



Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

**ANNUAL REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 6
OF THE AGREEMENT ON THE APPLICATION OF SANITARY
AND PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

NOTE BY THE SECRETARIAT¹

Article 6 of the SPS Agreement requires that measures take into account pest- or disease-free areas or areas of low pest or disease prevalence. This concept is frequently referred to as "regionalization". At the 2-3 April 2008 meeting, the Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures adopted guidelines to further the practical implementation of Article 6.² These guidelines are intended to provide assistance to Members in the implementation of Article 6 by improving transparency, exchange of information, predictability, confidence and credibility between importing and exporting Members.

The guidelines require the Secretariat to prepare an annual report to the Committee on implementation of Article 6 based on the information provided by Members concerning:

- a. requests for recognition of pest- or disease-free areas or areas of low pest or disease prevalence;
- b. determinations on whether to recognize a pest- or disease-free area or area of low pest or disease prevalence; and/or
- c. Members' experiences in the implementation of Article 6 and the provision of relevant background information by Members on their decisions to other interested Members.

In addition, since the Committee decided to hold thematic sessions on regionalization in July 2017 and March 2018, this report also includes information on these sessions in an additional section:

- d. Thematic sessions on regionalization.

The report covers the period from 1 April 2017 until 31 March 2018, based on information provided by Members through notifications and from information presented during SPS Committee meetings. This information was frequently provided under the agenda item "Pest- and or Disease-Free Areas - Article 6". Relevant information provided under other agenda items is also included in the report. A list of notifications related to Article 6 is contained in section 4; section 5 lists the relevant specific trade concerns.

1 REQUESTS FOR RECOGNITION OF PEST- OR DISEASE-FREE AREAS OR AREAS OF LOW PEST OR DISEASE PREVALENCE

1.1 July 2017 meeting (G/SPS/R/87)

1.1.1 Australia – Update on East West regional freedom for Mediterranean fruit fly (Ceratitis Capitata)

1.1. Australia announced that the Eastern states of Australia and the Ord River irrigation area of Western Australia were pest-free areas for Mediterranean fruit fly. In addition the Mediterranean

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

² G/SPS/48.

fruit fly had a limited distribution in Western Australia. These pest-free areas were maintained through the regulatory control of host material from infested areas. The pest-free status of these areas was verified through absence records collected from Australia's national fruit fly trapping grid.

1.1.2 Chile – Update on outbreak of Avian Influenza

1.2. Chile reiterated that the avian influenza outbreak that had occurred towards the end of 2016 had been of low pathogenicity, not of high pathogenicity, and that it was in compliance with the OIE Terrestrial Code. Further, it had been declared free from avian influenza in June 2017. Self-defined export-restricted areas had been lifted, placing Chile in a position to export according to agreements currently in force with their trading partners.

1.1.3 Costa Rica – Declaration of freedom from Velogenic Newcastle disease (G/SPS/GEN/1560)

1.3. Costa Rica provided information on the outbreak of Velogenic Newcastle disease of April 2015. After the implementation of control measures and epidemiological surveillance, the entire national territory had been declared free of this disease. Costa Rica referred Members to document G/SPS/GEN/1560 which described the measures applied by their national services.

1.1.4 Dominican Republic – Update on the Mediterranean fruit fly situation

1.4. The Dominican Republic informed the Committee that it had dealt with the outbreak of Mediterranean fruit fly, first detected in March 2015, and that it had been eradicated through declaration of a phytosanitary emergency, a control and eradication programme and a monitoring and surveillance system, in compliance with international norms. The Ministry of Agriculture announced that the Dominican Republic was free from the Mediterranean fruit fly. The Dominican Republic thanked USDA, FAO, OIE, IICA, IAEA, and the Guatemalan and Mexican agencies for their help in eradicating this pest.

1.1.5 Kazakhstan – Information on FMD-free areas

1.5. Kazakhstan provided the Committee with a brief history of the country's partnership with the OIE and its process of becoming a Member of the WTO. Kazakhstan informed the Committee that in 2017 Kazakhstan had been awarded the status of FMD-free zone where vaccination was practiced only in five regions. Kazakhstan emphasized the significant impact this had on its exports and on the number of investors showing interest in producing and processing meat in Kazakhstan. In addition, Kazakhstan was currently working to obtain other disease-free statuses as well. In concluding, Kazakhstan emphasized the increasing role of agriculture in the development of Central Asia and other emerging regions.

1.1.6 Paraguay – Recent recognition of health status by OIE

1.6. Paraguay provided updated information on recent resolutions from the OIE World Assembly of Delegates on the health status of the country with regard to classical swine fever and foot-and-mouth disease (FMD). Paraguay informed the Committee that for the first time it had been recognized as a country free of classical swine fever and that two disease-free zones had been merged, leading to recognition of the country as free of FMD with vaccination. In addition, Paraguay noted that the country maintained its health status for the following diseases: insignificant risk for BSE, free of African horse sickness, and free of peste des petits ruminants (PPR). Paraguay emphasized the importance of the OIE resolutions to obtain access to new markets.

1.2 November 2017 meeting (G/SPS/R/88)

1.2.1 Dominican Republic – Freedom from Mediterranean fruit fly

1.7. The Dominican Republic informed the Committee that through resolution RS/MA/2017/11 of the Ministry of Agriculture it had been declared free of Mediterranean fruit fly. The Dominican Republic explained that this was based on the ISPM with regard to the requirements for

establishing areas free of fruit fly, which required a minimum of three life cycles without any capture in the area to consider the pest eradicated.

1.3 March 2018 meeting (G/SPS/R/90)

1.3.1 Dominican Republic – Freedom from Mediterranean fruit fly

1.8. The Dominican Republic informed the Committee that further to an outbreak of the Mediterranean fruit fly in March 2015 near Punta Cana, a technical committee had been formed with the assistance of the United States, FAO and IAEA to address this issue. The Dominican Republic further indicated that through resolution RS/MA/2017/11 (July 2017) of the Ministry of Agriculture, it had been declared free from the Mediterranean fruit fly. A country-wide surveillance programme had also been put in place for the early detection of fruit flies.

2 DETERMINATION ON WHETHER TO RECOGNIZE A PEST- OR DISEASE-FREE AREA OR AREA OF LOW PEST OR DISEASE PREVALENCE

2.1 July 2017 meeting (G/SPS/R/87)

2.1.1 Indonesia – Recognition of Mediterranean fruit fly free region in Chile

2.1. Indonesia extended its appreciation to Chile's NPPO for providing transparent technical data and for their support during the field verification process carried out by Indonesian experts on the status of the Mediterranean fruit fly. In compliance with Article 6 of the SPS Agreement, Indonesia had finalized a comprehensive assessment of *Ceratitis capitata* in the grape-growing areas in the Atacama Region, in Chile, after which it recognized the region as a pest-free production area for grapes.

2.2. Chile thanked Indonesia for recognizing the Atacama Region as free of Mediterranean fruit fly and stressed that the whole country was free of the fruit fly, as recognized by the relevant international bodies. Chile therefore called upon other countries to also recognize Chile as a country free from the Mediterranean fruit fly.

2.2 November 2017 meeting (G/SPS/R/88)

2.3. No Member reported on this issue.

2.3 March 2018 meeting (G/SPS/R/90)

2.4. No Member reported on this issue.

3 MEMBERS' EXPERIENCES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 6

3.1 July 2017 meeting (G/SPS/R/87)

3.1.1 Russian Federation - Possible scenario on African swine fever spread in the Eurasian region

3.1. The Russian Federation reiterated the importance of paying close attention to the spread of African swine fever (ASF). The Russian Federation expressed appreciation for the thematic session organized at the margins of the SPS Committee meeting on animal diseases regionalization and acknowledged the efforts of international organizations like OIE, IPPC, FAO and WTO in this area. The Russian Federation noted that since the previous SPS Committee, ASF had been introduced into the Czech Republic, and reiterated its warning on said risk. The Russian Federation noted the possible introduction of the virus from third countries. The Russian Federation invited Members to consider compartmentalization and cooperation between competent surveillance services. The Russian Federation thanked the European Union for their bilateral meeting and looked forward to further discussions in the future.

3.2. The Chairperson reminded Members that information provided under the agenda item on information sharing was aimed at sharing national experiences and information on relevant national SPS activities.

3.3. The European Union again expressed its objection to the use of the agenda item on information sharing for purposes other than providing information to Members on relevant activities. The European Union stated that the Russian Federation's repeated references to EU member States and speculations on ASF spread in EU countries were neither pertinent nor appropriate. Furthermore, the European Union reported that a limited number of ASF cases, in a limited area had been detected in the Czech Republic, and that all necessary measures had been taken. As stated in the past, the European Union was confident in the effectiveness of its ASF-related measures as well as in its participation and leadership in international cooperation and in the response against ASF.

3.1.2 South Africa – Update on recent cases of animal diseases

3.4. South Africa provided information on two recent cases of animal diseases: (i) the detection and confirmation of African swine fever in free roaming pigs of smallholder farmers in two provinces in June and October 2016, and then in February and May 2017 in neighbouring provinces, on which investigations were ongoing and the outbreaks had not been closed; and (ii) the occurrence of outbreaks of highly pathogenic avian influenza (H5N8) in four commercial poultry farms and in wild birds, which were not epidemiologically linked. Control measures were being implemented; compartments free of avian influenza had been established and maintained. South Africa informed the Committee that it had received a contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (CBPP) freedom status as well as freedom of FMD and PPR.

3.2 November 2017 meeting (G/SPS/R/88)

3.2.1 Botswana – Information on FMD in Ngamiland

3.5. Botswana provided an update on the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in the Sehithwa area of Ngamiland District, which had been detected in September 2017 and notified to the WTO on 26 September 2017 through document G/SPS/GEN/1572. Botswana enumerated the measures it had taken to control the spread of the disease: (i) district wide clinical surveillance to determine the extent of the outbreak; (ii) primo vaccination followed by booster vaccination; (iii) FMD vaccination coupled with surveillance; (iv) a total livestock movement ban and other movement restrictions; (v) slaughter of cattle under certain conditions. Botswana emphasised that the outbreak was contained and did not affect beef trade in the OIE-recognized FMD-free zones of Botswana.

3.2.2 Ecuador – Update of list of quarantine pests

3.6. Ecuador informed the Committee that the Ecuadorian Agency for Agricultural Safety and Quality, AGROCALIDAD, had recently published Resolution No. 0122 through which it updated the list of quarantine pests not present in Ecuador. The annex of the aforementioned resolution contained the details of all pests that were not present in Ecuadorian territory. Ecuador committed to making the updated list available to Members.

3.2.3 South Africa – HPAI situation

3.7. South Africa provided an update on the highly pathogenic avian influenza (H5N8) outbreak reported in chickens in South Africa on 22 June 2017, indicating that as of 18 October, 92 locations had been identified as infected and reported to the OIE. South Africa informed Members of the measures that had been deployed to control the outbreak.

3.3 March 2018 meeting (G/SPS/R/90)

3.3.1 Thailand – Freedom from *Xanthomonus Stewartii* or *Pantoea Stewartii*

3.8. Thailand reminded the Committee that it had been declared free from *Xanthomonus Stewartii* or *Pantoea Stewartii* and that this information had been provided in document G/SPS/GEN/1352

on 7 August 2014. In addition, Thailand had reported the absence of *Xanthomonus stewartii* to the IPPC on 3 September 2013. Thailand indicated that some trading partners still required it to follow certain import measures to eradicate this pest, although Thailand had confirmed that it did not exist in Thailand, based on surveillance activities. Thailand requested Members to take this information into account.

4 THEMATIC SESSIONS ON REGIONALIZATION

4.1 July 2017 meeting (G/SPS/R/87)

4.1.1 Report on the thematic session on regionalization (animal diseases)

4.1. During the July 2017 SPS Committee meeting, the Chairperson reported that a thematic session on regionalization had been held on 11 July 2017 as agreed by the SPS Committee in March 2017, based on a proposal submitted by the European Union (G/SPS/W/293). The purpose of the thematic session had been to provide an opportunity for Members to increase their awareness of regionalization principles, and to learn from each other by sharing experiences about the challenges, as well as the benefits, of implementing regionalization in practice from the perspective of an importing, as well as an exporting party. This, in turn, would contribute to building confidence among trading partners when recognizing or seeking recognition of their regionalization measures. In particular, the thematic session had focused on animal diseases.

4.2. The programme for the thematic session had been circulated in document G/SPS/GEN/1567. It had been prepared on the basis of contributions received from Members, and had been divided in three sessions.

4.3. In Session 1, the Secretariat had provided an overview of the provisions of the SPS Agreement on regionalization (Article 6) and relevant guidelines (G/SPS/48), as well as relevant jurisprudence from recent disputes. Dr Matthew Stone, Deputy-Director General of the OIE, had provided an overview of the OIE standards on zoning and compartmentalization, and their implementation. In addition, he had also presented the implementation challenges and opportunities in applying the regionalization approach. Discussions had covered the use of the SPS Committee Guidelines in disputes, the differences in terminology related to regionalization, the use of special and differential treatment in recognizing free areas and the process for OIE recognition, among others.

4.4. In Session 2, Members had shared their experiences on the practical implementation of regionalization from both an exporting perspective, as well as from an importing perspective. Presentations covered the use of regionalization in dealing with diseases such as highly pathogenic avian influenza, BSE, classical swine fever, as well as more general experiences in applying the regionalization principle. Discussions had highlighted the importance of 'peace-time' agreements, building trust among trading partners and creating regional frameworks for cooperation. In addition, several common weaknesses had been identified in the recognition process from the importing Members' perspective, such as the submission of insufficient data by the exporting Member. In addition, the OIE had underscored that reports of avian influenza outbreaks in wild birds should not change a country's disease status and, as such, should not result in trade restrictions.

4.5. In Session 3, Members had been provided with the opportunity to have general discussions on regionalization.

4.6. Concluding, the Chairperson had underscored that the thematic session had proven to be informative and interesting, and that it had provided a useful opportunity to increase Members' awareness of regionalization, from the perspective of existing international rules and guidelines, as well as its practical implementation by importing and exporting Members.

4.7. The Chairperson indicated that the presentations from the Thematic Session would be made available on the SPS Gateway page.

4.8. Finally, the Chairperson thanked the presenters for their insightful and interesting presentations. In particular, he expressed appreciation to the Deputy-Director General of the OIE

for participating in the thematic session. He also acknowledged the willingness of Members to share their experiences, as indicated by the number of speakers on the programme.

4.9. Chile thanked the European Union for their proposal to organize a thematic session on regionalization and suggested that another session on regionalization should be organized with a specific focus on plant health.

4.10. The European Union appreciated how the session had developed, and stated that the suggestion by Chile should be reflected upon.

4.11. The United States expressed appreciation for the diversity of perspectives in the presentations in Session 2, in particular by Guatemala, Ukraine and South Africa. The United States suggested developing a deeper exchange with the OIE on a regular basis, as the OIE's information was so valuable.

4.12. Guatemala and Japan appreciated the initiative by the European Union. Also, Guatemala supported Chile's proposal to hold a thematic session on regionalization and plant health.

4.13. The OIE recognised the high level of engagement by Members and the opportunity provided to learn about country perspectives. The OIE looked forward to a continued engagement.

4.14. The Chairperson indicated that although there already was a lengthy agenda for the October meeting, he and the Secretariat were always open to explore other issues, such as the proposal presented by Chile.

4.2 November 2017 meeting (G/SPS/R/88)

4.2.1 Committee work on regionalization

4.15. The United States thanked the European Union for proposing the thematic session on regionalization held on 11 July 2017, which had allowed the exchange of experiences and best practices between a diverse set of Members, and further deepened the understanding of the SPS Agreement as it relates to regionalization. The United States encouraged Members to actively use the agenda on regionalization to share experiences on challenges encountered and successes achieved in applying the principles of regionalization to facilitate safe trade. It further encouraged Members to strengthen the implementation of regionalization in a manner consistent with Article 6 of the SPS Agreement. The United States proposed: (i) the upcoming Fifth Review of the SPS Agreement as a possible avenue to focus on regionalization; (ii) to further the discussion within the Committee by holding future thematic sessions or workshops to explore aspects of regionalization in greater detail, perhaps with a focus on developing guidance on best practices; (iii) a thematic session on pest-free areas in February 2018; and (iv) that Members report on cases where they had successfully applied the concept of regionalization in resolving a specific trade concern. The United States concluded by calling on other Members to provide possible ideas on how to build on the discussion held in July 2017 on regionalization. The United States offered to present a short proposal for the next thematic session on pest-free areas for Members' comments, if there was interest.

4.16. The European Union welcomed the United States proposal and highlighted the importance of continuous work on regionalization, possibly within the framework of the Fifth Review. The European Union considered favourably the proposal to hold a thematic session on pest-free areas in February 2018. The European Union was also interested in observing cases where regionalization had been useful and where it had failed to address trade concerns. With regards to the suggestion on guidance or best practices, the European Union pointed to the existing guidelines on the implementation of Article 6 and enquired about the added value in elaborating on this. Finally, the European Union emphasised the contribution of the relevant international organizations, the OIE and IPPC, on this matter.

4.17. Chile reiterated its support for the US suggestions.

4.3 March 2018 meeting (G/SPS/R/90)

4.3.1 Report on the Thematic Session on Pest-Free Areas

4.18. The Chairperson reported that a thematic session on pest-free areas had been held on 27 February 2018 as agreed by the SPS Committee in November 2017, based on a proposal submitted by the United States (G/SPS/GEN/1593/Rev.1). The purpose of the thematic session had been to provide an opportunity for Members to increase their awareness of IPPC standards on pest-free areas, and to share experiences about the challenges, as well as the benefits, of implementing pest-free areas in practice from the perspective of an importing, as well as an exporting party. This, in turn, would contribute to building confidence among trading partners when recognizing or seeking recognition of pest-free areas. The programme for the thematic session had been circulated in document G/SPS/GEN/1596/Rev.1, based on contributions received from Members.

4.19. In the Chairperson's introductory remarks, he had underscored the importance of thematic sessions for the work of the SPS Committee, in order to discuss particular SPS-related topics in an informal setting, and to hear the experiences of different Members in implementing specific provisions of the SPS Agreement.

4.20. In Session 1, the Secretariat had provided an overview of the provisions of the SPS Agreement on pest-free areas (Article 6) and the relevant guidelines (G/SPS/48), as well as relevant jurisprudence from recent disputes. Although the existing body of relevant jurisprudence focused on disease-free areas in relation to animal health, the Secretariat had highlighted that the legal findings from these disputes could be broadly applicable to pest-free areas.

4.21. The Chairperson had also highlighted the important role played by the IPPC, as the standard-setting organization for plant health referenced in the SPS Agreement. Unfortunately, due to unforeseen circumstances, the representative of the IPPC had not been able to attend the thematic session. However, arrangements had been made for a Member to present on IPPC's behalf, providing information on the IPPC standards on pest-free areas; factors to consider when establishing pest-free areas; implementation challenges; and information on the IPPC's Pest-Free Area Project.

4.22. The ensuing discussions in Session 1 had covered the role of dispute settlement panels in assessing the evidence provided by Members in relation to the determination of pest-free areas and the broad nature of IPPC standards, among others.

4.23. In Part 1 of Session 2, speakers representing COSAVE and IAEA had shared their regional and international perspectives on the establishment of pest-free areas. At the regional level, the importance of defining and maintaining a pest-free area had been highlighted and the role of a regional plant protection organization (RPPO) in supporting the phytosanitary activities of its members. At the international level, the use of the sterile insect technique as a tool for establishing and maintaining pest-free areas had been explained, as well as the associated benefits and challenges of this approach.

4.24. In Part 2 of Session 2, Members had shared their practical experiences on the establishment and maintenance of pest-free areas, as well as the legislative aspects and more general principles related to their implementation. Presentations had covered the use of pest-free areas in dealing with pests such as the Mediterranean fruit fly, oriental fruit fly, guava fruit fly and the red imported fire ant in different regions of the world. In addition to the speakers indicated on the programme, a couple of Members had taken the floor to share experiences in recognizing pest-free areas of their trading partners. The discussions had highlighted the importance of the early detection of pests, the availability of a corrective action plan to deal with outbreaks, and building trust among trading partners.

4.25. In concluding, the Chairperson had remarked that the thematic session had proven to be informative and interesting, and that it had provided a useful opportunity to increase Members' awareness of pest-free areas, from the perspective of international rules and guidelines, as well as their practical implementation by Members. The presentations from the Thematic Session would be made available on the SPS Gateway page. Finally, the Chairperson had thanked the presenters for

their insightful and interesting presentations. The Chairperson had also acknowledged the willingness of Members to share their experiences.

4.26. The IPPC expressed regret for its unavoidable absence at the Thematic Session on Pest-Free Areas, due to weather-related travel delays. The IPPC conveyed its appreciation to the delegate from the United Kingdom for stepping in at the last minute to deliver the IPPC presentation. The IPPC also indicated its willingness to contribute to follow-up actions, if any, from the thematic session.

5 NOTIFICATIONS RELATED TO ARTICLE 6

5.1. From April 2017 through March 2018, 93 notifications (28 regular and 65 emergency) related to Article 6. Five of those notifications (all regular) indicated that the notified measure was trade facilitating; these notifications mainly inform of measures that will simplify the requirements for the import of products originating from certain regions, as well as the recognition of pest-free or disease-free areas.

Table 4.1: Trade Facilitating Notifications Related to Article 6

Document symbol	Notifying Member	Description of content
G/SPS/N/ARG/211	Argentina	The notified text establishes the phytosanitary requirements governing the importation into Argentina of sugar cane cuttings/slips on the basis of a pest risk analysis (PRA). ³
G/SPS/N/ARG/212	Argentina	The notified text establishes the phytosanitary requirements governing the importation of strawberry plants, established on the basis of a pest risk analysis. ⁴
G/SPS/N/MEX/328	Mexico	Pursuant to the Decision establishing the module of phytosanitary requirements for the importation of goods regulated by the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food, in relation to plant health (<i>Acuerdo por el que se establece el módulo de requisitos fitosanitarios para la importación de mercancías reguladas por la Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación, en materia de sanidad vegetal</i>), published in the Mexican Official Journal on 7 February 2012, the current phytosanitary requirements for the importation into Mexico of Brussels sprout (<i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. <i>gemmifera</i>) seeds originating in and coming from France have been amended on the basis of an update to the phytosanitary requirements and a pest risk re-assessment.
G/SPS/N/MEX/330	Mexico	Pursuant to the Decision establishing the module of phytosanitary requirements for the importation of goods regulated by the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food, in relation to plant health (<i>Acuerdo por el que se establece el módulo de requisitos fitosanitarios para la importación de mercancías reguladas por la Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación, en materia de sanidad vegetal</i>), published in the Mexican Official Journal on 7 February 2012, the phytosanitary requirements for the importation into Mexico of asparagus (<i>Asparagus officinalis</i>) seeds originating in and coming from the Netherlands have been established on the basis of a pest risk analysis.
G/SPS/N/RUS/146	Russian Federation	This letter abolishes a number of letters of Rosselkhoznadzor imposing restrictions on imports of live pigs, pork and pork products from Lithuania, Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Czech Republic and Romania due to ASF outbreaks. In particular, letters notified by G/SPS/N/RUS/48 dated 10 February 2014,

³ In the notification, France is indicated as the specific region/country likely to be affected.

⁴ In the notification, Spain is indicated as the specific region/country likely to be affected.

Document symbol	Notifying Member	Description of content
		G/SPS/N/RUS/49 dated 4 March 2014, G/SPS/N/RUS/64 dated 16 July 2014, G/SPS/N/RUS/76 dated 16 September 2014, G/SPS/N/RUS/142 dated 24 July 2017, G/SPS/N/RUS/143 dated 4 August 2017, are abolished. In accordance with this letter, import of live pigs, pork meat and raw meat preparations from the entire territory of the European Union to the territory of the Russian Federation, excluding the territory of Sardinia and certain other administrative territories of the EU member States, is allowed. The list of administrative territories is set out in the Annex to the veterinary certificate. Moreover, in accordance with this letter, import of heat-treated pork products from the territories affected by ASF is allowed only on condition of heat-treatment in accordance with Chapter 15.1 of the OIE Code. Transit restrictions for goods from ASF affected territories persist.

6 SPECIFIC TRADE CONCERNS AND REGIONALIZATION

6.1. Specific trade concerns (STCs) can be raised due to issues pertaining to regionalization. From April 2017 through March 2018, one STC that related to regionalization was raised for the first time.

Table 5.1: New STCs Related to Regionalization (April 2017–March 2018)

STC No	Title	Member raising the concern	Member maintaining the measure	Date first raised
431	South Africa's import restrictions on poultry due to Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza	European Union	South Africa	02/11/2017

6.2. For the same period, four previously raised STCs that related to regionalization were brought again to the attention of the Committee.

Table 5.2: Previously Raised STC's Related to Regionalization (April 2017–March 2018)

STC No	Title	Member raising the concern	Member maintaining the measure	Date first raised
271	Restrictions on imports of swine meat	Brazil	Mexico	24/06/2008
392	China's import restrictions due to African swine fever	European Union	China	15/07/2015
393	Korea's import restrictions due to African swine fever	European Union	Korea, Republic of	15/07/2015
406	China's import restrictions due to Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza	European Union, United States of America	China	16/03/2016

6.3. In addition, panel proceedings in the context of the WTO dispute settlement resolution procedures continued with respect to two previously raised STCs:

- India's restrictions due to avian influenza (STC 185 raised by the United States, March 2004). At its meeting on 19 June 2015, the DSB adopted the Appellate Body report and the panel report, as modified by the Appellate Body report (DS430). Thereafter, on 19 April 2016, the matter was referred to arbitration under Article 22.6 of the DSU. The arbitration panel was composed with the original panelists. On 6 April 2017, India requested the establishment of a compliance panel (Article 21.5). At its meeting on 19 April 2017, the DSB deferred the establishment of a compliance panel. At its meeting on 22 May 2017, the DSB agreed, pursuant to Article 21.5 of the DSU, to refer to the original panel, if possible. The arbitration and compliance proceedings are currently ongoing.

- Russia's measures on live pigs and pork products due to African swine fever (STC 369 raised by the European Union, March 2013). At its meeting on 21 March 2017, the DSB adopted the Appellate Body report and the panel report (DS475), as modified by the Appellate Body report. Thereafter, on 3 January 2018, the matter was referred to arbitration under Article 22.6 of the DSU. On 25 January 2018, the Russian Federation requested consultations under Article 21.5 (compliance proceedings) of the DSU, and on 2 February 2018, the European Union also requested consultations under Article 21.5 of the DSU.
-