

March 2007

**E**

منظمة الأغذية  
والزراعة  
للأمم المتحدة

联合国  
粮食及  
农业组织

Food  
and  
Agriculture  
Organization  
of  
the  
United  
Nations

Organisation  
des  
Nations  
Unies  
pour  
l'alimentation  
et  
l'agriculture

Organización  
de las  
Naciones  
Unidas  
para la  
Agricultura  
y la  
Alimentación

## COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

### Second Session

Rome, 26 – 30 March 2007

### Report on the Activities of the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Committee and Other Relevant WTO Activities in 2006

### Agenda Item 8.1 of the Provisional Agenda

1. A report on relevant activities of the Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Committee and the World Trade Organization (WTO) prepared by the WTO Secretariat is provided at Annex 1.

For reasons of economy, this document is produced in a limited number of copies. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring it to the meetings and to refrain from asking for additional copies, unless strictly indispensable.  
Most FAO meeting documents are available on Internet at [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)

W0000

## Annex 1

# ACTIVITIES OF THE SPS COMMITTEE AND OTHER RELEVANT WTO ACTIVITIES IN 2006

26-30 March 2007

## Report by the WTO Secretariat<sup>1</sup>

1. The present report provides a summary of the activities and decisions of the WTO Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the "SPS Committee") during 2006 to the Second Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM). It identifies the work of relevance to the CPM and the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), including: specific trade concerns; equivalence; regionalization; monitoring the use of international standards; and technical assistance. The report also includes relevant information on dispute settlement in the WTO, which occurred outside the context of the SPS Committee, and on the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF).
2. The SPS Committee held four regular meetings in 2006: a meeting commenced on 24 October 2005 was concluded on 1-2 February; 29-30 March; 27-28 June; and 11-13 October.<sup>2</sup>
3. The Committee agreed to the following tentative calendar of regular meetings for 2007: 28 February-1 March, 27-28 June, and 18-19 October.
4. Mr Juan Antonio Dorantes (Mexico) replaced Mr Gregg Young (United States) from June 2006 as Chairperson of the SPS Committee.

## Specific Trade Concerns

5. A large part of each SPS Committee meeting is devoted to the consideration of specific trade concerns. Any WTO Member can raise particular problems with the food safety, plant or animal health requirements imposed by another WTO Member. Problems raised in this context are usually in relation to the notification of a new or changed measure, or based on the experience of exporters. Often other countries will share the same concerns. At the SPS Committee meetings, Members usually commit themselves to exchange information and hold bilateral consultations to resolve the identified concern.
6. A summary of the specific trade concerns raised in meetings of the SPS Committee is compiled on an annual basis by the Secretariat of the WTO.<sup>3</sup> In the ten years of implementation of the SPS Agreement, from 1995 to the end of 2006, 29 per cent of specific trade concerns raised were related to plant health.
7. In 2006, three phytosanitary issues were raised for the first time in the SPS Committee:
  - Canada's concerns regarding the Dominican Republic's tolerance levels for soil content on potato tubers;
  - United States' concerns, supported by Australia, regarding Indonesia's lack of recognition of pest-free areas;
  - China's concerns regarding United States' import restrictions on artificial, wooden handicrafts, including Christmas trees.
8. Two issues relating to plant health that had been previously raised were discussed again, including:

<sup>1</sup> This report has been prepared under the WTO Secretariat's own responsibility and is without prejudice to the positions of WTO Members or to their rights or obligations under the WTO.

<sup>2</sup> The report of the February meeting is contained in G/SPS/R/39 and corrigenda 1 and 2; that of the March meeting in G/SPS/R/40 and corrigendum; that of the June meeting in G/SPS/R/42 and the report of the October meeting as G/SPS/R/43.

<sup>3</sup> The latest version of this summary can be found in document G/SPS/GEN/204/Rev.7 and addenda. This document is a public document available from <http://docsonline.wto.org>.

- New Zealand's concerns, supported by Chile, the European Communities and the United States, regarding Australia's import restrictions on New Zealand apples;
- the European Communities' concerns regarding Israel's absence of phytosanitary import legislation;

9. A further five issues previously raised related to plant health were discussed again in the Committee and a resolution reported in 2006:

- Chile's concerns, supported by the European Communities and New Zealand, regarding Australia's restrictions on imports of fresh grapes;
- United States' concerns regarding Chile's restriction on imports of wheat and fruit;
- Argentina's concerns regarding China's import restriction for citrus and other fruits related to fruit fly;
- the United States' concerns, supported by Canada and Nicaragua, regarding Mexico's import restrictions on the importation of dry beans;
- the European Communities' concerns, supported by China, regarding the United States' import restrictions on potted plants from the European Communities.

10. Since 1995, resolutions have been reported for 27 of the 66 plant health concerns raised in the SPS Committee – approximately 41% of the concerns raised in this area. This compares favourably with a reported resolution rate of approximately 27% for trade concerns across all SPS disciplines. Actual rates of resolution may be higher as some issues may have been resolved without the Committee being informed.

### ISPM 15

11. In 2004 and 2005, concerns regarding the implementation and application of ISPM 15 were discussed by the SPS Committee at all of its meetings in the context of specific trade concerns as well as in discussions on monitoring the use of international standards. Since 2003, 87 notifications relating to wood packaging material have been submitted by WTO Members. Most of these relate to the intended implementation of the standard (see Attachment 1).

### Equivalence

12. In October 2001, the SPS Committee developed guidelines on the implementation of Article 4 of the SPS Agreement on equivalence in response to concerns raised by developing countries. In 2004, the SPS Committee completed its work programme related to clarifications of the Decision.<sup>4</sup> These clarifications note the work on recognition of equivalence undertaken in the Codex and the OIE, and request the ICPM to take into consideration the Decision on Equivalence and the subsequent clarifications in its work on the judgement of equivalence with regard to measures to address plant pests and diseases. The IPPC reported to the SPS Committee its adoption of ISPM-24: Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures. Equivalence remains a standing agenda item of the Committee.

### Regionalization

13. In 2003, the SPS Committee began to consider the implementation of Article 6 of the SPS Agreement, which requires consideration of the pest or disease status of exporting and importing areas. Discussions on regionalization continued in the Committee meetings in 2004 and 2005, with the Committee receiving regular updates on the work on regionalization undertaken by the IPPC and the OIE. The SPS Committee held regular informal meetings in March and June 2005, as well as an "enhanced" informal meeting on regionalization on 30-31 January 2006.<sup>5</sup> The WTO Secretariat

<sup>4</sup> The agreed clarifications are in G/SPS/19/Rev.2.

<sup>5</sup> Copies of these presentation can be downloaded from the WTO website:  
[http://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/sps\\_e/meet\\_jan06\\_e/meet\\_jan06\\_e.htm](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/sps_e/meet_jan06_e/meet_jan06_e.htm).

prepared a set of documents for the March 2006 meeting, including a summary of the extended informal held in January,<sup>6</sup> a compendium of all the papers submitted to date by Members and observer organizations<sup>7</sup> and a background document including a compilation of all the ideas and proposals received from the Members and the ISSBs.<sup>8</sup>

14. Discussions on this topic in the SPS Committee have focused on several themes. Many Members had noted the difficulty in committing to the long-term and sustained investments need to obtain and maintain recognition of pest- or disease-free status when recognition by their trading partners is unpredictable. Members highlighted the need for further clarification of the ways in which recognition by the OIE or IPPC affects bilateral recognition of pest- or disease-free status. Some Members recognized that harmonization of procedures in the area of regionalization could improve the recognition process, enhance predictability and thus facilitate the implementation of Article 6, but the Committee had yet to develop a consensus of what the typical administrative procedures for the recognition of pest- or disease-free areas would include. During these discussions, the IPPC and OIE regularly described work within their organizations which was in direct response to requests from the SPS Committee for guidance in this area.

15. A small group of interested Members is holding detailed discussions with a view to developing a common understanding on this topic. Dependent on the progress of these discussions and the acceptability of any understanding to the broader membership, the Committee may be able to make progress on this issue in 2007. A key variable to progress in the Committee is progress in advancing the IPPC's own work programme on regionalization and recognition of pest- or disease-status.

#### Monitoring the Use of International Standards

16. The procedure adopted by the SPS Committee to monitor the use of international standards invites countries to identify specific trade problems they have experienced due to the use or non-use of relevant international standards, guidelines or recommendations.<sup>9</sup> These problems, once considered by the SPS Committee, are drawn to the attention of the relevant standard-setting body. In 2005, two issues relating to ISPM 15 were raised under this procedure<sup>10</sup>. The issue was also considered again at the March 2006 meeting. In October 2006, the Committee adopted the Eighth Annual Report on the Procedure to Monitor the Process of International Harmonization.<sup>11</sup>

#### Technical Assistance

17. At each of its meetings, the SPS Committee has solicited information from countries regarding their technical assistance needs and activities. The SPS Committee has been kept informed of the collaborative efforts of the IPPC and FAO secretariats to strengthen the capacity of developing countries and of the importance of the participation of the IPPC in the regional SPS workshops organized by the WTO. The IPPC secretariat and the FAO have also provided information regarding their technical assistance activities at each regular meeting of the SPS Committee in 2006.<sup>12</sup>

#### Review of the Operation and Implementation of the SPS Agreement

18. Article 12.4 of the SPS Agreement indicates that the Committee should review the operation and implementation of the Agreement three years after its entry into force, and thereafter as appropriate. At the Doha Ministerial Conference in 2001, it was decided that the Agreement should be

<sup>6</sup> G/SPS/R/38.

<sup>7</sup> G/SPS/GEN/636 and Corr.1.

<sup>8</sup> G/SPS/GEN/640.

<sup>9</sup> G/SPS/11/Rev.1

<sup>10</sup> G/SPS/37: Concerns raised by China and Mauritius over ISPM 15 implementation.

<sup>11</sup> G/SPS/42 and G/SPS/42/Corr.1.

<sup>12</sup> This information is available in the reports of the SPS Committee meetings (G/SPS/R/39 and corrigenda 1 and 2; G/SPS/R/40 and corrigendum; G/SPS/R/42; and G/SPS/R/43).

reviewed every four years. In 2004 the SPS Committee began its second review of the Agreement. The Committee adopted the Report on the Review of the Operation of the SPS Agreement in June 2005.<sup>13</sup>

19. The second review report covers a wide number of areas related to implementation of the Agreement. For example, it recommends that the relevant international organizations keep the Committee informed of any work they undertake with regard to the recognition of equivalence, as well as their activities relevant to the recognition of pest- or disease-free areas or areas of low pest or disease prevalence. The report recommends that the Committee continue to monitor the use of international standards at each of its regular meetings. Members have also expressed interest in finding out more information related to IPPC's dispute settlement mechanism as part of their discussions on how to resolve trade concerns raised in the SPS Committee.

20. Submissions and proposals by Members on specific issues will determine the Committee's approach to addressing issues raised in the Review.

### Other Relevant WTO Activities

#### Dispute Settlement

21. In 2006, a dispute settlement report was adopted in the case regarding the European Communities' measures affecting the approval and marketing of biotech products (DS291; 292; 293). Dispute settlement proceedings also continued in 2006 over the United States' and Canada's continued suspension of obligations in the *EC -Hormones* Dispute.

#### The WTO dispute settlement procedure

22. Any WTO Member may invoke the formal dispute resolution procedures of the WTO if they consider that a particular measure imposed by another WTO Member violates any of the WTO Agreements, including the SPS Agreement. Informal consultations on the problem, the first step of the WTO dispute procedure, are unsuccessful, a WTO Member may request that a panel be established to consider the complaint.<sup>14</sup> A panel of three individuals considers written and oral arguments submitted by the parties to the dispute and issues a written report of its legal findings and recommendations. The parties to the dispute may appeal a panel's decision before the WTO's Appellate Body. The Appellate Body examines the legal findings of the panel and may uphold or reverse these. As with a panel report, the Appellate Body report is adopted automatically unless there is a consensus against adoption. According to the SPS Agreement, when a dispute involves scientific or technical issues, the panel should seek advice from appropriate scientific and technical experts. Scientific experts have been consulted in all SPS-related disputes. The experts are usually selected from lists provided by the standard-setting organizations referenced in the SPS Agreement, including the IPPC for plant health. The parties to the dispute are consulted in the selection of experts and regarding the information solicited from the experts.

#### SPS Disputes

23. As of 2006, six SPS-related issues had been considered by panels. Two SPS cases dealt with plant pests and quarantine requirements: the United States complaint about Japan's requirement for testing each variety of fruit for efficacy of treatment against codling moth (*Japan-Agricultural Products*)<sup>15</sup>; and the United State's complaint about Japan's set of requirements on apples imported from the United States relating to fire blight (*Japan-Apples*).<sup>16</sup> The United States subsequently

---

<sup>13</sup> G/SPS/36.

<sup>14</sup> A flow chart of the dispute resolution process can be consulted at ([http://www.wto.org/english/thewto\\_e/whatis\\_e/tif\\_e/disp2\\_e.htm](http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/disp2_e.htm)).

<sup>15</sup> The report of the panel is contained in document WT/DS76/R. The Appellate Body report is contained in document WT/DS76/AB/R.

<sup>16</sup> The report of the panel is contained in document WT/DS245/R. The Appellate Body report is contained in document WT/DS254/AB/R.

challenged the revised measures applied by Japan, and in accordance with WTO procedures, these were examined by the original panel.

24. The panel considering Japan's compliance issued its report in April 2005.<sup>17</sup> The panel examined the revised requirements imposed by Japan, and its new risk assessment. The panel provided a ruling with respect to each of Japan's phytosanitary requirements on US apples. Japan was found to have breached Article 2.2 of the *SPS Agreement* by maintaining the compliance measure at issue without sufficient scientific evidence. Furthermore the panel found that Japan's measures were not "based on an assessment, as appropriate to the circumstances, of the risk to [...] plant life or health" in Japan, because Japan relied on uncorroborated new studies that did not support the conclusion that imported apples could spread fire blight. The parties notified a mutually agreed solution in September 2005.

25. The panel to examine the complaints by the United States, Canada and Argentina regarding the European Communities' measures affecting the approval and marketing of biotech products was established in 2003.<sup>18</sup> The volume of submissions from the parties, the need to consult scientific advice and requests for time extensions meant that the Panel circulated its report on 29 September 2006. In its report, the Panel concluded that the European Communities had applied a general *de facto* moratorium on the approval of biotech products between June 1999 and August 2003, as well as a moratorium on 24 specific product applications. As such, the EC had acted inconsistently with its obligations under Annex C(1)(a), first clause, and Article 8 of the *SPS Agreement*. In short, there had been undue delays in the completion of EC approval procedures. With respect to the safeguard measures taken by six EC member states against products authorized in the European Communities, the Panel found that the member states (and thus by extension the European Communities itself) had violated Articles 5.1 and 2.2 of the *SPS Agreement*. More specifically, those national safeguard measures were not based on risk assessments satisfying the definition of the *SPS Agreement* and, hence, could be presumed to be maintained without sufficient scientific evidence.

26. Two dispute cases have concerned food safety regulations – the European Communities (EC) ban on imports of meat treated with growth-promoting hormones, challenged by both the United States and by Canada (*EC-Hormones*).<sup>19</sup> One complaint dealt with diseases of fish, brought by Canada against Australia's import restriction on fresh, chilled or frozen salmon (*Australia-Salmon*).<sup>20</sup> A US complaint on this same issue was resolved before the panel completed its examination.

#### Disputes brought back to the WTO dispute settlement procedure

27. On 13 February 1998, the WTO Dispute Settlement Body adopted the panel and Appellate Body reports in the *EC – Hormones* case which recommended that the European Communities bring the measures at issue into conformity with WTO obligations. When the European Communities was unable to implement by the 13 May 1999 deadline, the United States and Canada obtained authorisation from the DSB on 26 July 1999 to suspend obligations up to the level of US\$116.8 million and CDN\$11.3 million per year, respectively. On 28 October 2003, the European Communities announced that its measures were now in compliance with the rulings, and on 17 February 2005 a new panel was established to consider an EC complaint against the continued suspension of concessions by the United States and Canada.<sup>21</sup> The hearings for this panel have been the first to be made public.

<sup>17</sup> WT/DS245/RW.

<sup>18</sup> The requests for the establishment of a panel by the US, Canada and Argentina are found in the documents WT/DS291/23, WT/DS292/17, and WT/DS293/17, respectively.

<sup>19</sup> The reports of the panels are contained in documents WT/DS26/R/USA and WT/DS48/R/CAN. The Appellate Body report is in document WT/DS/26/AB/R and WT/DS48/AB/R.

<sup>20</sup> The report of the panels is contained in document WT/DS18/RW. The Appellate Body report is in document WT/DS18/AB/R.

<sup>21</sup> The requests by the European Communities for the establishment of a panel are found in documents WT/DS320/6 and WT/DS321/6..

## The Standards and Trade Development Facility

28. The aim of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) is to assist developing countries enhance their capacity to meet international sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) standards, improving the human health, animal health and phytosanitary situation, and thus gaining and maintaining market access. The partner agencies of the STDF are: the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), the World Bank, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Trade Organization (WTO). The WTO is the administrator of the STDF and provides the secretariat.

29. The STDF is both a financing and a coordination mechanism. Grant financing is available for private and public organizations in developing countries seeking to comply with international SPS standards and hence gain or maintain market access. The STDF provides funds for two types of grants: project preparation grants and project grants. Project preparation grants up to US\$20,000 aim to act as a bridge between the identification of technical assistance needs and the development of coherent project proposals. The STDF also funds project grants. The size of grants typically ranges between US\$300,000 and US\$600,000. Applicants must assume some of the financial cost of the projects.<sup>22</sup>

30. A new medium term strategy for the STDF was agreed in December 2006. This strategy places greater emphasis on the STDF acting as a vehicle for the co-ordination of SPS-related technical assistance. A key part to this work is the identification of good practice with regard to the provision and receipt of SPS-related technical assistance. In 2007, this work will be advanced through the organization of two regional workshops in East Africa and Central America based on historic analysis of technical assistance flows and their effectiveness.

31. The STDF had approved the following projects and project preparation grants in the plant health area by the end of 2006.

**Table 1: Status of implementation of STDF project grants**

STDF 133: Phytosanitary capacity evaluation in the Pacific	Project approved in October 2006. Application of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation tool in the Pacific.	\$261,780
STDF 146: Strengthening phytosanitary controls in Mali – with particular reference to mango exports	Project approved in June 2006. The project aims to strengthen capacity in Mali in phytosanitary control in order to contribute to export diversification and poverty alleviation. Implementation commenced in February 2007.	\$508,000
STDF 145: Rwanda Horticulture Export Standards Initiative (RHESI)	Project approved in June 2006. The project aims to establish a plant health management in Rwanda. The project will address SPS issues for specific commodities.	\$526,674
STDF 65: Support to compliance with official and commercial standards in the fruit and vegetable sector in Guinea	Project approved in September 2005. The project is focused on assisting the public and private sector in Guinea in training to meet official and commercial standards for fruit and vegetable exports. Contract and project terms of reference currently being elaborated. Project to end in 2008.	\$600,000

<sup>22</sup> Applicants from least-developed countries must meet at least 10 per cent of the cost of the project from their own resources, while other developing countries are required to fund at least 25 per cent of the project cost. Further information on eligibility criteria, the application process and governance arrangements for the STDF can be found in document G/SPS/GEN/748.

STDF 79: Quality information on SPS issues - a pre requisite for capacity building	Project approved in September 2005. The project is a one-off activity to improve the sharing of information on official standards (including the supporting scientific evaluations) developed by the three international standards-setting bodies referred to in the SPS Agreement through the medium of the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health. The project will be implemented by the FAO in collaboration with Codex, OIE and the IPPC. The project will improve the sustainability of core resources for the Portal. Implementation began in 2006	\$470,000
STDF 89: International Plant Health Risk Analysis Workshop	Project approved in September 2005. The aim of the project is to provide funding for 29 developing and least-developed country officials to attend a workshop on pest risk analysis to be held in Canada on 24-28 October 2005. The aim of the workshop is to strengthen expertise in and capacity to apply IPPC's standards for PRA (ISPMs No. 2, 11 and 21, in particular) with a view to harmonizing methods for their implementation internationally. Project will be finished in 2007.	\$147,000
STDF 37: Assistance to Developing Countries in the Implementation of ISPM 15 (Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade)	Project approved in September 2004. Project centrepiece, a workshop on implementation of ISPM 15, was held in Vancouver, Canada on 28 February – 4 March 2005. Project completed. Training materials related to the workshop can be found on the IPPC website at <a href="http://www.ippc.int">www.ippc.int</a>	\$332,000

**Table 2: Status of implementation of STDF project preparation grants**

Project title	Implementation status	Project budget
STDF 126: Assistance establishing an industry organisation on horticulture in Tanzania	Approved in February 2006. The project preparation grant has funded development of a business plan for an Association in the horticulture sector in Tanzania.	\$5,500

32. Applications for STDF funding may be made at any moment in the year. The STDF Working Group meets three times per year to consider funding requests. **The deadline for funding submissions to be considered at the next STDF Working Group meeting is 12 May 2007.**

33. Applications received after that date will be considered at the next STDF Working Group meeting on 20 October 2007. Further information on the STDF, including the medium term strategy, application forms and information on projects approved can be found at the STDF website [www.standardsfacility.org](http://www.standardsfacility.org). The website also contains training materials collected from partner agencies.



**ATTACHMENT 1**  
**CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF**  
**NOTIFICATIONS ISSUED ON WOOD PACKAGING (ISPM 15)**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Symbol</b>	<b>Date of distribution</b>
Canada	G/SPS/N/CAN/158/Rev.2	22/09/2006
Canada	G/SPS/N/CAN/163/Rev.2	31/08/2006
China	G/SPS/N/CHN/42/Add.4	31/08/2006
Oman	G/SPS/N/OMN/8	02/08/2006
Brazil	G/SPS/N/BRA/101/Add.2	18/07/2006
Dominican Republic	G/SPS/N/DOM/2	07/07/2006
Ecuador	G/SPS/N/ECU/13	05/07/2006
India	G/SPS/N/IDN/27	29/05/2006
New Zealand	G/SPS/N/NZL/344/Add.1	09/05/2006
Brazil	G/SPS/N/BRA/101/Add.1	03/04/2006
Nicaragua	G/SPS/N/NIC/32	14/03/2006
New Zealand	G/SPS/N/NZL/344	24 /02/2006
Bulgaria	G/SPS/N/BGR/24	22/02/2006
China	G/SPS/N/CHN/42/Add.3	17/02/2006
European Communities	G/SPS/N/EEC/221/Add.4	13/02/2006
Paraguay	G/SPS/N/PRY/6	08/02/2006
Paraguay	G/SPS/N/PRY/5	08/02/2006
Honduras	G/SPS/N/HND/11	03/02/2006
Jordan	G/SPS/N/JOR/14	12/01/2006
Ecuador	G/SPS/N/ECU/2/Corr.1	20/12/2005
Ecuador	G/SPS/N/ECU/1/Corr.1	20/12/2005
Brazil	G/SPS/N/BRA/124/Corr.1	24/11/2005
Paraguay	G/SPS/N/PRY/4	16/11/2005
Paraguay	G/SPS/N/PRY/3	16/11/2005
Paraguay	G/SPS/N/PRY/2	16/11/2005
Argentina	G/SPS/N/ARG/73/Add.1	16/11/2005
Costa Rica	G/SPS/N/CRI/35/Add.2	31/10/2005
Brazil	G/SPS/N/BRA/124	21/10/2005
Mexico	G/SPS/N/MEX/207/Add.2	24/10/2005
Mexico	G/SPS/N/MEX/207/Add.1	23/09/2005
Trinidad and Tobago	G/SPS/N/TTO/5 – EMRG	21/09/2005
Australia	G/SPS/N/AUS/187	05/09/2005
Egypt	G/SPS/N/EGY/2	06/09/2005
Philippines	G/SPS/N/PHL/71/Add.2/Corr.1	29/07/2005
Ecuador	G/SPS/N/ECU/5	21/07/2005
Philippines	G/SPS/N/PHL/71/Add.2	20/07/2005
Bolivia	G/SPS/N/BOL/9	04/07/2005

Brazil	G/SPS/N/BRA/101	06/06/2005
China	G/SPS/N/CHN/42/Add.2	02/06/2005
Guatemala	G/SPS/N/GTM/34	26/05/2005
Argentina	G/SPS/N/ARG/73	27/04/2005
Korea	G/SPS/N/KOR/138/Add.1	28/04/2005
Panama	G/SPS/N/PAN/44	15/04/2005
Ecuador	G/SPS/N/ECU/1	15/04/2005
Peru	G/SPS/N/PER/91	23/03/2005
European Communities	G/SPS/N/EEC/221/Add.3	02/03/2005
China	G/SPS/N/CHN/42/Add.1	28/02/2005
Peru	G/SPS/N/PER/87/Corr.1	23/02/2005
Peru	G/SPS/N/PER/87	11/02/2005
Colombia	G/SPS/N/COL/85/Add.1	07/01/2005
South Africa	G/SPS/N/ZAF/18/Add.1	15/12/2004
Costa Rica	G/SPS/N/CRI/35/Add.1	03/11/2004
European Communities	G/SPS/N/EEC/221/Add.2	14/10/2004
Turkey	G/SPS/N/TUR/4	05/10/2004
Mexico	G/SPS/N/MEX/207	04/10/2004
Brazil	G/SPS/N/BRA/96	01/10/2004
United States	G/SPS/N/USA/705/Add.1	24/09/2004
Australia	G/SPS/N/AUS/164/Add.1	03/09/2004
Chile	G/SPS/N/CHL/170	26/08/2004
Costa Rica	G/SPS/N/CRI/35	20/08/2004
Philippines	G/SPS/N/PHL/71/Add.1	20/07/2004
Colombia	G/SPS/N/COL/85	09/07/2004
India	G/SPS/N/IND/12/Add.2	28/06/2004
Australia	G/SPS/N/AUS/164	21/06/2004
Canada	G/SPS/N/CAN/163/Rev.1	21/06/2004
Mexico	G/SPS/N/MEX/204/Add.1	10/06/2004
Philippines	G/SPS/N/PHL/71	03/06/2004
European Communities	G/SPS/N/EEC/221/Add.1	13/05/2004
South Africa	G/SPS/N/ZAF/18	27/04/2004
Switzerland	G/SPS/N/CHE/35	05/02/2004
Mexico	G/SPS/N/MEX/204	10/12/2003
China	G/SPS/N/CHN/42	08/12/2003
European Communities	G/SPS/N/EEC/221	10/11/2003
Korea	G/SPS/N/KOR/138	11/07/2003
United States	G/SPS/N/USA/705	06/06/2003
Canada	G/SPS/N/CAN/163/Add.1	20/05/2003
New Zealand	G/SPS/N/NZL/210	29/04/2003
Canada	G/SPS/N/CAN/163	18/03/2003
Australia	G/SPS/N/AUS/123	13/11/2000