining which services are exempted from GATS coverage and the very different impact GATS will have on individual countries.

- *Rationales and benefits*

The rationales that drive further liberalization differ from country to country. Australia stresses greater access for students, New Zealand points to economic and social benefits and the USA focuses on opportunities for new knowledge and skills. Benefits are closely linked to rationales. Australia believes that the competition inherent in more trade will have flow-on benefits to students. New Zealand emphasizes that in addition to revenue generation there are benefits at the individual, institutional and societal level through academic exchange, technological transfer and cross-cultural linkages. The USA highlights the contribution to global spread of the modern knowledge economy and improved competitiveness. It is not a surprise that the economic benefits are emphasized but it is noteworthy that social and academic value to individuals, institutions and society are not totally overlooked. More work is needed to understand and analyse the perceived rationale and benefits as this will lead to a clearer picture of what countries expect from increased import and export in education. Of course, expectations can be seen in terms of desirable or undesirable results. A better understanding of anticipated outcomes would assist in the development of policies to help achieve or prevent them. At the same time, it is equally important to be mindful of 'unintended consequences'.

- *Public/private mix*

The public/private mix of higher and adult education provision is implicitly and explicitly recognized in the proposals. It is interesting to note that New Zealand suggests that education may be one of the least committed service sectors due to the recognition of its 'public good' element and the high degree of government involvement in its provision. The USA is more pointed when they state that private education co-exists with the public domain and will continue to supplement, not displace public education systems. There are mixed reactions to this statement and a great deal of uncertainty as to how the GATS will affect the balance of a mixed system, especially given the individualized nature of mixed systems

- *Further analysis needed*

Further analysis of the factors driving commitments or the lack of commitments in

higher education is needed. There are diverse perspectives on the number and substance of commitments because countries have different national policy objectives and therefore different goals and expectations from trade in education services.

For example, a consumer oriented rationale can be interpreted as the need to provide a wider range of opportunities to consumers, or the need to protect consumers by assuring appropriate levels of access and quality. The economic rationale can be understood as a way to increase trade revenues for exporting countries or seen as a means to attract additional investment for education for importing countries. Other see the economic rationale as sabotaging the social development goals of education, or even scientific enquiry and scholarship. Any number of issues can be used to illustrate the debate and the dichotomy of opinions on the rationales and benefits of increased trade in education. Differences exist between and within countries and certainly among education groups as well. Further debate and analysis is necessary so that an informed position is taken on why or why not trade liberalization is attractive to an individual country and how trade agreements help or hinder achieving national goals and global interests.

- *Developing country interests*

The voices of developing countries need to be heard so that the benefits and risks associated with increased trade are clear and do not undermine national efforts to develop and enhance domestic higher education. However, the voices and interests of the developing countries differ. The opportunity to have foreign suppliers provide increased access to higher and adult education programs or to invest in the infrastructure for education provision is attractive to some. The threat of foreign dominance or exploitation of a national system and culture is expressed by others. Trade liberalization for whose benefit or at what cost are key questions.

Quality and accreditation are at the heart of much debate. The importance of frameworks for licensing, accreditation, qualification recognition and quality assurance are important for all countries, whether they are importing and exporting education services. Developing countries have expressed concern about their capacity to have such frameworks in place in light of the push toward trade liberalization and increased cross border delivery of education.

The GATS is one of many factors and instruments encouraging greater mobility of professionals. Although the agreement focuses on temporary movement of the labour force, it may lead to and facilitate permanent migration as well. The implications of increased mobility of teachers and researchers are particularly relevant to developing countries. It will be a major challenge to improve education systems if well-qualified professionals and graduates are attracted to positions in other countries.

At the root of the impact of GATS on developing countries is the fundamental issue of capacity to participate effectively in the global trading system and to be equal members in the WTO. Strong feelings exist about the potential for trade rules to make poor countries poorer, instead of narrowing the gap between developed and developing countries. The perceived injustice that poor nations are expected to remove trade barriers while rich nations retain barriers on certain goods, contributes to the strong reactions of some developing countries about the impact of GATS in general.

3.0 BARRIERS

Identification of the barriers to trade in higher education services is fundamental because it is the elimination of these barriers which is the *raison d'être* of GATS. There are some barriers that are applicable to all sectors. There are other impediments that are specific to the education services sector. The following two sections list some of the generic barriers and also those most relevant to the four modes of trade in education. The sources used to identify these barriers are the three negotiating proposals described above, reports by non-governmental organizations¹⁶ (NGOs) and intergovernmental bodies¹⁷, and by the WTO itself. This is a comprehensive collection of perceived barriers, not a list of the most significant ones. There is no agreement or consensus on which barriers are the most critical as they are usually seen from a self-interest perspective. The list is for illustrative purposes only. Attention needs to be given to whether the barriers are seen from the perspective of an exporting or importing country. Finally, it is important to remember that what is perceived as a barrier by some countries is perceived as fundamental to the education system in another.

3.1 Generic Barriers

The majority of these generic barriers are from an exporter country's point of view and focus on supply modes one and three.

- lack of transparency of government regulatory, policy and funding frameworks
- domestic laws and regulations are administered in an unfair manner
- subsidies are not made known in a clear and transparent manner
- when government approval is required long delays are encountered and when approval is denied, no reasons are given for the denial and no information is given on what must be done to obtain approval in the future
- tax treatment that discriminates against foreign suppliers
- foreign partners are treated less favourably than other organizations.

3.2 Barriers by mode of supply

Chart Five: Barriers to trade by mode of supply

Modes of delivery	Barriers
<p>Cross border supply</p> <p>Examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - distance delivery or e-education - virtual universities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inappropriate restrictions on electronic transmission of course materials - economic needs test on suppliers of these services - lack of opportunity to qualify as degree granting institution - required to use local partners - denial of permission to enter into and exit from joint ventures with local or non-local partners on voluntary basis - excessive fees/ taxes imposed on licensing or royalty payments - new barriers, electronic or legal for use of Internet to deliver education services - restrictions on use/import of educational materials
<p>Consumption abroad</p> <p>Example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - students studying in another country 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - visa requirements and costs -foreign currency and exchange requirements - recognition of prior qualifications from other countries - quotas on numbers of international students in total and at a particular institution - restrictions on employment while studying - recognition of new qualification by other countries
<p>Commercial presence</p> <p>Examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - branch or satellite campus - franchises - twinning arrangements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inability to obtain national licenses to grant a qualification - limit on direct investment by education providers (equity ceilings) - nationality requirements - restrictions on recruitment of foreign teachers - government monopolies - high subsidization of local institutions - difficulty in obtaining authorization to establish facilities - economic needs test on suppliers of these services - prohibition of higher education, adult education and training services offered by foreign entities - measures requiring the use of a local partner - difficulty to gain permission to enter into and exit from joint ventures with local or non-local partners on voluntary basis

Modes of delivery	Barriers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - tax treatment that discriminates against foreign suppliers - foreign partners are treated less favourably than other organizations - excessive fees/ taxes are imposed on licensing or royalty payments - rules for twinning arrangements
<p>Presence of natural persons</p> <p>Examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers travelling to foreign country to teach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - immigration requirements - nationality or residence requirements - needs test - recognition of credentials - minimum requirements for local hiring are disproportionately high - personnel have difficulty obtaining authorization to enter and leave the country - quotas on number of temporary staff - repatriation of earnings is subject to excessively costly fees and/or taxes for currency conversion - employment rules - restrictions on use/import of educational materials to be used by foreign teacher/scholar

Of course, many of these barriers are not new or specific to the GATS, as they already impact the flow of education services across borders. However, the barriers are significant as they are seen by some as key elements of a public education system that need to be maintained, and by others as impediments to trade.

Some of the barriers identified above affect internationalization initiatives, in other words, those activities that do not have an economic or for-profit motive. For instance, mobility of students and teachers for academic exchange or research purposes are affected by many of the barriers noted for supply modes two and four.

It is important to note that within a country's schedule of commitments, it is possible to list specific limitations to market access and national treatment. These are a type of barrier and must be honoured. For example, Mexico has telecom laws that restrict the use of national satellites and receiving dishes.¹⁸ This has potential impact on cross border delivery of education services. It is hard to predict what future barriers, especially technological ones, could be applied in order to control the electronic movement of

education services across borders. For instance, the capacity to install electronic fences may have major repercussions on cross border e-education.

Finally, it should be mentioned that countries that have not made any formal commitments to trade in higher education services are currently in the process of easing some of the identified barriers. A good example of this is the number of countries who are changing visa and employment requirements to attract more international students to study in their country. This is happening irrespective of the GATS.

4.0 POLICY ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

Given the current interest and pressure toward increasing trade liberalization, what are the policy implications that the higher education sector needs to look at?

It is a challenging task to examine policy implications as the impact of trade liberalization is firmly enmeshed with other issues and trends in higher education. These trends include:

- the increasing use of ICTs for domestic and cross border delivery of programs
- the growing number of private for-profit entities providing higher education domestically and internationally
- the increasing tuition fees and other costs faced by students of public (and private) institutions,
- the need for public providers to seek alternate sources of funding which sometimes means engaging in for-profit activities or seeking private sector sources of financial support.
- the ability of government to fund the increasing demand for higher and adult education

These trends are with us today in both developed and to some extent, developing countries. How does the existence of the GATS relate to these trends? While the GATS may lead to expanded use of electronic or distance education and may contribute to more commercial or market oriented approaches to education, it cannot be held responsible for the emergence or existence of these trends. Supporters of more trade in education services can celebrate the existence of the GATS to maximize the benefits of these trends and opportunities. Critics, on the other hand, can emphasize the risks associated with increased trade, believing that it leads to more for-profit providers, to programs of questionable quality, and to a market oriented approach - all of which are seen to challenge the traditional 'public good' approach to higher education. However, the impact of trade liberalization on education cannot be positioned as an 'either-or' question or answer; it is a multi-layered and complex set of issues.

4.1 Role of government

The changing role of government is a contentious issues. First, let it be said that in general, globalization and the new public management are challenging and changing roles of government and nation state. The movement toward more trade liberalization is yet another factor. With respect to education, the government usually plays a role in the funding, regulation, monitoring and delivery of higher education or at least, designating bodies to do so. This is true in countries where a public system dominates or where a mixed public/private system exists. The advent of increased cross border delivery by foreign education providers raises the following issues all of which impact on the role of government:

- licensing and regulation procedures for foreign providers
- quality assurance and accreditation for imported and exported education services
- funding protocols including operating grants, loans, subsidies and scholarships
- qualification recognition and credit transfer systems

These issues will be discussed in more detail in other sections but the role of government as an education provider needs to be examined. A combination of increased demand for public services and limited financial capacity is forcing governments to examine their priorities and options for service delivery. In higher education, this has prompted a number of new developments. These include

- developing funding formulas which are placing more of the financial burden on students
- forcing publicly funded institutions to seek alternate and additional sources of funds through entrepreneurial or commercial activities at home and abroad
- individual institutions wanting increased autonomy from government regulation
- permitting new private providers (non-profit and for-profit) to deliver specific education and training programs

These developments are further complicated if and when a) a foreign public or private education provider is interested in access to the domestic market; and b) if a domestic public provider is interested in seeking markets in other countries. Together these scenarios require the government to take a long term and macro perspective on the impact of increased foreign trade on their role in the provision of and regulation of higher education.

4.2 Student access

Many governments and public education institutions have keenly felt the responsibility of ensuring broad access to higher education opportunities. In many, if not in most countries, this is a challenging issue as the demand for higher and adult education is steadily growing, often beyond the capacity of the country to provide it. This is one more reason why some students are interested in out-of-country education opportunities and providers are prepared to offer higher education services across borders.

When increased trade liberalization is factored into this scenario, the question of access becomes complicated. Advocates of liberalized trade maintain that consumers/students can have greater access to a wider range of education opportunities at home and abroad. Non-supporters of trade believe that access may in fact be more limited as trade will commercialize education, escalate costs and perhaps lead to a two-tiered system. Trade is therefore often perceived by critics as a threat to the 'public good' nature of education services.

This raises the question of the capacity and role of government with respect to providing access to higher education. For instance, if education is seen as a public function, can private providers or foreign providers help to fulfil this public function? If so, would foreign for-profit providers be eligible for the same grants, subsidies and tax incentives as public providers under the national treatment obligation of the GATS? Would this in turn decrease the amount of financial support available to public universities if funds were distributed across a larger number of institutions? Different education models exist and must exist in order to respond to the needs, resources and priorities of individual countries.

4.3 Funding

Many of the same issues and arguments regarding access can also apply to funding. Some governments have limited budget capacity or at least lack the political will to allocate funds to meet the needs of higher education. Can international trade provide alternate funding sources or new providers? Or, because of the GATS obligations such as most favoured nation treatment and national treatment obligations, does it mean that public funding will be spread too thinly across a broader set of domestic and foreign providers? Furthermore, does the presence of foreign providers signal to government that they can decrease public funding for higher and adult education, thereby jeopardizing domestic publicly funded institutions. Does international trade in education advantage some countries, such as those with well-developed capacity for export, and disadvantage others in terms of funding or access? Once again, the impact of more liberalized trade can be a double-edged sword with respect to funding, whether public or

private, higher education teaching/learning and research activities.

4.4 Regulation of foreign or cross border providers

As already noted, a regulatory framework is needed to deal with the diversity of providers and new cross border delivery modes, and becomes more urgent as international trade increases. In some countries, this may mean a broader approach to policy which involves licensing, regulating and monitoring both private (profit and non-profit) and foreign providers to ensure that national policy objectives are met and public interests protected. It may also involve a shift in government and public thinking-while higher education remains a "public good", both public and private providers can fulfil this public function. This in turn may introduce greater competition among providers and general confusion for the consumer. Hence a coherent and comprehensive regulatory framework is called for- to serve national interests and protect the interests of different stakeholders, especially students.

More work is necessary to determine how national regulatory frameworks are compatible with, or part of, a larger international framework.¹⁹ Increased connectivity and interdependence among nations, as well as liberalized trade, will mean urge greater coherence between national frameworks. How can coherence between a national framework and an international framework actually strengthen national regulatory and policy functions, not weaken them? Clearly there are risks and opportunities associated with this issue but doing nothing is a risk in itself.

4.5 Recognition and transferability of credits

New types of education providers, new delivery modes, new cross border education initiatives, new levels of student mobility, new opportunities for trade in higher education - all this can spell further confusion for the recognition of qualifications and transfer of academic credits. This is not a new issue. Trade agreements are not responsible for increased confusion, but they add to the complexity and also make resolution more urgent. National and international recognition of qualifications and the transfer of credits have already been the subject of a substantial amount of work. The 'Lisbon Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications of Higher Education in the Europe Region', the 'European Credit Transfer System', and 'University Mobility in Asia Pacific' are good examples of regional initiatives that could lead to a more international approach.

4.6 Quality assurance and accreditation

Increased cross border education delivery and a set of legal rules and obligations in

trade agreements require that urgent attention be given to the question of quality assurance and accreditation of education providers. Not only is it important to have national mechanisms which have the capacity to address accreditation and quality assessment procedures for the academic programs of new private and foreign providers, it is equally important that attention be given to developing an international approach to quality assurance and accreditation.²⁰

There is growing awareness that in the world of cross border education trade, national quality assurance schemes are becoming challenged by the complexities of the international education environment. While there may be growing awareness, there is no acceptance or agreement that harmonization of national policies with an international approach to quality assessment and accreditation is needed. It is imperative that education specialists discuss and determine the appropriate regulating mechanisms at the national and international level and not leave these questions to the designers and arbitrators of trade agreements.

Another, potentially contentious issue is the application of quality assurance schemes to both domestic and foreign providers. It may well be that under certain conditions, the national treatment obligation requires that all providers, domestic and foreign, be subject to the same processes and criteria. In some countries this will not be a problem, in others it will be hotly debated.

Quality assurance of higher education in some countries is regulated by the sector, and in others by the government to a greater or lesser degree. The key point is that authority for quality assurance, regulation and accreditation of cross border delivery needs to be examined and guided by stakeholders and bodies related to the education sector and not left solely in the hands of the market.

4.7 Research and intellectual property rights

In the new economy that emphasizes knowledge production and trade, there is increasingly more value attributed to the creative and intellectual content inherent in both products and services. The 'Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights' (TRIPS) is another trade agreement, completely separate from the GATS, but which also addresses trade liberalization.²¹ TRIPS covers such things as patents, trademarks and copyright, all of which are salient to the research and teaching/learning functions of higher education. Careful monitoring of TRIPS is also necessary by the higher education sector.^{21, 22}

A look at the potential implications of trade agreements on research and scholarly work reveals a number of issues. A consistent theme expressed by trade critics is a deep con-

cern about the increased emphasis on commercialization and commodification of the production of knowledge. Sceptics believe that the highly valued trinity of teaching, research and service at traditional universities may be at risk. A more differentiated and niche oriented approach to higher education may be an unanticipated outcome of increased trade in education and the growing importance of agreements such as GATS and TRIPS.

4.8 Internationalization

Attention needs to be given to the impact of trade liberalization on non-profit internationalization activities. Will trade overshadow and dominate the international academic relations of countries and institutions, or enhance them? Many internationalization strategies might be jeopardized by a purely commercial approach. For example, participation in international development or technical assistance programs can lead to mutual benefits for all partners and important spin-off effects for research, curriculum development and teaching. Will these programs have less or more importance when there is increased pressure for trade? Will revenue raised from commercial education activities be used to subsidize internationalization activities? What might happen to student exchange, internships, and other forms of academic mobility that do not have an income generation or for-profit motive? Will limited financial resources be directed to trade initiatives that have an economic return instead of internationalization activities which stress added academic value? How can internationalization and trade activities complement each other? Will bilateral relationships and multilateral networks among institutions be shaped by trade opportunities at the expense of research, curriculum development and other academic endeavours? Effort is needed to profile the benefits and importance of non-profit internationalization and to direct resources to the implementation and sustainability of the international dimension of teaching, research and service.

4.9 Mobility of professionals / labour force

It has already been noted that the GATS may address the widespread unmet demand for skilled workers by facilitating the mobility of professionals. This impacts many of the service sectors and has particular implications for higher education. Not only is higher and adult education providing education and training programs to meet economic needs, the sector itself is affected by the mobility of its teachers and researchers. In many countries, the increasing shortage of teachers is resulting in active recruitment campaigns across borders. Since many teachers and researchers want to move to countries with more favourable working conditions and salaries, there is a real concern that the most developed countries will benefit disproportionately.

4.10 Culture and acculturation

Last, but certainly not least, is the issue of cultural and indigenous traditions. Education is a process through which cultural assimilation takes place. In fact education is a fundamental vehicle for acculturation. Concern about the homogenization of culture through cross border supply of higher and adult education is expressed by critics of GATS. Advocates maintain that a positive hybridization and fusion of culture will evolve through increasing mobility and the influence of ICTs. In fact, some argue that this has been happening for decades and is contributing to new cultural exchanges and richness. Once again, the divergence of opinion shows that there are potential opportunities and threats to consider.

4.11 Institutional level issues

The emphasis of this section has been on macro policy issues. But the effect on individual institutions, especially public higher education institutions, should not be ignored²³ The foremost issues are institutional autonomy, academic freedom and conditions of employment for academic staff. While these three issues are linked to trade liberalization, they are more closely associated with the larger issues of the commercialization and privatization of education in general, which many believe is advanced within as well as across borders.

4.12 Trade dominates

Finally, it needs to be said that the question of trade liberalization, which most often is interpreted in economic terms, has the potential of dominating the agenda. There is a risk of 'trade creep' where education policy issues are increasingly framed in terms of trade.²⁴ Even though domestic challenges in education provision are currently front and centre on the radar screen of most countries, the issue of international trade in education services will most likely increase in importance. Supporters of freer trade applaud the fact that GATS is seen first and foremost as an economic agreement and that its purpose is to promote and expand free trade for economic reasons. Given that the market potential for trade in higher education is already significant and is predicted to increase, it is clear that GATS and other trade agreements will help to promote trade and further economic benefit. Critics of the trade agreements maintain that the domination of the trade agenda is at the expense of other key objectives and rationales for higher education such as social, cultural and scientific development and the role of education in promoting democracy and citizenship.

5.0 MOVING FORWARD

5.1 Actions and reactions of stakeholders

One of the prime objectives of this report is to get the issue of trade liberalization in higher education services on the agenda of university managers and higher education policy makers. Overall, there seems to have been little reaction to the issue. This does not dismiss, however, the work that has been done by some non-government organizations. One of the more interesting initiatives is the 'Joint Declaration on Higher Education and the General Agreement on Trade in Services'²⁵ developed and signed by four organizations: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), American Council on Education (ACE), European University Association (EUA) and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).

This declaration encourages countries to not make commitments in 'Higher Education Services' or in the related categories of 'Adult Education' and 'Other Education Services' in the GATS. Instead it supports the notion of reducing obstacles to international trade in higher education using conventions and agreements outside of a trade policy regime. Clearly there are supporters of the principles of the declaration, but there are also critics who feel that the protectionist position is rather self-serving, especially given the degree of exporting activity already in existence. It is noteworthy that three of the signatories come from the USA and Europe, both of whom have made some commitments on education services in GATS. This is yet another sign of the heated debate, the complexities and the uncertainties related to GATS. The most important role of the declaration is that it is drawing more attention to the issue.

The declaration is the only internationally co-ordinated effort but there are many national level student, teacher and education organizations that are vocal in their questions and criticisms of the intent and impact of the agreement. There are similar groups such as the 'National Committee for International Trade in Education' (NCITE) in the US and other business organizations which are expressing support for freer trade in education services. At the intergovernmental level there appears to be some level of interest in the issues - primarily from the economic organizations such as APEC or OECD. At the same time, there are international non-government organizations such as Association of Commonwealth Universities that are trying to raise awareness about the broad issue of trade liberalization and the specifics of the GATS. But, this is only a beginning. More work is needed to consult with the different education stakeholders so that their voices are heard in ongoing analysis and negotiations.

5.2 Important dates for WTO negotiations

The key dates to be aware of for the next phases of the GATS negotiations are:

- June 30, 2002: Countries will file initial requests asking trading partners to open their markets in service areas.
- March 31, 2003: Countries that were the subjects of requests will present offers to open their markets in service areas. Trading partners will hold meetings and discussions. Overall, if insufficient agreement is reached regarding higher education, the sector could be part of new round of global negotiations after talks conclude in January 2005.
- January 2005: GATS negotiations will end.

This is a rather tight timetable and the next twelve months are key. By June 2002, the details of all education requests should be known. While it is important that the voice of the education sector is heard in the formulation of these requests, it may be even more important to influence the response to the requests. This involves working with the appropriate government officials and monitoring the offers made by one's own country in response to requests from other countries. The second part is monitoring the offers that are being received by one's own country in response to the requests originally made to other countries. This is an important, but a rather daunting task due to the reality that education stakeholders hold differing perspectives on the extent and nature of the limitations on national treatment and market access and may or may not speak with one voice to government trade officials.

5.4 Concluding remarks

Complex and contentious. These two words sum up the current analysis and debate about the impact of GATS on higher education. Opinions on the risks and benefits are divided, if not polarized. They differ within and between countries. Each country must undertake the very serious challenge of balancing opportunities and commitments to liberalize trade for exporting higher education services, with the possible impact, related to the same commitments, of the import of education services. This is not an easy task. One can tend to be liberal while considering exporting opportunities and more protectionist when analysing the implications of importing.

At this stage, one is left with the impression that there are more questions than clear answers. The questions are complex as they deal with

- technical/legal issues of the agreement itself (see section 1.5)

- education policy issues such as funding, access, accreditation, quality and intellectual property (see section 5) and,
- the larger more political/moral issues for society, such as the role and purpose of higher education, and the 'public good' or 'market commodity' approach.

The one certainty in this picture is the need for the higher education sector to study these questions and to consult stakeholders. At the same time it is necessary to be proactive and strategic in monitoring and influencing government negotiating positions for the request/offer stage of the GATS negotiations. This, of course, involves close communication with education departments and bodies in one's country. It is equally important not to lose sight of the need for international approaches and frameworks for the regulation of providers, quality assurance and qualification recognition. Finally, it is important not to overstate the impact of GATS. Trade in education was alive and well prior to and outside the purview of trade agreements. Yet, it is also critical not to understate the potential implications- risks and opportunities- of GATS.

The first aim of this paper is to highlight the potential impact of trade liberalization on higher education. The second aim is to raise questions and identify policy issues that require further attention and analysis. These will have been met if readers are better informed, and motivated to take appropriate action at institutional, regional, national or international level.

Author's Note

The author has tried to present the views of both the supporters and critics of increased trade liberalization of educational services through GATS. In doing so, she has intentionally not taken a personal position on the risks and benefits of increased trade liberalization on higher education. That being said, the ideas and views in this paper are those identified by the author alone.

References

- ¹ Cunningham, S. et al (2000) *The Business of Borderless Education*, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Canberra, Australia.
- ² CVCP (2000). *The Business of Borderless Education: UK Perspectives*. Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principles. London, United Kingdom.
- ³ Davis, D. et al (2000) *Transnational Education Providers, Partners and Policy*. IDP Education Australia. Brisbane, Australia.

- ⁴ CVCP (2000). *The Business of Borderless Education: UK Perspectives*. Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principles. London, United Kingdom.
- ⁵ Knight, Jane (1999) *A Time of Turbulence and Transformation for Internationalization*. Research Monograph Canadian Bureau for International Education. Ottawa, Canada No. 14.
- ⁶ WTO (1999) *The WTO in Brief*. Prepared by the WTO Secretariat. Geneva Switzerland. Available from:
www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/whatis_e.htm
- ⁷ WTO *The General Agreement in Trade in Services - objectives, coverage and disciplines*. Prepared by the WTO Secretariat . Available from:
www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/gatsqa_e.htm
- ⁸ WTO The Services Sectoral Classification List, World Trade Organization. Prepared by WTO Secretariat. Document MTN.GNS/W/120. Available from:
www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/sanally_e.htm
- ⁹ WTO *The General Agreement in Trade in Services - objectives, coverage and disciplines*. Prepared by the WTO Secretariat . Available from:
www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/gatsqa_e.htm
- ¹⁰ WTO *The General Agreement in Trade in Services Text*. Available from:
www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/1-scdef_e.htm
- ¹¹ Gottlieb and Pearson (2001) *GATS Impact on Education in Canada. Legal Opinion*. Prepared for the Canadian Association of University Teachers. Ottawa, Canada. Available from: www.caut.ca/english/issues/trade/gats-opinion.asp
- ¹² WTO (1998). *Education Services. Background Note* by the Secretariat. Council for Trade in Services. Geneva, Switzerland. S/C/W/49, 98-3691. Available from:
http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/sanally_e.htm
- ¹³ WTO (2001) Communication from Australia. Negotiating Proposal for Education Services. Council for Trade in Services. WTO . Document S/CSS/W/110. Available from: www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/s_propnewnegs_e.htm
- ¹⁴ WTO (2001) Communication from New Zealand. Negotiating Proposal for Education Services. Council for Trade in Services. WTO. Document S/CSS/W/93. Available from: http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/s_propnewnegs_e.htm
- ¹⁵ WTO (2000) Communication from the United States. Higher (Tertiary) Education, Adult Education, and Training. Council for Trade in Services. WTO. Document

S/CSS/W/93. Available from: www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/s_prop-newnegs_e.htm

- ¹⁶ NCITE (2001) *Barriers to Trade in Transnational Education*. National Committee for International Trade in Education. Washington, D.C, USA. Available from: www.tradeineducation.org/general_info/frames.html
- ¹⁷ APEC (2001) *Measures affecting trade and investment in education services in the Asia-Pacific region*. A report to the APEC group on Services 2000. Singapore. Available from: www.apecsec.org.sg
- ¹⁸ NCITE (2001) *Barriers to Trade in Transnational Education*. National Committee for International Trade in Education. Washington, D.C, USA. Available from: www.tradeineducation.org/general_info/frames.html
- ¹⁹ Van Damme, D. (2001) *Higher Education in the Age of Globalization: The need for a new regulatory framework for recognition, quality assurance and accreditation*. Working Paper. UNESCO. Paris, France
- ²⁰ Van Damme, D. (2001) *Higher Education in the Age of Globalization: The need for a new regulatory framework for recognition, quality assurance and accreditation*. Working Paper. UNESCO. Paris, France
- ²¹ WTO. *Frequently asked questions about TRIPS in the WTO*. Available from: www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/trips_e/tripfq_e.htm
- ²² OECD (2001) *Trade in Educational Services: Trends and Emerging Issues*. Working Paper. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Paris, France
- ²³ Nunn, Alex (2001) *The General Agreement on Trade in Services: An Impact Assessment for Higher Education in the UK*. Report. UK Association of University Teachers. London, United Kingdom.
- ²⁴ EI/PSI (2000) *Great Expectations. The Future of Trade in Services*. Joint paper by Education International (EI) and Public Services International (PSI). Brussels, Belgium. Available from: www.ei-ie.org/main/english/index.html
- ²⁵ AUCC (2001) *Joint Declaration on Higher Education and the General Agreement on Trade in Services*. 2001 Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), American Council on Education, European University Association, Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Available from: www.aucc.ca

DISCUSSANT PIECE TO KNIGHT ARTICLE: SOUTH AFRICAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND GATS

Pundy Pillay

INTRODUCTION

Dr Jane Knight's pioneering paper raises a number of pertinent issues which developing country governments, particularly Education Ministries, as well as educators and higher education institutions need to grapple with as a matter of urgency. This is particularly so in a context where the pressures for greater liberalization of trade in higher education services is likely to increase considerably with each successive round of international trade negotiations.

This discussant piece focuses largely on the implications of the various issues that Knight has raised in her paper, for South African policy makers, educators and higher institutions. This input argues for the development of a well-defined strategy to address some of the key issues raised by Knight and makes some policy recommendations in this regard.

GATS and South Africa

With respect to the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS), South Africa has made the following limited commitments. Its 'horizontal commitments' relate to supply Mode 4, the presence of natural persons and include provisions affecting service salespersons; intra-corporate transferees, including executives, managers, specialists, and professionals.

Its sector-specific commitments are in the following seven sectors: **Business services** (including professional services; architectural services; engineering; integrated engineering; urban planning; landscape architectural; medical and dental; veterinary services; computer and related services; and real estate services); **Communication services** (including courier services and telecommunication services); **Construction and related engineering services**; **Distribution services**; **Environmental Services**; **Financial services**; and **Tourism and travel related services**.

Thus no specific commitments have yet been made in the education sector. However, South Africa has already received specific requests in this sector from New Zealand,

Norway and Kenya. In addition the United States has made a generic request to all member countries.

Requests of South Africa

New Zealand has made an initial request to South Africa to improve and/or expand its existing schedule of GATS commitments. The request covers horizontal commitments, 'Most Favoured Nation' (M FN) exemptions and the following services sectors: business services; communications services; construction and related engineering services; education services; environmental services; tourism services; recreational, cultural and sporting services; and transport services.

In education the request is for mutual recognition. In terms of the request, 'New Zealand would be interested in advancing the recognition of education or experience gained, requirements met or licenses or certificates granted, for the authorization, licensing and certification of services suppliers.'

New Zealand's focus in education services appears to be Asia although it is likely that it considers South Africa to be a potentially viable market for the export of education services as well as a gateway to the export of education services to the rest of Africa.

For New Zealand the most common mode of supply of education services would be mode 2, although in the light of the geographical distance between New Zealand and South Africa, mode 3 might be a more viable alternative.

Norway has proposed that South Africa revise and improve its GATS commitments with regards to horizontal commitments and the following services sectors: business; telecommunication; education; environmental; financial services; maritime transport; land transport; and air transport services.

In education, Norway says it 'is fully committed in this sector and, hence, is requesting similar commitments of other countries". It is unclear whether Norway regards South Africa as a potential market for its education services beyond the array of existing arrangements between the respective education ministries.

Kenya has submitted the following request for Horizontal and Specific Commitments in Services to South Africa:

- Horizontal Commitments - Mode 4: Make commitments for elimination from the application of any economic needs test or equivalent measure; extension of temporary stay of natural persons beyond the minimum period of three years;

make commitments for recognition of academic and professional qualification for persons with a university degree or equivalent technical qualifications as well as the right to practise; elimination of any restrictions on inter-corporate transfers.

- Sector specific commitments - Educational services: Take full commitments under Market Access and National Treatment.
- Additional commitments include the following: assurance that the issuance of visas and work permits will be automatic in those committed sectors and the procedural requirements are transparent and not burdensome than necessary. The fees charged for acquisition of work permits and visas should be kept at a minimum and should not exceed the cost of the service; the right of a person to appeal in case of denial of visa or work permit.

The USA request addresses (1) horizontal provisions applying to all services sectors in the schedule, and (2) sector-by-sector requests. While this request addresses all measures as they are defined in the GATS, the US "expects that under the proposed new GATS obligations, as under current obligations, each WTO member can establish, maintain and enforce its own levels of protection, inter alia, for consumers, health, safety, and the environment, as well as take actions it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests".

The U.S. definition of higher education includes all tertiary education (i.e. education beyond secondary education), including degree courses taken for college or university credits or non-degree courses taken for personal edification or pleasure or to upgrade work-related skills. Such education and training services can be provided in traditional institutional settings, such as universities or schools, or outside of traditional settings, including workplaces, homes, or elsewhere. The US requests on education also include adult education and "other" education, as well as training services and educational testing services.

In terms of market access and national treatment, members who have already done so are 'requested to provide full commitments for market access and national treatment in modes 1, 2 and 3 for higher education training services (as defined above), for adult education, and for "other" education. Consistent with the commitments, countries remain free to review and assess higher education and training, by governmental or non-governmental means, and to cooperate with other countries, for purposes of assuring quality education'. South Africa has been asked to remove 'burdensome requirements, including non-transparent needs tests, applicable to foreign universities operating, or seeking to operate in South Africa'.

GATS and South African Higher Education

The GATS is described as a voluntary agreement because countries can decide which sectors they will agree to cover under GATS rules. This is done through the preparation of their national schedules of commitments and through the 'request-offer' negotiation rounds. The extent to which the agreement is voluntary is debateable once a country commits a sector such as education, in the light of the 'progressive liberalization' requirement.

The process of progressive liberalization involves two aspects - extending GATS coverage to more service sectors and decreasing the number of and extent of measures that serve as impediments to increased trade. Therefore, in spite of the right of each country to determine the extent of its commitments, with each new round of negotiations, countries are expected to add sectors or sub-sectors to their national schedules of commitments and to negotiate the further removal of limitations on market access and national treatment.

The intention of GATS is to facilitate and promote ever-more opportunities for trade. Therefore, countries that are not interested in either the import or export of education services will most likely experience greater pressures to allow market access to foreign providers. The implication of this for South Africa is that even though it has not yet committed education as a sector, there will be increasing pressures for concessions in the international forum. Therefore it is imperative that a long-term Higher Education-GATS strategy be developed as a matter of urgency.

In the light of the issues addressed by Knight, the following set of issues would appear to be key considerations in the development of such a strategy.

1. Obtaining clarification on the term 'in the exercise of governmental authority' and its related terms 'not in competition' and 'non-commercial basis'. Clarification will enable higher education policy makers in consultation with trade negotiators, to determine whether this country can seek exemption for its education sector.
2. Related to (1) above, South Africa needs to assess the implications of having an increasingly 'mixed' system, that is, public and private providers. In addition, consideration needs to be given to the implications of already having permitted foreign providers such as Monash University, Bond University and Henley Management School to operate in the country. This assessment is particularly appropriate in the light of the MFN and national treatment requirements of GATS.

3. Are we willing to cross-trade? The possibility of 'cross-trading' across sectors will come into play during the "request/offer" stage of negotiations between two trading WTO member countries. Cross-trading can take place for all 12 service sectors covered by GATS, one of which is education. Until one knows what requests have been made of a country, it is impossible to know what impact there will be, if any, on higher education. This is why it is important for the education sector to consult with officials in the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) about requests which have been received from countries wanting access to the higher education market and what offers South Africa will make in response. In other words, will South Africa decide to trade education services in response to the request/offer negotiations?
4. Will GATS threaten public funding? GATS raises the question of the capacity and role of government with respect to providing access to higher education. For instance, as Knight points out, if education is seen as a public function, can private providers or foreign providers help to fulfil this public function, and if so, be eligible for the same subsidies?

In this regard Knight further states that "(T)he concern is that public funding directed, for example, to public education institutions would be interpreted as an unfair subsidy by a private education provider. There is concern that this might lead to a situation where public subsidies would have to be made available to private providers or, to a situation where public funding is decreased."

5. How can South Africa resist GATS partially or fully by making a case for the preservation of the quality of its higher education sector? Increased cross-border education delivery and a set of legal rules and obligations in trade agreements require that urgent attention be given to the question of quality assurance and accreditation of education providers. It is vital to have national mechanisms that have the capacity to address accreditation and quality assessment procedures for the academic programmes of new private and foreign providers. However, it is equally important that attention be given to developing both regional (SADC?) and international approaches to quality assurance and accreditation.
6. What level of market access, if any, is South Africa prepared to consider now? In five years? In ten years? Under GATS, each country has to decide the level of market access it will provide in each sector. It is up to each country to decide what commitments it will make. Undoubtedly, there will be mounting pressure over the next years for countries to open up their services sector to global market forces.

7. To what extent has South Africa undertaken the kind of analysis required to be able to argue that opening up its 'market' to educational imports, will in fact increase or decrease access, quality and development of its own educational system. More broadly, how can we assess whether opening up trade in higher education services, will result in different, more equitable outcomes between developed and developing countries than has generally resulted from the opening up of the international trade in goods?

Countries that have a commitment to education services up to early 2002 include Congo, Lesotho, Jamaica, Sierra Leone, Costa Rica, Mexico, Panama, Turkey, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Poland, Hungary, Norway, Switzerland, Leichtenstein, European Community and Japan. The commitments from these countries vary considerably according to which mode of supply they are addressing and the degree of market access they will allow. Most of the developing countries in this group have poorly-developed higher education systems. From their perspective, opening up to foreign providers may be a more cost-effective approach.

8. As the pressure for liberalization grows, all countries will make choices as to what commitments they will make regarding market access and national treatment. Therefore, developing countries are able to determine their commitments to higher education and identify restrictions. However, given the domination of industrialised countries in international trade, what 'safeguards' should South Africa establish?
9. Will liberalization increase South Africa's capacity to increase access to higher education? As Knight points out, many governments and public education institutions have felt the responsibility of ensuring broad access to higher education opportunities. In many countries this is a challenging issue as the demand for higher education is steadily growing, often beyond the capacity of the country to provide it. This may be one reason why governments in some developing countries are willing to let their students seek out-of-country opportunities and/or open up their higher education system to foreign providers. Advocates of liberalized trade maintain that students can have greater access to a wider range of education opportunities at home and abroad. Opponents of free trade believe that access may in fact be more limited as trade will commercialise education, escalate costs and lead to a two-tiered system, one for the rich and one for the poor. Trade is, therefore, often perceived by critics as a threat to the 'public good' nature of education services.
10. Will liberalization lead to less pressure on the government's higher education

budget and possibly lead to the release of some funds for other aspects of education in South Africa?

11. Given the pressures to liberalize, what kind of regulatory framework should South Africa be thinking about developing? A regulatory framework will undoubtedly be needed to deal with the diversity of providers and new cross border delivery modes, and will become more urgent as international trade increases, as Knight correctly demonstrates. In some countries, this may mean a broader approach to policy that involves licensing, regulating and monitoring both private and foreign providers to ensure that national policy objectives are met and public interests protected. In other words, what is needed is a coherent and comprehensive regulatory framework to serve national interests and protect the interests of different stakeholders, especially students.
12. How does South Africa guard against 'trade creep' in education? There is always a risk of 'trade creep' where education policy issues are increasingly framed in terms of trade. It is important to guard against the situation where international trade issues in education overshadow the more important issues such as the key objectives and rationales of higher education such as social, cultural and scientific development and the role of education in promoting democracy and citizenship.

In summary, the key issue is: Trade liberalization in higher education for whose benefit and at what cost. There are many stakeholders involved in the trade of educational services. As a result there are different agendas at play. As Knight states, policy makers, institutions and educators should ask what are the benefits to the students, the scholars, institutions and the society at large. The role of government, public institutions and private providers varies considerably from country to country. If trade is monitored and managed in a strategic manner, it may well help a country to better meet the national policy objectives and help with capacity issues.

CONCLUSION

A persuasive case can be made at this stage for not committing South Africa's higher education sector to GATS. First, the dangers of liberalization in this sector are considerable given the level of development of our system relative to that of the industrialized (and potentially exporting) countries. The dangers relate to the unequal distribution of benefits, similar to what developing countries have experienced in general in the opening up of the international trade in goods.

Second, the potential for liberalization to derail the transformation process currently underway in higher education is considerable. South Africa is undertaking a massive and difficult process to develop a more efficient higher education system. Opening up the system at this stage to an array of private and foreign providers can only add to the complications of an already delicate process. Moreover, it is likely to exacerbate regional and racial inequalities in provision and quality.

Third, we should resist the temptation to treat education in the same way that we trade goods and other services. South Africa should consider framing education in terms of global trade only when we have the necessary data and other information, undertaken the necessary assessments and developed the appropriate institutional mechanisms.

The recommendation therefore is that South Africa should not commit its higher education sector to GATS for a period of at least three years. This should constitute the basis of the response to the New Zealand, Norway and US requests.

With regard to Kenya and other developing countries that make similar requests, serious consideration should be given to meeting some of the components of the request relating particularly to the removal of some of the specific barriers such as the immigration requirements and visas and work permits. However, we should attempt to remove these barriers without committing the sector to GATS. The negotiations around the removal or easing of the barriers should be done through consultations with the Department of Home Affairs and DTI.

It is clear, however, that the country will not be able to resist committing the sector for any period beyond the short- and medium-terms. Thus it will be vital to use the intervening period to develop a strategy that addresses the key issues raised in this paper. Based on the preceding analysis, the elements of such a strategy and their timeframes can be summed up as follows: (for the purposes of this analysis, the short or immediate term refers to the period until the end of 2004; the medium term extends to the end of 2005; and the long term to the end of 2007, thus slightly less than five years from now).

1. Obtain clarification on the term 'in exercise of governmental authority' and its related terms 'not in competition' and 'non-commercial basis' (short term).
2. Undertake research to determine the possible impact on the South African higher education system of liberalization including whether it will increase the capacity of the system, as well as its impact on access and equity. Include here also an assessment of the implications of having a mixed system of public and private providers (medium term).

3. Consult with the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) about whether 'cross-trading' will be necessary (short term).
4. Conduct an analysis to determine whether GATS will threaten public funding (medium term).
5. Make case for resisting GATS as long as possible by focusing on the need to preserve quality (short term). Consider what needs to be done to develop national mechanisms for addressing accreditation and quality assessment procedures for academic programmes of new private and foreign providers (medium term). Consider the development of both regional (SADC) and international approaches to quality assurance and accreditation (long term).
6. Develop a timeframe for the level of market access that South Africa may be willing to consider for the next decade (short term).
7. In consultation with DTI, develop 'safeguards' to prevent the replication of inequitable outcomes in higher education trade vis a vis industrialized (exporting) countries (long term). Consultations with other developing, especially African countries, is crucial here.
8. Undertake an analysis to determine what the impact of liberalization would be on public funding of higher education (medium term).
9. Given the pressures to liberalize, start developing a regulatory framework to deal with the diversity of providers and new delivery modes (medium to long term).

**PRESENTATION BY THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION,
PROFESSOR KADER ASMAL, TO THE PORTFOLIO
COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND INDUSTRY:
IMPLICATIONS OF THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON
TRADE IN SERVICES (GATS) ON HIGHER EDUCATION
(4 MARCH 2003)**

I am pleased to have the unique opportunity to engage you on this important topic. This must surely be the first occasion on which the Minister of Education addresses the Portfolio Committee on Trade and Industry. This discussion comes at an important point in the history of higher education in our country, as we are poised to implement our agenda for the transformation and reconstruction of the system. This process of renewal is designed to ensure that the higher education system is able to respond to the country's high level human resource and research needs for the 21st century in an equitable, effective and efficient manner. The size, configuration and priorities of the system will be shaped by the key policy imperatives of the Government. However, there is the real possibility that external pressure on the system, in particular the impact of GATS, could have a negative impact on our transformation agenda, especially if its influence on education is not carefully regulated.

The World Trade Organisation (WTO) defines education services by reference to Primary Education Services; Secondary Education Services; Higher (Tertiary) Education Services; Adult Education; and Other Education Services. Although there are implications for all four categories, I will largely confine today's input to higher education.

However, let me say at the outset that the designation of education as a service is in itself a problem. Education is surely not a commodity to be bought and sold. A reductionist view of education as merely an instrument for the transfer of skills should have no place in our world-view. Education must embrace the intellectual, cultural, political and social development of individuals, institutions and the nation more broadly. We cannot sacrifice this 'public good' agenda to the vagaries of the market.

International 'trade' in education services, particularly at the higher education level, has grown significantly in the past period, with increasing numbers of students studying outside their home country, increased international marketing of academic programmes, the establishment of overseas 'branch campuses' etc. Terms such as 'transnational' and 'borderless' education have gained currency to describe "real or virtual

movement of students, teachers, knowledge and academic programs from one country to another" (Knight, 2002). By 1995, the global market for international higher education was estimated at US\$ 27 billion. The United States (US) is the leading exporter of education services, with higher education being the country's fifth largest service sector export. The main export markets are in Asia, accounting for 58% of all US exports, followed by countries in Europe and Latin America. (WTO Council for Trade in Services Background Notes, September 1998).

In the main, the movement of students and staff is from the south to the north, while export of educational services in the form, amongst others, of educational information, provision and facilities, such as branch campuses etc., is in the reverse direction.

The impact of private foreign providers on African higher education over the past period has been particularly devastating. This has been especially so because higher education in much of Africa was already weakened by the effects of World Bank driven policy that developing countries should largely concentrate on building up basic and secondary education provision, since these were considered to offer greater individual and social returns. Although I am glad to say that the World Bank has subsequently revised its views in this regard, this change has come too late for many countries in Africa.

The GATS identifies four 'modes of supply', i.e. ways in which services can be traded. I am sure you will be familiar with these modes since they are applicable to all services. However, it is useful to summarise these with examples of their potential reach in higher education. These are:

- **cross border supply** where the service crosses the border. This would include distance education, e-learning and virtual universities.
- **consumption abroad** where the service involves the movement of the consumer to the country of the supplier. This includes students who go to another country to study.
- **commercial presence** where the service provider has facilities in another country to render service. This includes branch campuses and franchising arrangements.
- **presence of natural persons** where persons travel to another country on a temporary basis to provide a service. This includes academics working outside their own borders.

As you know, within the WTO, each country is expected to identify those services for which it wishes to provide access to foreign providers, including the extent of com-

mitment and the conditions for such access. Notwithstanding this, there are a number of general obligations, such as the 'Most Favoured Nation' (MFN) element, applicable to all trade in services, which, as some have argued, may apply even when a country has made no specific commitments to provide foreign access to their markets. This provision requires equal and consistent treatment of foreign trading partners, although exemptions for a period of 10 years are permissible. This may have particular implications for countries that already provide access to foreign providers. For example, it is possible that the provision of government subsidies to public institutions could be challenged as unfair treatment. It could be argued that subsidies should be provided to all institutions, public and private.

It is also important to note that, once a commitment is scheduled, it cannot be changed, even in the light of subsequent changes to local regulatory frameworks/contexts, unless such amendments are re-negotiated.

In terms of coverage, the GATS applies to all services with two exceptions, one being services provided in **the exercise of governmental authority** and the other to air traffic rights. "In the exercise of governmental authority" is said to mean that the service is provided on a 'non-commercial basis' and 'not in competition' with other service suppliers. However, these terms are subject to interpretation. Some contend that education provided and funded by governments is exempted while others argue that public sector service providers are not exempt, especially in countries where there is both public and private provision of education.

GATS is also premised on so-called progressive liberalisation of trade in service. This means that with each round of negotiations, countries are expected to add sectors to their schedules of commitments. Thus, the pressure to allow market access to foreign providers is likely to increase.

In addition to the national schedules of commitments, there are bilateral negotiations ("request-offer" negotiations) on market access and national treatment commitments, which requires equal treatment for foreign and domestic providers. Knight (2002) highlights that "sectors for which access is sought do not have to correspond to those for which requests made. So Country A may request of Country B greater access to transportation services. Country B can respond by requesting access to educational services". This is particularly of concern to countries that have not made commitments in education, because it does make education vulnerable to deals across sectors.

South Africa has not made any commitments in education. However, to date, four countries have made requests of South Africa. These are Kenya, New Zealand, Norway and the US. In all four cases, the request is that South Africa ensures that there

are no limits whatsoever on service providers from these countries that wish to operate in South Africa and that they be treated no less favourably than their South African counterparts. The US request further requests that South Africa removes "burdensome requirements, including non-transparent needs tests, applicable to foreign universities operating, or seeking to operate, in South Africa".

Some 44 of the 144 WTO members have made commitments to education, with 21 including higher education. Congo, Lesotho, Jamaica and Sierra Leone have made full unconditional commitments in higher education, presumably with the intention of encouraging foreign providers to help develop their systems. (Knight). The European Union has included higher education in their schedules with limitations on all modes of trade except 'consumption abroad', which as you will remember refers to services involving the movement of the consumer to the country of the supplier. Four countries - USA, New Zealand, Australia and Japan have submitted negotiating proposals outlining their interests and issues.

How then should we act, given this complex terrain? Our response should be firmly located within a commitment to genuine international collaborations and partnerships in education, which is critically important to the health of any higher education system. It should not be informed by parochialism and narrow chauvinism.

Each and every one of our public universities and technikons has a rich history of partnerships with sister institutions across the globe. These relationships include staff and student exchanges, support for capacity building, research linkages etc. They are partnerships between peers, shaped for mutual benefit and not for commercial purposes. We are also deeply committed to our responsibilities in the SADC. In this regard, all SADC students studying at South African universities and technikons are treated as home students for purpose of Government subsidy. This translates into a significant annual financial commitment to the SADC protocol. We have also been at the forefront of ensuring that unnecessary barriers (such as costly and onerous procedures/requirements for obtaining study and work permits) to international academic interchange are removed.

Regrettably, trade liberalisation is impacting on these efforts to internationalise higher education. Of particular concern is whether limited financial resources might increasingly be used for trade driven activities rather than those that emphasise intellectual and social gains.

My views are also shaped by our experience, over the past years, with the regulation of the private higher education sector, including foreign providers. Prior to 1997 and the promulgation of the Higher Education Act, which provides the statutory basis for

the regulation of private higher education, there was a legal and policy vacuum with respect to this sector. This vacuum was exploited and resulted in the proliferation of both local and foreign private providers of varying and sometimes dubious quality.

With specific reference to the foreign providers, South Africa was seen as a fertile market for growth and furthermore, a spring board to the rest of the sub-Continent. In particular, institutions from the United Kingdom, Australia and the US either began operations in South Africa or surveyed the field. In most instances, their focus was on areas of study, such as the MBA and other commerce and management programmes, where we already have significant capacity in the country, but which would be financially lucrative markets. The unbridled growth of these providers would have had a profound effect on the public higher education system, which was in the process of transformation and renewal. Let me illustrate this by just one example. A foreign institution, which I shall not name, unashamedly targeted the recruitment of students from high-income groups and particularly white students who may otherwise have gone overseas to study. As you can imagine, the impact of such agendas on our efforts to build non-racial South African higher education institutions can be quite profound.

I am pleased to say that, through the implementation of our policy and legal frameworks, we have been able to ensure the planned development of the private sector in ways that do not threaten the sustainability and integrity of the higher education system as a whole. I must emphasise that this is not an attempt to exclude foreign institutions but to ensure that those who operate in South Africa do so with due regard to our policy goals and priorities and in ways that meet our national transformation agenda and quality assurance requirements.

It is important that we remain vigilant to ensure that increased trade in education does not undermine our national efforts to transform higher education and, in particular to strengthen the public sector so that it can effectively participate in an increasingly globalising environment. Trade considerations cannot be allowed to erode the 'public good' agenda for higher education. Higher education must play a central role in nurturing the values of our democracy and to help build a critical citizenry. As argued by the Chief Executive Officer of the Council on Higher Education, Saleem Badat, "the achievement of equity, development, justice and democracy in South Africa requires academics and higher education institutions to become powerhouses of knowledge production and knowledge dissemination and diffusion, and of the formation of new generations of thinkers and actors" (Re-inserting the 'Public Good' into Higher Education Transformation, 2001).

We cannot also countenance the excessive marketisation and commodification of higher education, which amongst others, can lead to the unfortunate homogenisation of

academic approaches and can undermine institutional cultures, academic values and the search for truth.

At the recent Council on Higher Education Colloquium on Building Relationships between Higher Education and the Private and Public Sectors, Minister Erwin was forthright: "Knowledge is not a commodity and can never be one. Knowledge is the distillation of human endeavour and it is the most profound collective good that there is." Minister Erwin goes on to argue that the more knowledge is turned into a commodity and privatised "the more it will either corrode the collective knowledge base or itself corrode as it distances itself from that collective wellspring"

GATS in education, then, has huge implications for our knowledge base. I do not need to remind you that under globalisation, knowledge is indeed the wellspring, the electricity for our country's economic and social development.

We are not alone in having reservations about GATS in education. Members of the Committee will be interested to know that there is a 'Joint Declaration on Higher Education and the General Agreement on Trade in Services', adopted by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, American Council on Education, European University Association and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. The declaration encourages countries not to make commitments in Higher Education Services' or in the 'Adult Education' and 'Other Education Services' categories of the GATS. According to Knight, "instead it supports the notion of reducing obstacles to international trade in higher education using conventions and agreements outside of a trade policy regime".

It would only be fair for us to ask what value can be added by GATS in higher education. The proponents of GATS will argue that the potential benefits are as follows:
-it provides a strategy to attract foreign providers by creating certainty in the regulatory environment. This could be a desirable strategy to attract capacity in areas of scarce or specialised skills;

- it provides a platform for South African providers to export services;
- it creates leverage possibilities in the broader negotiations, particularly with respect to sectors that South Africa might wish to gain market access i.e. as a bargaining tool.

Regarding certainty in the regulatory environment, we already have this. We have a transparent policy and legislative framework for the registration of private providers - both local and foreign. Our quality assurance regime applies the same criteria and conditions for all providers.

With respect to the export of services, some of our institutions are active in the rest of

Africa (and other parts of the world). We will have to ensure that we conduct ourselves within a principled framework that does not adversely affect our fellow Africans.

Finally, we certainly could use education as a bargaining tool. But given the relationship between education, and culture and society, we must be certain that we do not bargain away our values, our hard won independence and our ability to contribute to the global pool of knowledge and innovation.

I am pleased to report that officials from my Department have been having good discussions with their colleagues in the Department of Trade and Industry and are well on the way to developing a coordinated approach to GATS in education. I am also awaiting a report from the Council on Higher Education on the challenges of GATS and our options in this regard.

While those of us in education acknowledge that there may, in the long term, be enough flexibility within GATS to protect the integrity of our national regulatory frameworks within larger multilateral frameworks, we believe that, at this point, there is more to be lost than gained from making any commitments in education within the GATS. Instead, we favour the strengthening of our current activities designed to promote our role in the global environment. At the same time, there is a transparent framework to govern those foreign providers that choose to operate in South Africa.

In conclusion, I hope I have managed to convey to you some of the complexities of the matter before us. The unintended consequences and costs of trade liberalisation in education cannot be underestimated. My proposal to you is that, at least for the moment, we do not make any commitments in the education sector. Furthermore, given the concerns in different parts of the world, we must ask whether there should not be a fundamental re-thinking of the inclusion of education in GATS. We must engage with GATS in a way that holds promise for our own agendas and needs. We must avoid at all costs a GATS in education that puts our education, our culture and our future in peril.

THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TRADE IN SERVICES: A BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mymoena Adriaanse

Literature on GATS

- Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2001. *WTO Ministers Reaffirm "Right to Regulate" in GATS*. Available http://www.dfat.gov.au/media/releases/trade/2001/mvt154_01.html
- Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2002. *Developments in the World Trade Organisation (WTO)*. Available <http://www.tradedata.net/cibre/tinfo/policy/multilateral/dfat.htm>
- Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2003a. *Fact Sheet: A New Round of Global Trade Negotiations: What is the DOHA Round of Trade Negotiations?* Available http://www.dfat.gov.au/trade/fs_new_round_global_trade_negotiations.html
- Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2003b. *Fact Sheet: The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS)*. Available http://www.dfat.gov.au/trade/negotiations/gats_factsheet.html
- Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2003c. *Main Features of the GATS Agreement*. Available http://www.dfat.gov.au/trade/negotiations/services/main_features_gats_agreement.html
- Barlow, M. 2000. *A GATS Primer*. Available http://www.canadians.org/documents/campaigns-gats_primer.pdf
- Canadian Federation of Students. 2001. *Brief on the General Agreement on Trade in Services*. Toronto: Canadian Federation of Students.
- Deardoff, A. 2001. International Provision of Services, Trade and Fragmentation. *Review of International Economics*, 9, 233-148.
- ESIB (The National Unions of Students in Europe). 2003. *GATS Briefing for NUS's*. Available <http://www.esib.org/commodification/documents/gatsbriefing.html>

- EUA (European University Association). 2002. *The Bologna Process and the GATS Negotiations*. Geneva: EUA (European University Association). Available <http://www.unige.ch/eua/En/Activities/WTO/GATSMEMO100602.pdf>
- FOEI (Friends of the Earth International). 2002. *Primer on the General Agreement on Trade in Services*. Geneva: FOEI (Friends of the Earth International). Available <http://www.foei.org/publications/trade/primer.pdf>
- Fosse, F. 2001. *An Introduction to the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) for Gender Advocates*. Available www.genderandtrade.net/GATS/GATS_Intro.pdf
- Ghosh, J. 2001. Trading in Basic Needs. *National Magazine*, 18(9). Available <http://www.flonnet.com/fl1809/18091040.htm>
- Lambert, J. and Lucas, C. 2002. *General Agreement on Trade in Services: Response to UK Consultation on Requests*. Available <http://www.wdm.org.uk/cambriefs/gatssubs/political%20parties/greenmeps.pdf>
- Mashayekhi, M. and Julsaint, M. 2002. *Assessment of Trade in Services in the Context of the GATS 2000 Negotiations*. Available <http://www.southcentre.org/publications/tradeinservices/paper13.pdf>
- Mattoo, A. 1999. *Financial Services and the World Trade Organization: Liberalization Commitments of the Developing and Transition Economies*. Policy Research Working Paper No. 2184. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- McCarthy, S. 1999. Public Must be Persuaded Open Markets are Beneficial. *Globe and Mail*, September.
- Mtume, G. 2002. WTO: Trading Services: an Opening or a Noose? *Africa Recovery*, 16(1), 26.
- Nielson, J. 2000. *Electronic Commerce - Existing GATS Commitments for Online Supply of Services*. Paris: OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development).
- Nielson, J. 2002. *Service Providers on the Move: A Close Look at Labour Mobility and the GATS*. Paris: OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development).

- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development). 1994. *The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS): An Analysis*. Paris: OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development).
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development). 2002. *GATS: The Case for Open Service Markets*. Paris: OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development).
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2003. *A Not-Very-Happy-New-Year for GATS Negotiators*. Available <http://peopleandplanet.org/news/news.php?story=262>
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2003. *Fury at EU Gats Leak*. Available <http://peopleandplanet.org/news/news.php?story=303>
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2003. *Trade Negotiators Bombarded by United Uni Opposition to GATS*. Available <http://peopleandplanet.org/news/news.php?story=292>
- Rajan, R. S. and Sen, R. 2002. *Liberalisation of International Trade in Financial Services in Southeast Asia: Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Thailand*. Discussion Paper No. 0217. Australia: Centre for International Economic Studies.
- Sinclair, S. 2000a. *After Seattle: How the WTO 'Services 2000' Negotiations Threaten Democratic Governance*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Sinclair, S. 2000b. *Summary: Sequel to Seattle GATS: How the World Trade Organization's New "Services" Negotiations Threaten Democracy*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. Available <http://www.esib.org/commodification/documents/GATSServicesDemocracy.pdf>
- Trade Committee. 2000. *Assessing Barriers to Trade in Services: The Scheduling of Economic Needs Tests in the GATS: An overview*. Paris: Trade Committee. Available [http://appli1.oecd.org/olis/1999doc.nsf/63c71d2d4054d0fdc125685d0053aee4/c1256927006223ffc125699700439072/\\$FILE/JT00100472.DOC](http://appli1.oecd.org/olis/1999doc.nsf/63c71d2d4054d0fdc125685d0053aee4/c1256927006223ffc125699700439072/$FILE/JT00100472.DOC)
- UNESCO. 2001. *Trade in Higher Education and GATS Links*. Available http://www.unesco.org/education/studyingabroad/highlights/global_forum/gats_he/basics_links.shtml

- WDM (World Development Movement). 2001. *GATS Debated: Transcript from You and Yours*, BBC Radio 4, 12.04 - 1.00pm, Wednesday 17th October 2001. Available <http://www.wdm.org.uk/campaign/GATSyouandyours.htm>
- WDM (World Development Movement). 2002. Leaked European Negotiating Documents Confirm WDM's Fears About the GATS. *GATS Campaign Update*, May. Available <http://www.wdm.org.uk/cambriefs/updateEULeaks.pdf>
- WDM (World Development Movement). 2003. *Press Release: Leaked Documents Reveal UK Government Hypocrisy Over Trade Agreement Danger*. Available <http://www.wdm.org.uk/presrel/current/109gatsleak.htm>
- Woodroffe, J. 2002. *GATS: A Disservice to the Poor*. London: WDM (World Development Movement). Available <http://www.wdm.org.uk/cambriefs/gatsdiss.pdf>
- World Bank. 2001. *Global Economic Prospects and the Developing Countries 2002*. Washington D. C.: World Bank.
- WTO (World Trade Organisation). 1999. *An Introduction to the GATS*. Available http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/gsintr_e.doc
- WTO (World Trade Organisation). 2002. *The GATS: Objectives, Coverage and Disciplines*. Available http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/gatsqa_e.htm
- WTO (World Trade Organization). 2000. *The Design and Underlying Principles of the GATS*. Available <http://gsis.ewha.ac.kr/curriculum/services.htm>

Literature on GATS and Education

- Ansink, J. 2001. *U S Denounces 'Protectionism' of European Education Market: Under the Guise of Quality*. Available <http://www.nuffic.nl/nuffic50years/usdenoun.html>
- APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Co-Operation). 2001. *Measures Affecting Trade and Investment in Education Services in the Asia-Pacific Region: A Report to the APEC Group on Services 2000*. Singapore: APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Co-Operation).

- Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. 2003. *International Trade in Services - Communication from Australia - Negotiating Proposal for Education Services*. Available http://www.dfat.gov.au/trade/negotiations/services/np_education.html
- Booth, T. 2001. Decoding the Educational Services Negotiations. *CAUT-ACPPU Bulletin Online*, April. Available http://www.caut.ca/english/bulletin/2001_apr/pres.asp
- CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers). 1999. *Trade Talks - Risk to Education*. Available http://www.caut.ca/english/bulletin/99_nov/trade.htm
- CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers). 2001a. Canada Targets Education in GATS Talks. *CAUTNOW*, 3(3). Available http://www.caut.ca/english/publications/now/20010315_gats.asp
- CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers). 2001b. Education at Risk in WTO Talks. *CAUT-ACPPU Bulletin Online*, November. Available http://www.caut.ca/english/bulletin/2001_nov/news/wto.asp
- CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers). 2001c. Education at Risk in WTO Talks: Legal Opinion. *CAUT-ACPPU News Release*, October. Available http://www.caut.ca/english/publications/news_releases/20011029_gats.asp
- CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers). 2001d. Education Services are Non Negotiable. *CAUT-ACPPU Bulletin Online*, November. Available http://www.caut.ca/english/bulletin/2001_nov/news/services.asp
- CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers). 2002. United States Pushes to Open World Markets for Education Services. *CAUT-ACPPU Bulletin Online*, June. Available http://www.caut.ca/english/bulletin/2002_june/news/united.asp
- CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers). 2003. EU Excludes Education. *CAUT-ACPPU Bulletin Online*, March. Available http://www.caut.ca/english/bulletin/2003_mar/news/eu.asp
- CFS. 2001. *General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS): Impact on Education in Canada: Summary of Key Findings*. Available http://www.cfs-fcee.ca/pre_campaigns/materials/doc-200110-gats_legal_sum.pdf

- Cohen, M. G. 2000. The General Agreement on Trade in Services: Implications for Public Post-Secondary Education in Australia. *Australian Universities Review*, 42(2), 9-15.
- Colas, B. and Gottlieb, R. 2001. *GATS Impact on Education in Canada: Legal Opinion*. Ottawa: (CAUT) Canadian Association of University Teachers.
- Education International (EI) and Public Service International (PSI). 2000. *The WTO and the Millennium Round: What is at Stake for Public Education? Common Concerns for Workers in Education and Public Sector*. Available <http://www.ei-ie.org/pub/english/epbeipsiwto.html>
- ESIB (The National Unions of Students in Europe). 2002. *Commodification of Education: Introductory Information*. Available http://www.esib.org/commodification/documents/ESIB_Info_sheet_on_GATS.pdf
- ESIB (The National Unions of Students in Europe). 2002. *Policy Paper on the Commodification of Education*. Available <http://www.esib.org/policies/CommodificationEducation.pdf>
- ESIB (The National Unions of Students in Europe). 2003. *March 13 2003: European Action Day Against GATS and for Public Education*. Available <http://www.esib.org/news/gatsactiondaypress.htm>
- Hirtt, N. 2000. *Will Education Go to Market?* Available http://www.unesco.org/courier/2000_02/uk/apprend/txt1.htm
- HRK. 2002. *HRK Plenary Session on the Coming New Round of GATS Negotiations: Public Education is Not a Tradable Commodity*. Available <http://www.hrk.de/e/282.htm>
- IFC (International Finance Corporation). 2001. *Investing in Private Education: IFC's Strategic Directions*. Washington D.C.: IFC (International Finance Corporation).
- Keuhn, L. 2000. *Keep Public Education Out of Trade Agreements*. Paper produced at the World Forum for People's Education Conference, which was held in Santiago, Chile during November 2000. Available <http://www.esib.org/commodification/documents/KeepPublicEducationOut.pdf>

- Langlois, R. 1999. *The WTO and the Millennium Round: What is at Stake for Public Education?* Brussels: Education International, p.7.
- Lenn, M.P. 1997. *The Global Alliance for Transnational Education: Transnational Education and the Quality Imperative*. Available <http://www.lmcp.jussieu.fr/eunis/html3/congres/EUNIS97/papers/031901.html>
- NCITE (National Committee on International Trade in Education). 2001. *NCITE Update - Chilly Climate in South Africa*. Available http://www.tradeineducation.org/general_info/update020901.pdf
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development). 2002. *Current Commitments Under the GATS in Educational Services*. Washington, D.C.: OECD/CERI.
- Sauve, P. 2002. *Trade, Education and the GATS: What's in, What's out, What's all the Fuss About?* Washington, D.C.: OECD/CERI.
- WTO. 2001. *Communication from New Zealand: Negotiating Proposal on Education Services: Council for Trade in Services*. Available http://www.mft.govt.nz/foreign/tnd/wtonegotiations/topics/services_prop2.html

Literature on GATS and Higher Education

- ACE (American Council on Education). 2000. *An Overview of Higher Education and GATS*. Available <http://www.acenet.edu/programs/international/gats/overview.cfm>
- Adams, T. 1999. *The Internationalisation of Australian and Canadian Universities: A Comparison*. Paris: INTRUDA.
- Aldridge, E. 2001. Ethics and Cash. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 23 March.
- Altbach, P. G. 1996. *The International Academic Profession: Portraits of Fourteen Countries*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Altbach, P. G. and McGill, P. 1998. Internationalise American Higher Education? Not Exactly. *Change*, 30, 36-39.

- Altbach, P.G. 2001. Higher Education and the WTO: Globalization Run Amok. *International Higher Education*, Spring, No.23, 2-4.
- Anderson, E. 1996. International Education in Australia: Historical Trends, Current Developments, and Challenges for the Future. In Blumenthal, P., Goodwin, C., Smith, A. and Teichler, U. (eds.) *Academic Mobility in a Changing World*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 286-299.
- Ansink, J. 2002. *The GATS Need Not Be a Disaster*. Paper Presented at the Nuffic Conference: The Global Higher Education Market: Shifting Roles, Changing Rules, held at The Hague during 19th March. Available <http://www.nuffic.nl/nuffic50years/papers3.html>
- Ascher, B. 1997. Is Quality Assurance in Education Consistent with International Trade Agreements? In *International Trade in Professional Services: Advancing Liberalisation Through Regulatory Reform*. Paris: OECD(Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development).
- Ascher, B. 2001. *Education and Training Services in International Trade Agreements*. Paper prepared for Conference on Higher Education and Training in the Global Marketplace: Exporting Issues and Trade Agreements held in Washington D.C. on 10 May 2001.
- Ascher, B. 2002. *Education and Training in International Trade Agreements*. Paper prepared for Distance Education and Training Council News.
- Asmal, K. 2003. *Presentation by the Minister of Education, Professor Kader Asmal MP, to the Portfolio Committee on Trade and Industry: Implications of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) on Higher Education*. Cape Town: South African Parliament, Cape Town, 4 March 2003.
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), ACE (American Council on Education), EUA (European University Association) and CHEA (Council for Higher Education Accreditation). 2001. *Joint Declaration on Higher Education and the General Agreement on Trade in Services*. Available <http://www.aic.lv/ace/gats/jointdec.html>
- AUCC (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada). 1992. What is Internationalisation? *Uniworl*d, Winter/Spring.

- AUCC (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada). 2001. *Canadian Higher Education and the GATS: AUCC Background Paper*. Available http://www.aucc.ca/_pdf/english/reports/2001/gats_07_e.pdf
- AUT (Association of University Teachers). 2001. *Globalisation Threat to Universities*. Available <http://www.aut.org.uk/news/88.html>
- AUT (Association of University Teachers). 2002. *Response to DTI Consultation on the General Agreement on Trade and Services*. Available <http://www.aut.org.uk/pandp/documents/gatsconsultation.pdf>
- AUT (Association of University Teachers). 2003a. *GATS and Higher Education*. Available http://www.aut.org.uk/pandp/publications_fset.html?briefings/gatsbriefing.html~main
- AUT (Association of University Teachers). 2003b. *Trade Liberalisation in Higher Education*. Available <http://www.aut.org.uk/campaigns/int-fset.html?international/gats.html~main>
- Baker, M., Creedy, J and Johnson, D. 1996. *Internationalisation and Higher Education: Goals and Strategies*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Barrow, C. W. 1991. Social Investment in Massachusetts Public Higher Education: A Comparative Analysis. *New England Journal of Public Policy*, 7(2), 85-110.
- Barrow, C. W. 1996. The New Economy and the Restructuring of Higher Education. *Thought and Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal*, 12 Spring, 37-54.
- Barrow, C.W. 1993. Will the Fiscal Crisis Force Higher Education to Restructure? *Thought and Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal*, 9, 25-39.
- Baty, P. 2002. Go-Ahead for Corporate Degrees. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 29 November.
- Baumgratz-Gangl, G. 1996. Developments in the Internationalization of Higher Education in Europe. In Blumenthal, P., Goodwin, C., Smith, A. and Teichler, U. (eds.) *Academic Mobility in a Changing World*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 103-128.

- Bennell, P. and Pearce, T. 1998. *The Internationalisation of Higher Education: Exporting Education to Developing and Transitional Economics*. Working Paper. Institute of Development Studies.
- Benner, P., et. al. 2002. GATS Gains and Losses *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 2 August.
- Booth, T. 2000. *Academic Freedom as Just Another Commodity*. Available http://www.caut.ca/english/bulletin/2000_sep/pres.htm
- Bowen, H. 1980. *The Cost of Higher Education: How Much Do Colleges and Universities Spend Per Student and How Much Should They Spend?*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Brazziel, W. F. 1981. College-Corporate Partnerships in Higher Education. *Educational Record*, 622, 50-53.
- Bremer, L. and van der Wende, M.C. 1995. *Internationalizing the Curriculum in Higher Education*. The Hague: Nuffic.
- Brett, A., et. al. 1988. *Higher Education in Partnership with Industry: Opportunities and Strategies for Training, Research, and Economic Development*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Brubacher, J.S. and Rudy, W. 1997. *Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities*. 4th ed. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Calbert, J. and Keuhn, L. 1993. *Pandora's Box: Corporate Power, Free Trade and Education*. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Education Foundation.
- CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers). 2000. *The General Agreement on Trade in Services: What's at Stake for Post-Secondary Education?* Available <http://www.caut.ca/english/issues/trade/gats-stakes.asp>
- CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers). 1999. *Higher Education Unions Plan Pro-Active Agenda*. Available http://www.caut.ca/english/bulletin/99_nov/budapest.htm
- CBIE. 1993. Economic and Social Challenges: New Educational Paradigms and Needed Attitude Changes. *Synsthesis*, Autumn.

- Cemmel, J. 2000. *Higher Education in the GATS Negotiations: The European Approach*. Available <http://www.esib.org/commodification/documents/BolognaGATS.rtf>
- Chmura, T. J. 1987. The Higher Education-Economic Development Connection: Emerging Roles for Colleges and Universities. *Economic Development Commentary*, 11(3), 1-7.
- Cohen, M.G. 2000. *The World Trade Organisation and Post-Secondary Education: Implications for the Public System in Australia*. Adelaide: Hawke Institute, University of South Australia. Working Paper Series No. 1.
- Commission of the European Communities. 2003. *The Role of the Universities in the Europe of Knowledge*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.
- Commission on International Education. 1995. *Educating Americans for a World in Flux: Ten Ground Rules for Internationalising Higher Education*. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Davis, C. 2002. Unions Fear GATS Impact. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 1 November
- Davis, C. 2003. GATS Threat is Lifted - For Now. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 14 February.
- De Wit, H. 1995. *Strategies for Internationalisation of Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America*. Amsterdam: The European Association for International Education.
- Dean, J. and Harrop, C. 2002. *Mind the GATS*. Available <http://www.eusa.ed.ac.uk/external/mind%20the%20gats.pdf>
- Didou-Aupetit, S., Mallea, J. and Barrow, C.W. ? *Globalisation, Trade Liberalisation and Higher Education in North America*. Unpublished Document.
- Duke, C. 2002. Cyberbole, Commerce and Internationalisation: 'Desperate Hope and Fear'. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(2), 93-114.
- EI (Education International). 2002. *GATS Update*. Available http://www.ei-ie.org/action/english/Globalisation/etr_GATS%20Update_dec01.htm

- EI (Education International). 2002. What GATS Means to Higher *Education*. *Education International Quarterly Magazine*, March, 6-7.
- EI/PSI (Education International/Public Service International). 2000. *Great Expectations: The Future of Trade in Services*. Belgium: Education International and Public Services International. Available http://www.esib.org/commodification/documents/EI-PSI_Great_Expectations.pdf
- Ensor, L. 2003. *Asmal Warns Against Trade Agreement*. Available <http://allafrica.com/stories/200303050547.html>
- ESIB. 2001. *Education, Trade Liberalisation and CHOGM*. Available http://www.esib.org/commodification/documents/nus_australia_gats.pdf
- ESIB. 2003. *Speech Outline Exploring the Social Dimension of the EHEA and Consequences of Conceptualising HE as a Public Good*. Available <http://www.esib.org/news/athensspeech.htm>
- EUA (European University Association). 2002. *GATS (WTO) and the Implications for Higher Education in Europe*. Available <http://www.unige.ch/eua/En/Activities/WTO/>
- European Commission/OECD. 1994. *Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education*. Report of a Pilot Project. Paris: OECD.
- Fairweather, J. S. 1988. Entrepreneurship and Higher Education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, No. 6. Washington D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Fine, P. 2001. GATS Poses Threat to Public Learning. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 2 November.
- Gallagher, M. 2000. *Corporate Universities, Higher Education and the Future: Emerging Policy Issues*. Sydney: DETYA.
- Garavalia, B. 1992. The Private Sector/Educational Partnership for International Competence. In Klasek, C. B. (Ed.), *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalising Higher Education*. Carbondale: Association of International Education Administrators.

- Gibbons, M. 2002. Letter: Raise GATS Game. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 15 March.
- Gottlieb and Pearson. 2001. *GATS Impact on Education in Canada: Legal Opinion*. Prepared for the Canadian Association of University Teachers. Available <http://www.caut.ca/english/issues/trade/gats-opinion.asp>
- Haarder, B. 2001. *The Future Global Context and its Likely Influence on Higher Education*. Available <http://www.csus.edu/iaup/haarder.htm>
- Hartridge, D. 2000. *Service Trade and Globalisation - Government Services and Public Policy Concerns*. Speech Given to the European Services Forum, Brussels, 27 November.
- Held, D., et. al. 1999. *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Hirsch, D. 2001. 7th OECD. E-Learning in Post Secondary Education Seminar, held in Tokyo during 5-6 June 2001.
- Honeck, D.B. 2000. Transnational Education Provisions: Enabling Access or Generating Exclusion. *Higher Education in Europe*, 25(3), 291-295.
- Huisman, J., Maassen, P. and Neave, G. 2001. *Higher Education and the Nation State: The International Dimension of Higher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Humphries, J. 1996. *Where the Students are: An Analysis of the Major Competing Countries for the International Student Market*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- James, O. 2002. GATS Protection. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 5 April.
- Jobbins, D. 2002. V-cs Seek Openness in Talks on Free Trade. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 12 July.
- Johnstone, B. D. 1993. The Costs of Higher Education: Worldwide Issues and Trends for the 1990's. In Altbach, P.G. and Johnstone, B.D. (eds.) *The Funding of Higher Education: International Perspectives*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 3-24.

- Johnstone, W.B. 1991. Global Workforce 2000: The New World Labor Market. *Harvard Business Review*, 69, 115-27.
- Jongbloed, B. *Lifelong Learning: Implications for Institutions*. Enschede: CHEPS.
- Kettinger, W.J. and Wertz, R.D. 1993. The Financial Restructuring of Higher Education: Reengineering or Radical Reform? *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 9(1), 13-27.
- Kimber, C. 2003. Why Clare Short is Wrong on GATS Deal. *Socialist Worker*, January, No.1833. Available <http://www.socialistworker.co.uk/1833/sw183314.htm>
- Kirby, D. and Mallea, J. R. 2002. *Globalization, Trade Liberalization and Higher Education: Research Areas and Questions*. Occasional Papers in Higher Education, No. 10. Canada: CHERD (Centre for Higher Education Research and Development).
- Knight, J. 1999. *A Time of Turbulence and Transformation for Internationalization*. Canada: Research Monograph Canadian Bureau for International Education, No. 14.
- Knight, J. 1999. Issues and Trends in Internationalisation: A Comparative Perspective. In Bond, S. and Lemasson, J.P. (Eds.) *A New World Of Knowledge: Canadian Universities and Globalization*, Ottawa: International Development Research Centre (IDRC), 201-239.
- Knight, J. 2002. *The Impact of Trade Liberalization on Higher Education: Policy Implications*. Available <http://www.ulaval.ca/BI/Globalisation-Universities/pages/actes/JaneKnight.pdf>
- Knight, J. 2002. Trade Creep: Implications of GATS for Higher Education Policy. *International Higher Education*, Summer, No.28, 5-7.
- Knight, J. 2002. Trade in Higher Education Services: The Implications of GATS. *The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education*, March.
- Knight, J. 2002. Trade Talk: An Analysis of the Impact of Trade Liberalization and the General Agreement on Trade in Services on Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(3), 209-229.

- Knight, J. and de Wit, H. 1997. *Internationalisation of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Lajos, J. 1996. *Quality Equality: Access to Higher Education Through Student Mobility*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Larsen, K., Morris, R. and Martin, J. 2001a. *Trade in Educational Services: Trends and Emerging Issues*. Working Paper. Paris: OECD Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development).
- Larsen, K., Morris, R. and Martin, J. 2001b. *Trade in Educational Services - Size, Negotiations and Policy Issues*. Working Paper. Paris: OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development).
- Lenn, M.P. 1992. *Toward Common Educational Standards for North America: A Case Study in Trade Agreements, the Professions and Higher Education*. Washington D.C.: Centre for Quality Assurance in International Education.
- Leslie, L. and Brinkman, P. 1998. *The Economic Value of Higher Education*, New York: Macmillan
- Mallea, J. R. 1994. The Internationalisation of Higher Education: Stakeholder Views in North America. *Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Paris: OECD/CERI.
- Mallea, J. R. 1997. Internationalisation of Higher Education and the Professions. In *International Trade in Professional Services Advancing Liberalisation Through Regulatory Reform*, Paris: OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development).
- Mallea, J. R. 1999. Globalisation, Trade Liberalization and Higher Education in North America. Wei Lun Lecture Series. *Chinese University Bulletin Supplement*, No.44.
- Mallea, J.R. 1994. Human Resources Development and Higher Education in the Triad: Europe, North America and Japan. In *Proceedings of the Seminar on Education and Resource Development for the Pacific Basin*. Co-Partnerships Strategies and Actions. Guadalajara: Universidad Autonoma de Guadalajara.

- Mallea, J.R. 1995. *The Views and Activities of Stakeholders on the Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Paper delivered at the International Conference on Learning Beyond Schooling New Forms of Supply and New Demands. Paris: OECD/CERI.
- Mallea, J.R. 2001. *International Trade in Professional and Educational Service: Implications for the Professions and Higher Education*. Paris: OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development).
- Marcus, J. 2002. Universities Fear Trade Talk Ploy Will Backfire. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 22 February.
- Marshall, J. 2002. UNESCO Mellows Market Drive. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 1 November.
- Martin, J. and Samels, J. E. 1994. *Merging Colleges for Mutual Growth: A New Strategy for Academic Managers*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Maslen, G. 2001. World Leaders Face Australian Blockade. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 24 August.
- Middlehurst, R. 2002. Is an Eager UK Academy Able to Take Over the World? *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 26 April.
- Miley, V. 2001. *Higher Education on the GATS Chopping Block*. Available <http://www.Greenleft.org.au/back/2001/448/448p13.htm>
- Nun, A. 2001. *The General Agreement on Trade in Services: An Impact Assessment for Higher Education in the UK*. London: UK Association of University Teachers.
- Nyborg, P. 2002. *GATS in the Light of Increasing Internationalisation of Higher Education: Quality Assurance and Recognition*. Available <http://www.oecd.org/pdf/M00030000/M00030599.pdf>
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development). 2001. *Trade in Education Services: Benefits and Risks*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development). 2002. *Current Commitments Under the GATS in Educational Services*. OECD/CERI Paper Prepared for the OECD/US Forum on Trade in Education Services.

- OECD. 2002. *Indicators on Internationalisation and Trade of Post-Secondary Education*. OECD/CERI Paper prepared for the OECD/US Forum on Trade in Education Services.
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2001. *People & Planet Holds First UK Protest Against GATS*. Available <http://peopleandplanet.org/news/news.php?story=55>
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2002a. *Catastrophe Lurks in Shadow of Tuition Fees Row*. Available <http://peopleandplanet.org/news/news.php?story=252>
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2002b. *Head of 'African NUS' Calls for Student Action to Stop GATS Trade Treaty*. Available <http://peopleandplanet.org/news/news.php?story=246>
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2002c. *McUniversities Anyone?* Available <http://peopleandplanet.org/news/news.php?story=255>
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2002d. *NUS Gets Active on GATS*. Available <http://peopleandplanet.org/news/news.php?story=125>
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2002e. *Universities Unite to Slam GATS*. Available <http://peopleandplanet.org/news/news.php?story=145>
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2003a. *First Breakthrough for Campaign to Defend Higher Education From Global Trade Treaty*. Available http://www.peopleandplanet.org/downloads/press_release_gats1.pdf
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2003b. *GATS Negotiators Hit Crisis Over Higher Education*. Available <http://peopleandplanet.org/news/news.php?story=270>
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2003c. *Take Action: Stop GATS on Campus*. Available <http://peopleandplanet.org/news/news.php?story=293>
- p&p (People and Planet Online News). 2003d. *What's at Stake in March?* Available <http://peopleandplanet.org/news/news.php?story=294>
- Peitzker, T. 2002. *Swiss: Do Not Leave Us in Dark Over GATS*. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 23 August.

- Puskas, Peter. 2003. *Challenges to Academic Values and to the Organization of Academic Work in a Time of Globalization*. Available <http://www.esib.org/news/puskasbucharestspeech.htm>
- Radner, M. 1997. International Trade in Higher Education Services in the Asia Pacific Region. *World Competition*, 21(1), 88-116.
- Rui, Yang. 2001. China's Entry into the WTO and Higher Education. *International Higher Education*, Summer, No.24.
- Rutherford, J. 2001. Scholars Squeezed by Market Muscle. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 26 January.
- Rutherford, J. 2003. Private Path Holds Hidden Dangers. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 17 January.
- Sanders, C. 2001. Analysis: Private Lives of Public Places. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 2 February.
- Sinclair, S. 2000. *GATS: How the WTO's New 'Services' Negotiations Threaten Democracy*. Paper Prepared for the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Suave, P. 2002. *Trade, Education and the GATS: What's In, What's Out, What's All the Fuss About?*. Paper Prepared for the OECD/US Forum on Trade in Education Services.
- Surssock, A. 2000. *Towards Accreditation Schemes for Higher Education in Europe? First Findings of the Project. CRE Project*. Available http://www.esib.org/BPC/docs/Archives/CoP011_cre_accreditation_1st_findings.pdf
- Trollet, C. 1997. Recent Developments in the WTO on Professional Services. In OECD, *International Trade in Professional Services: Advancing Liberalisation Through Regulatory Reform*. Paris: OECD.
- Trollet, C. 1997. *The Liberalization of Professional Services According to GATS*. Presented at the Conference on Trade Agreements, Higher Education and the Globalization of the Professions: A Multinational Discourse on Quality Assurance and Competency, held in Montreal during 7th to 9th May 1997.

- Tschöpe, A. 2002. *The Economic Importance of Higher Education and the Justification of State Intervention on the "Market of Higher Education"*. Paper Presented for the Meeting of the IWG during 5th until the 7th April. *An Economic Point of View on Higher Education*.
- UNESCO. 2001. *Expert Meeting on the Impact of Globalization on Higher Education*. Available http://www.unesco.org/education/studyingabroad/highlights/global_forum/expert_main.shtml
- UNESCO. 2002. Higher Education for Sale. *Education Today*, October-December, No. 3, 4-7.
- van Dalen, D. 2001. *Lucrative Shares*. Available <http://www.nuffic.nl/nuffic50years/goodshar.html>
- van Dalen, D. 2002. *Not as Simple as a Tiled Roof*. Paper Presented at the Nuffic Conference: The Global Higher Education Market: Shifting Roles, Changing Rules, held at The Hague during 19th of March. Available <http://www.nuffic.nl/nuffic50years/papers2.html>
- van Damme, D. 2001. *Higher Education in the Age of Globalization: The Need for a New Regulatory Framework for Recognition, Quality Assurance and Accreditation*. Working Paper. Paris: UNESCO.
- WDM (World Development Movement). *Campaigners Call for Halt to Trade in Services Negotiations After Revelations of 'Substantial Risk' To Universities*. Available http://www.wdm.org.uk/presrel/current/GATS_uni_risk.htm
- Wojtas, O. 2002. Call to Arms Over GATS Changes. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 18 October.
- Wojtas, O. Academic Freedom Threat from GATS Plan. *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 22 February.
- WTO (World Trade Organization). 1998. *Education Services: Background Note by the Secretariat*. Geneva: WTO (World Trade Organization).
- WTO (World Trade Organization). 2002. *WTO Services - U S Negotiating Proposals*. Geneva: WTO (World Trade Organization). Available <http://www.ustr.gov/releases/2000/12/factsheet.html>

Select Websites

ACE (American Council on Education) <http://www.acenet.edu>

AUCC (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada) www.aucc.ca

AUS (Association of University Staff, New Zealand) <http://www.aus.ac.za>

AUT (Association of University Teachers) www.aut.org.uk

CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers) www.caut.ca

CHEA (Council for Higher Education Accreditation) <http://www.chea.org>

ESIB (The National Unions of Students in Europe) www.esib.org

EUA (European University Association) <http://www.unige.ch/eua>

IAU (International Association of Universities) <http://www.unesco.org/iau>

OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development) www.oecd.org

WDM (World Development Movement) www.wdm.org.uk

WTO (World Trade Organization) <http://www.wto.org/>