

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

G/SPS/GEN/204/Rev.5/Add.3
25 February 2005

(05-0804)

Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

SPECIFIC TRADE CONCERNS

Note by the Secretariat¹

Addendum

PART 4

This part of document G/SPS/GEN/204/Rev.5 contains summary information regarding all issues which were raised in the SPS Committee between 1995 and 2004, and on which a resolution was reported prior to 2004.

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 or obligations under the WTO.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ARGENTINA	1
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY ARGENTINA	1
Animal Health and Zoonoses	1
171. Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Singapore, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, United States and others – Measures related to BSE.....	1
AUSTRALIA	3
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY AUSTRALIA	3
Food Safety	3
172. Australia – Restrictions on imports of sauces containing benzoic acid.....	3
173. Australia and New Zealand – Import restrictions on cheese	4
Animal Health and Zoonoses	5
174. Australia – Ban on salmon imports.....	5
Plant Health	5
175. Australia - Access of California table grapes	5
BRAZIL	6
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY BRAZIL	6
Plant Health	6
176. Brazil – Restrictions on imported wheat.....	6
CANADA	7
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY CANADA	7
Animal Health and Zoonoses	7
177. Canada - Measures affecting imports of products containing Brazilian beef.....	7
CHINA	8
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY CHINA	8
Food Safety	8
178. China – Import ban on products of Dutch origin.....	8
Animal Health and Zoonoses	9
179. China – Quarantine measures for the entry and exit of aquatic products	9
COLOMBIA	10
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY COLOMBIA	10
Animal Health and Zoonoses	10
180. Colombia - FMD restrictions.....	10
CZECH REPUBLIC	11

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY CZECH REPUBLIC	11
Food Safety	11
181. Czech Republic - Prohibition of poultry meat imports from Thailand	11
Animal Health and Zoonoses	12
182. Czech Republic – Regulation concerning warehouses and silos	12
Plant Health.....	12
183. Czech Republic - Imports of potatoes.....	12
EL SALVADOR.....	13
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY EL SALVADOR	13
Animal Health and Zoonoses	13
184. El Salvador – Restrictions on meat and dairy products	13
EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES	13
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES	13
Food Safety	13
185. European Communities – Restrictions on honey imports.....	13
186. European Communities - Emergency measures on citrus pulp	14
187. European Communities – Trade restrictions in response to cholera.....	14
HONDURAS.....	15
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY HONDURAS.....	15
Plant Health.....	15
188. Honduras – Restrictions on imports of rough rice	15
INDONESIA.....	15
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY INDONESIA	15
Plant Health.....	15
189. Indonesia - Restrictions on importation of fresh fruit.....	15
ISRAEL.....	16
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY ISRAEL	16
Animal Health and Zoonoses	16
190. Israel – Measures affecting imports of bovine meat.....	16
JAPAN	17
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY JAPAN.....	17
Plant Health.....	17
191. Japan – Testing requirements for different varieties of apples, cherries and nectarines... 17	
REPUBLIC OF KOREA.....	17
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA	17
Food Safety	17

192.	Korea – Import ban on frozen poultry	17
193.	Korea – Shelf-life requirements.....	18
	Other Concerns	19
194.	Korea – Import clearance measures and practices.....	19
	MALAYSIA	20
	CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY MALAYSIA	20
	Food Safety	20
195.	Malaysia and Singapore - Notifications related to dioxin	20
	MEXICO	21
	CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY MEXICO	21
	Plant Health	21
196.	Mexico – Import prohibition of milled rice	21
	NEW ZEALAND	23
	CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY NEW ZEALAND	23
	Plant Health	23
197.	New Zealand - Proposed import prohibition of commodity-country combinations of fresh cut flowers and foliage.....	23
	NORWAY	23
	CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES	23
	Animal Health and Zoonoses	23
198.	Norway – Restrictions on gelatin imports	23
	PANAMA	24
	CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY PANAMA	24
	Plant Health	24
199.	Panama – Requirements for certification of consumer rice.....	24
	PHILIPPINES	24
	CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY THE PHILIPPINES	24
	Food Safety	24
200.	Philippines – Certification of meat and dairy products	24
	Plant Health	25
201.	Philippines - Notification on Chinese fruit imports.....	25
	POLAND	26
	CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY POLAND	26
	Animal Health and Zoonoses	26
202.	Poland - Notifications on veterinary measures and measures on animal products including gelatin	26

SLOVAK REPUBLIC	27
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC	27
Plant Health	27
203. Slovak Republic – Restrictions on imports of apples, pears and quinces.....	27
UNITED STATES	28
CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY THE UNITED STATES	28
Plant Health	28
204. United States – Import restrictions on rhododendrons in growing medium.....	28

ARGENTINA**CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY ARGENTINA****Animal Health and Zoonoses***Concerns related to TSEs***171. Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Singapore, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, United States and others – Measures related to BSE**

Raised by:	Switzerland
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	May 1996 (G/SPS/R/5 and Corr.1, paras. 6-9), October 1996 (G/SPS/R/6, para. 53), March 1997 (G/SPS/R/7, paras. 56), July 1997 (G/SPS/R/8, paras. 10-19), October 1997 (G/SPS/R/9/Rev.1, para. 15-17), March 1998 (G/SPS/R/10, para. 9), June 1998 (G/SPS/R/11, para. 29), September 1998 (G/SPS/R/12, paras. 26-30), November 1998 (G/SPS/R/13, paras. 17-18), March 1998 (G/SPS/R/14, para. 14), March 1999 (G/SPS/R/14, para. 8)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/AUS/56, G/SPS/N/AUS/57, G/SPS/N/CAN/18, G/SPS/N/CHL/1, G/SPS/N/CHL/6, G/SPS/N/CHL/31, G/SPS/N/CZE/14 and Add.1, G/SPS/N/SGP/1, G/SPS/W/68, G/SPS/W/79, G/SPS/GN/5, G/SPS/GEN/71
Solution:	Slovak transit ban removed, mutually satisfactory solution found with regard to Slovak importation of Swiss milk and milk products; Chilean import measure modified; some other measures withdrawn/revisted.

1. In May 1996, Switzerland presented information on its BSE situation, and noted that a number of countries had restricted imports of dairy products, although both the OIE and the WHO concluded that dairy products posed no risk in respect of BSE. In October 1996, Switzerland provided an update of its sanitary prescriptions, culling and veterinary measures to be adopted at the border. In March 1997, Switzerland indicated that although it was a country of low incidence of BSE, it had been subject to a number of BSE-related trade restrictions, some of which could not be justified under WTO rules. The Chairman agreed to hold informal consultations with interested Members on 21 March 1997.

2. In July 1997, Switzerland reported that although there had been some positive developments, problems remained. Switzerland addressed some questions to the Members concerned, stressing its interest to find rapid solutions through bilateral discussions. Argentina informed the Committee that it had replied to Swiss questions and would provide more information; Switzerland expressed satisfaction with this progress. Brazil noted that its import prohibition of bovine semen was based on the classification of bovine semen as a medium risk product, and on Brazil's BSE-free status. At the subsequent meeting of the relevant MERCOSUR working group in July 1997, Brazil would attempt to reclassify bovine semen as low risk.

3. Canada noted that there had been no changes to its import conditions for the importation of live cattle, bovine embryos, bovine semen, bovine meat or meat products from Switzerland, although a draft document on BSE policies was being discussed. Canada was receiving comments on its draft measure, which would be in accordance with the OIE Code. Canada was concerned with the lack of quantitative or qualitative parameters for the differentiation between countries with high and low incidence of BSE, and re-extended an invitation for bilateral discussions.

4. The United States stressed that it did not prohibit the importation of meat. BSE-related measures were subject to continued review based on scientific evidence, which, for example, had led to the opening of trade in bovine semen, although other matters remained unresolved. The United States remained open to scientific discussion in the area. Switzerland noted that the United States required certification for dried meat, and hoped that the reviewed US policies would be in line with OIE recommendations.

5. Romania informed the Committee that it had held bilateral discussions with Switzerland. Its policies were in line with OIE recommendations, and would be notified shortly. Switzerland expressed satisfaction with the results of bilateral talks. Poland noted that imports to Poland were carried out on the grounds of individual import permissions, but that no application had been received from Switzerland. Switzerland requested bilateral clarifications. Singapore indicated that countries exporting beef were required to certify BSE-freedom for six years. It believed this measure to be consistent with the SPS Agreement, and planned to notify it shortly.

6. The Czech Republic was concerned about continued occurrence of BSE in Switzerland, especially since the Czech Republic was BSE-free. However, imports of bovine semen, brain and embryos from Switzerland were not restricted. The Czech Republic would prefer to continue discussion at the level of veterinary experts. The European Communities noted that measures were taken on a national basis by EC member States, but were screened for conformity with EC law before being notified to WTO. In the case of BSE, this had taken more time than expected, and although there was no common position within the European Communities, changes to the policy were being considered. The European Communities indicated it was going beyond OIE recommendations, and indicated that it would be useful to continue discussions with the relevant experts.

7. In October 1997, Switzerland indicated that its BSE-situation was improving, but that numerous restrictions continued to affect Swiss exports of live cattle, genetic material, meat, and in certain cases milk products. Bilateral consultations were continuing. Switzerland questioned why the Australian quarantine requirements for the importation of bovine embryos and semen applied to Switzerland only, and whether countries with actual BSE incidents were subject to similar requirements. Switzerland also wondered why the objective of the new requirements was to "develop import requirements...based on international standards", whereas the notification indicated that no international standard existed. Australia replied that it had developed generic conditions for importation of ruminants and ruminant genetic material from member States of the European Communities, but had established bilateral conditions with other trading partners. The conditions in the notified draft requirements for Switzerland were in accordance with Australia's general import policy relating to BSE promulgated in January 1995, and were equivalent to BSE requirements for all other countries. International standards existed and Australia did not consider that the notified draft measures deviated from such standards.

8. Switzerland questioned why the Czech import restriction on imports of cattle over six months applied to Switzerland only, and whether countries with actual BSE incidents were subject to similar requirements. The Czech Republic replied that an individual import permit was required for traders interested in importing goods subject to veterinary control, including live animals. The Czech authorities considered the epizootic situation in the country of origin, frequency of newly found cases of contagious diseases, efficiency of eradication programmes, etc. The import approach was always the same and included discussion with the veterinary authorities of the country of origin. The system distinguished between countries with sporadic positive cases and those with continued occurrence of cases, like Switzerland. Although the measures in place in Switzerland corresponded to OIE recommendations, they had not fully eliminated BSE-related risks, and had not prevented new infections. Unlike other countries, Switzerland slaughtered and destroyed only BSE-affected animals, not all animals kept and fed in the same place. Such animals could be considered as a source of disease. Trade between the Czech Republic and the European Communities was based on EC

measures which represented a higher rate of prevention than the OIE recommendations. The Czech Republic offered to continue bilateral discussions with Switzerland.

9. In March 1998, Switzerland reported that most BSE-related measures against its exports remained in place although they deviated from OIE recommendations. However, some Members had eliminated or revised their measures, especially on genetic products. With respect to the European Communities, Switzerland hoped that recent developments would lead to a more predictable situation. In June 1998, Switzerland and the Slovak Republic reported on progress achieved during consultations and in September 1998, Switzerland reported that the transit ban had been removed, although discussions on market access for dairy products continued.

10. In September 1998, Switzerland reiterated concerns with import prohibitions on Swiss bovine semen, which seemed to contradict WTO provisions regarding non-discrimination, risk assessment, notification and consultation. Switzerland was still awaiting answers to its detailed questions to the relevant Members, or re-admission of Swiss exports. The European Communities reported on useful bilateral contacts with Switzerland, and indicated that the European Communities was undertaking an inventory of all national BSE-related measures in order to notify them. In addition, the European Communities would propose that EC member States harmonize their conditions for import from Switzerland. Chile indicated that, based on OIE recommendations on BSE, it had authorized bovine semen imports from France and was processing a request from the United Kingdom. No official request to export bovine semen had been received from Switzerland.

11. In November 1998, Switzerland and the Slovak Republic reported that they were close to a short-term solution regarding the Slovak import ban on Swiss dairy. In the longer term, a few technical issues remained to be settled. In March 1999, Switzerland informed the Committee that a mutually satisfactory solution regarding Slovak importation of Swiss milk and milk products had been found. Chile reported that its measure affecting imports of bovine semen had been modified.

AUSTRALIA

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY AUSTRALIA

Food Safety

172. Australia – Restrictions on imports of sauces containing benzoic acid

Raised by:	Philippines
Supported by:	Malaysia
Dates raised:	September 1998 (G/SPS/R/12, paras. 83-85), November 1998 (G/SPS/R/13, paras. 24-25), July 1999 (G/SPS/R/15, para. 68), June 2000 (G/SPS/R/19, para. 21), October 2001 (G/SPS/R/25, para. 36)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/GEN/106; see also G/SPS/13, G/SPS/GEN/137 and G/SPS/W/107/Rev.1
Solution:	Australian tolerance level modified in June 2000. In October 2001, the Philippines confirmed that sauces were no longer being detained.

12. In September 1998, the Philippines voiced concerns that Australia's import prohibition on Philippine sauces containing benzoic acid were discriminatory, since sauces from New Zealand were allowed entry even if they contained benzoic acid. Australia indicated willingness to pursue this matter with the Philippines. Both Members noted the absence of an international standard for benzoic acid in sauces. In November 1998, the Philippines reported that bilateral consultations had not been successful. Australia explained that the different rules applying to sauces from New Zealand were

transitional, and stemmed from a treaty establishing a common food standards system for both countries. Australia expected that the final standard for food additives would be implemented in the first half of 1999.

13. In July 1999, the Philippines again reported on bilateral consultations. Completion of Australia's new food code was foreseen for late 1999. Australia confirmed that benzoic acid would be allowed as an additive under the new food standards code.

14. In June 2000, the Philippines requested an update of the situation from Australia. Australia reported that the relevant part of the Australian Food Standards Code had been revised. The present restriction on benzoic acid would be removed and replaced on 22 June 2000 with a tolerance level of 1000 milligrams per kilogram for benzoates in sauces, applicable to all products sold in the Australian market, whether domestic or imported.

15. In October 2001, the Philippines confirmed that Australia had modified the tolerance level for benzoic acid in sauces, and that detention of Philippine sauces in Australia due to benzoic acid had not been noted in Hold Order Lists since June 2000.

173. Australia and New Zealand – Import restrictions on cheese

Raised by:	European Communities, Switzerland
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	June 1998 (G/SPS/R/11 and Corr.1, paras. 41-42b), November 1998 (G/SPS/R/13, paras. 21-23), March 1999 (G/SPS/R/14, paras. 9-13), November 2000 (G/SPS/R/20, para. 32)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/AUS/80, G/SPS/N/AUS/107, G/SPS/N/NZL/48
Solution:	Switzerland reported that a mutually satisfactory solution had been found.

16. In June 1998, Switzerland reported that, without advance notice, New Zealand and Australia had stopped imports of hard cheeses made from unpasteurized milk, on the grounds that they did not meet the sanitary requirements. Australia and New Zealand responded that the relevant import measure required inactivation of pathogenic organisms. This measure had been put in place before 1 January 1995 and therefore not been notified, but compliance had recently been reinforced. ANZFA was evaluating the applications received from Switzerland and the European Communities.

17. In November 1998, the European Communities requested Australia to identify the international standard on which its import ban on Roquefort cheese was based, or to provide scientific justification and a risk assessment. Australia responded that its food standards required all cheese to be made from pasteurized milk, or milk that had undergone an equivalent process. Australia's risk assessment on Roquefort cheese had identified potential problems with pathogenic micro-organisms, in particular entero-hemorrhagic E-coli. Further data from the Roquefort manufacturers had been received and were being evaluated. In addition to food safety assessments, Roquefort cheese was being evaluated for risks to animal health. Draft revised import conditions would be notified soon, and comments solicited. A final decision was likely in the first quarter of 1999 on both food safety and animal health aspects.

18. In March 1999, Switzerland asked about the progress of ANZFA's procedures. Australia responded that ANZFA had conducted a risk assessment. The documentation would be published on 17 March 1999 for public comment, after which a final recommendation would be made. Swiss officials in Canberra would be briefed on 16 March 1999. Regarding EC concerns, Australia reported that according to a risk assessment initiated by the Australia New Zealand Food Authority (ANZFA), French Roquefort did not comply with Australian requirements. French officials in Canberra would

be briefed on the issue. In November 2000, Switzerland reported that a mutually satisfactory solution had been found.

Animal Health and Zoonoses

Other Animal Health Concerns

174. Australia – Ban on salmon imports

Raised by:	Canada, United States
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	October 1996 (G/SPS/R/6, paras. 13-15), March 1997 (G/SPS/R/7, para. 58)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/AUS/3
Solution:	Dispute settlement (W/DS18 and W/DS26, respectively). Mutually agreed resolution between Canada and Australia reported in May 2000.

19. In October 1996, the United States reported that Australia maintained a ban on North American fresh, chilled or frozen salmon on the grounds that imports might transmit diseases and pathogens to Australian fishery stocks. In 1994, Australia published a draft risk assessment which indicated there was little risk from imported North American salmon. However, Australia did not adjust its measure to reflect the results of that risk assessment, but instead undertook another risk assessment, completed in May 1996, which again failed to find a scientific basis for maintaining the ban. The United States expected that when the final report was published, the ban would be lifted, especially since the salmon in question complied with OIE standards.

20. Australia indicated that the 1995 draft risk assessment had been revised in response to the large number of comments received. Comments, including from the United States and Canada, had again been received on the 1996 draft risk assessment, which would be finalized by the end of 1996. Australia noted that the OIE standard did not meet its appropriate level of protection. In March 1997, Canada and the United States again noted their concern that Australia had decided to maintain its ban on salmon imports. Canada had formally requested the establishment of a panel in the Dispute Settlement Body.

Plant Health

175. Australia - Access of California table grapes

Raised by:	United States
Supported by:	Philippines on behalf of ASEAN, European Communities
Dates raised:	March 2001 (G/SPS/R/21, paras. 92-94), July 2001 (G/SPS/R/22, paras. 65-67), October 2001 (G/SPS/R/25, para. 26), March 2002 (G/SPS/R/26, para. 39).
Relevant document(s):	Raised orally
Solution:	Mutually agreed solution on a series of risk management procedures to be re-evaluated in a year.

21. In March 2001, the United States indicated that for the past 10 years there had been difficulties in exporting California table grapes to Australia. Even under Australia's new IRA process, delays and requests for additional information and documentation had continued, although nearly a year had elapsed since the release of the import risk assessment (IRA). Australia had conducted additional studies, the latest focussing on the glassy-winged sharpshooter and Pierce's Disease. The United States maintained that these additional studies were not justified, and urged Australia to

modify its import restrictions consistent with the IRA and its obligations under Article 5.1. Australia explained that the administrative process was not complete until the Director of Plant and Animal Quarantine made a final decision. Australia was free of Pierce's Disease and believed that there was a need for further scientific research. A mission of scientists to the United States in 2000 had raised questions about changes in the risk profile which required more information. Australia was willing to cooperate with the United States to learn more about this disease and its vector. The Philippines, on behalf of ASEAN, shared the US concern regarding Australia's phytosanitary regulatory process.

22. In July 2001, the United States expressed disappointment at Australia's apparent abandonment of its commitment to a transparent, science-based risk assessment system. The IRA process did not seem to have an end. Australia had initiated new studies whose chief purpose seemed to be to delay lifting the import prohibition on California table grapes. Australia had pointed to the relatively recent introduction of a leaf-hopping insect, the glassy-winged sharpshooter, although its own IRA had noted that the risks associated with this pest would be negligible. Australia had decided more research on risk mitigation for glassy-winged sharpshooters would be necessary. Table grapes in California were subject to numerous mitigations, and the United States was willing to address legitimate scientific concerns. However, additional research on a pest not found in shipments of table grapes was completely without scientific merit and was a delaying tactic. Australia indicated that the change in risk profile associated with the spread of Pierce's disease, and of its vector, the glassy-winged sharpshooter, in California required additional scientific information to ensure protection from quarantine risk.

23. In October 2001, the United States informed the Committee that constructive consultations had been held to discuss quarantine procedures. Both countries had agreed to continue the dialogue to work toward a resolution of the outstanding issues. Australia was confident that a mutually acceptable solution could be found soon.

24. In March 2002, the United States reported that following consultations, Australia and the United States had agreed on a series of risk management procedures to allow for the export of California table grapes to Australia. The risk management practices would be re-evaluated after one year.

BRAZIL

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY BRAZIL

Plant Health

176. Brazil – Restrictions on imported wheat

Raised by:	United States
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	March 1997 (G/SPS/R/7, paras. 16-17), July 2001 (G/SPS/R/22, para. 127)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/GEN/265
Solution:	Import of certain classes of wheat allowed as of early 2001.

25. In March 1997, the United States raised concern regarding Brazilian restrictions on wheat imports intended to prevent the establishment of the fungus *tilletia controversa* (TCK bunt or Dwarf bunt). However, a 1996 bilateral agreement was based on the understanding that the fungus in question could not be established in Brazil, and the United States was not aware of scientific evidence that might alter this conclusion. Brazil responded that it had implemented new legislation on risk assessment and risk management for several products as a result of harmonization efforts in the

MERCOSUR context. Thus, a certificate of origin was required for wheat, to establish that the product originated in a pest-free zone. Scientific consultations between Brazilian and US experts had yet to produce a final report on the risk posed by *tilletia controversa* and *tilletia indica* (Karnal bunt). The 1996 bilateral agreement did not preclude Brazil from applying its internal legislation.

26. In July 2001, the United States reported that following extensive technical consultations, Brazil had issued new import instructions in early 2001 that allow import of certain classes of US wheat (G/SPS/GEN/265). The United States considered this trade concern resolved.

CANADA

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY CANADA

Animal Health and Zoonoses

Concerns related to TSEs

177. Canada - Measures affecting imports of products containing Brazilian beef

Raised by:	Brazil
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	March 2001 (G/SPS/R/21, paras. 2-5)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/GEN/245, G/SPS/W/108, G/SPS/N/CAN/39, G/SPS/N/CAN/94
Solution:	Suspension lifted in February 2001.

27. Canada outlined its BSE policy, and informed Members of recent actions taken regarding the application of this policy. Imports from Brazil had recently been suspended because Brazil had not provided the information requested by Canada in order to carry out a risk assessment. Canada was especially concerned about the traceability of cattle imported from BSE-infected countries. Canada had lifted its suspension after receipt and analysis of documentation from Brazil and a visit to Brazil by scientists from Canada, the United States and Mexico. Canada reported that Brazilian authorities had agreed to certification requirements. Brazil regretted that Canada had not handled this matter in a more transparent manner, with prior notification and consultation. Brazil recalled its BSE-free status according to OIE classification, and its ban on feeding of ruminant material to cattle. Brazil had suffered many adverse effects from Canada's hasty embargo. This had raised awareness of certain shortcomings of the multilateral system in cases like this one. Brazil announced its intention to present proposals to the SPS Committee and the General Council to address these problems.

CHINA**CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY CHINA****Food Safety****178. China – Import ban on products of Dutch origin**

Raised by:	European Communities
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	June 2002 (G/SPS/R/27, paras 31-32), November 2002 (G/SPS/R/28, paras 73-74), April 2003 (G/SPS/R/29, paras. 82-83), June 2003 (G/SPS/R30, paras. 39-40)
Relevant document(s):	Raised orally
Solution:	Ban on Dutch products lifted

28. The European Communities stated that the Chinese authorities had suspended imports of all products of animal origin from the Netherlands after detection of one positive consignment in a single category of products. The European Communities considered this measure to be more trade restrictive than necessary, and noted that in a similar situation with regard to Chinese products, the European Communities had given China sufficient time to solve problems of detection of the presence of chloramphenicol in their products.

29. China noted that the use of chloramphenicol in animal foodstuffs had been prohibited in EC member States since 1994. When the substance had been detected in Dutch products, China had imposed a provisional ban and immediately alerted the Dutch authorities. China had received part of the information requested, and was waiting for further information so as to review its measure. The representative of China reported that the problem apparently arose due to Dutch imports of feedstuffs from some eastern European countries, which gave rise to concerns regarding Dutch import control measures, residue monitoring systems and export control measures.

30. In November 2002, the European Communities reported that some progress had been made, however they requested China to increase efforts to resolve the issue. The European Communities considered this a disproportionate reaction to a problem that could have been resolved in a mutually satisfactory manner without disrupting trade. China observed that other countries had faced similar problems with Dutch products. His country was working to remove the ban remaining for some products. For this purpose, the Netherlands had been invited to provide information to enable China to conduct a risk assessment, as soon as possible.

31. In April 2003, the European Communities reported that China had lifted restrictions on certain products of no real trade significance, but no satisfactory solution had yet been found for a large number of animal products of Dutch origin, in particular dairy products. In December 2002, the European Communities had supplied the information requested by China. In March 2003, China requested additional information and indicated that an inspection mission would be necessary before anything further could be done. The European Communities questioned why this inspection visit had not been proposed sooner.

32. China responded that it had lifted the ban on certain products on 25 December 2002, after receipt of information from the European Communities. For other products, China had been waiting for almost one year on the Netherlands' residue monitoring and assessment controls. Based on the information provided to date, China had identified significant defects with respect to conformity with the relevant EC directives, including sampling of dairy products and casings. An inspection visit was

necessary to address these outstanding issues. The receipt of additional information from the Netherlands on 21 March 2003 would enable the visit of China's inspection team in the near future.

33. In June 2003, the European Communities reported that the Chinese embargo on products from the Netherlands had been lifted and the European Communities believed this issue now resolved. China reaffirmed that the ban on Dutch products had been lifted after an inspection visit and the conclusion of a risk assessment.

Animal Health and Zoonoses

Other Animal Health Concerns

179. China – Quarantine measures for the entry and exit of aquatic products

Raised by:	European Communities
Supported by:	United States
Dates raised:	April 2003 (G/SPS/R/29, paras. 33-35), June 2003 (G/SPS/R/30, para. 39, 59-60)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/CHN/17
Solution:	Measure notified and comments solicited

34. The European Communities noted that Decree No.31, due to enter into force in June 2003, had not been notified to the WTO. The European Communities, therefore, were not able to assess the decree and comment on it. The Chinese authorities were requested to notify the measure to the WTO and suspend its entry into force for four additional months to allow Members a chance to comment on it and for permits to be issued to exporters. The United States echoed the concerns of the European Communities.

35. China explained that Decree 31 was notified to the WTO as part of a notification covering China's existing laws on animal and plant quarantine and on sanitation, inspection and certification of imports and exports of food products at the time of its WTO accession. The purpose of the Decree was to standardize the standards of quarantine for aquatic animals and to improve transparency of procedures in line with WTO obligations on transparency and consistency. The regulation did not contain any new technical requirements and thus did not need to be notified to the WTO. Nonetheless, China would consider any comments from Members. China had decided to delay the date of entry into force from 10 December 2002 until 12 June 2003, so as to minimize any trade impact. On 23 December 2002, AQSIQ sent a notice to all foreign embassies in Beijing and requested them to identify which governmental authorities had responsibility for issuing certificates for export to China, and to submit a model certificate so that China could verify the certificates.

36. In June 2003, the European Communities reported that China had notified its Decree 31 on aquatic products and had provided a comment period.

COLOMBIA

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY COLOMBIA

Animal Health and Zoonoses

Concerns related to FMD

180. Colombia - FMD restrictions

Raised by:	Argentina
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	March 2002 (G/SPS/R/26, paras. 18-19), June 2002 (G/SPS/R/27, paras. 44-45), November 2002 , (G/SPS/R/28, paras. 56-58), April 2003 (G/SPS/R/29, paras. 74-75), June 2003 (G/SPS/R/30, para. 44), October 2003 (G/SPS/R/31, para. 37)
Relevant document(s):	Raised orally
Solution:	Restrictions lifted on bovine meat from Argentina

37. Argentina reported that Colombia had restricted imports of certain products from Argentina on 26 September 2001, after the FMD outbreaks in Argentina. Colombia had agreed to accept Argentine products for which risk mitigation techniques could be applied according to the OIE code, and on 17 October 2001 had published new measures specifying those processed products which could be imported. An inspection visit by the Colombian sanitary services in late October 2001 complemented the information provided by the Argentine services. However, Argentina was unable to export the products in question due to continued information requests from Colombia. Colombia noted that it had replied to comments and questions from Argentina in November 2001 and March 2002. Argentina did not have establishments authorised by the Colombian Livestock Institute (ICA) to export risk products to Colombia. Colombia was considering the process and production methods at Argentine establishments to inactivate the virus in risk materials, and if satisfactory, Argentine establishments would receive the necessary ICA authorization.

38. In June 2002, Argentina indicated that its exports continued to be restricted. Colombia recalled that no plants in Argentina were currently certified to export to Colombia. However, Colombia had identified 10 plants in Argentina for which it needed to update information, and another 38 plants which it proposed to visit for the first time. Only 21 of these establishments had provided the information needed for the Colombian Agricultural Institute to undertake certification visits.

39. In November 2002, Argentina noted that Colombia continued to prohibit Argentine meat despite the fact that there had been no new outbreaks in Argentina for nine months. Colombia still had not carried out inspections of 21 packing plants which Colombia claimed was necessary before trade in beef meat could resume. Colombia stated that Argentina had blocked imports of fresh flowers from Colombia, and requested Argentina not to link these two issues. Argentina indicated that there was no linkage to Colombian flowers, and asked Colombia to provide information as to whether it would carry out the veterinary inspections in Argentina so that beef meat exports could resume.

40. In April 2003, Argentina noted that it had not received a reply from Colombia on the completed questionnaire concerning chilled products. No in-situ inspections had taken place that would lead to a lifting of these restrictions nor had Argentina received any requests for further information. Noting Colombia's concern over cut flowers, Argentina stated that it did not maintain any restriction on the import of flowers from Colombia. Colombia stated that it enjoyed a favourable FMD situation but allowed the importation of low risk products. High risk products, however, were

banned from Argentina and this was notified to the WTO. Establishments of origin had to be authorized by the Colombian sanitary service and a programme of visits to Argentina had been planned. Information from Argentine authorities was required with regard to the serological and epidemiological assessment of FMD, vaccination coverage, and the dates on which the status of disease freedom both with or without vaccination were achieved. Colombia considered the Argentine decision to suspend the import of cut flowers in November 2001, without a WTO notification, to be unjustified.

41. In June 2003, Argentina reported that progress had been made and that inspections of Argentine meat plants by Colombian officials were being planned. Colombia noted that once the necessary information was provided by Argentina, Colombian authorities would carry out the necessary missions. The good progress in the case of bovine exports from Argentina to Colombia was similar to the progress made on the issue of flower exports from Colombia to Argentina.

42. In October 2003, Argentina reported that the issue had been resolved at the end of September 2003, and that Colombia had eliminated its restrictions. Colombia confirmed that the issue had been resolved, and that exports of flowers from Colombia to Argentina had also been discussed during the meeting.

CZECH REPUBLIC

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY CZECH REPUBLIC

Food Safety

181. Czech Republic - Prohibition of poultry meat imports from Thailand

Raised by:	Thailand
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	September 1998 (G/SPS/R/12, paras. 81-82), November 1998 (G/SPS/R/13, paras. 39-40), March 1999 (G/SPS/R/14, para. 16), July 1999 (G/SPS/R/15, para. 8), November 1999 (G/SPS/R/17, para. 5)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/CZE/16
Solution:	Czech measure lifted in October 1999.

43. In September 1998, Thailand indicated that since June 1998, the Czech Republic had stopped shipments of poultry meat from Thailand on the grounds that it contained levels of arsenic acid above the acceptable Czech limits. Thailand indicated that this measure was not scientifically justified and too trade restrictive, and asked whether the measure was non-discriminatory. The Czech Republic indicated that bilateral consultations had begun and would continue, and assured Thailand of the non-discriminatory nature of its testing methodology.

44. In November 1998, Thailand reported that bilateral consultations had been held, and that the Czech Republic had agreed to provide further clarifications on the measure, as well as a scientific justification. The Czech Republic indicated that the exchange of information would take place before a mission of Czech experts to Thailand in the near future.

45. In March 1999, Thailand and the Czech Republic reported that bilateral consultations were progressing, and that the problem might be resolved after a visit of Czech experts to Thailand, planned for April 1999. In July 1999, Thailand reported that the visit of Czech experts had been re-scheduled for September 1999. The Czech Republic confirmed that consultations were advancing. In

November 1999, the Chairman informed the Committee that the Czech Republic had recently notified the lifting of the measure from 1 October 1999.

Animal Health and Zoonoses

Other Animal Health Concerns

182. Czech Republic – Regulation concerning warehouses and silos

Raised by:	European Communities
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	October 1997 (G/SPS/R/9/Rev.1, para. 54)
Relevant document(s):	Raised orally
Solution:	EC satisfied with Czech clarifications.

46. The European Communities sought clarification of a Czech regulation requiring warehouses and silos for animal feed to be under state control for purposes of quality assurance. The Czech Republic indicated that it wished to pursue the matter bilaterally with EC veterinary authorities. In February 2001, the Czech Republic indicated that the European Communities had accepted its clarifications.

Plant Health

183. Czech Republic - Imports of potatoes

Raised by:	European Communities
Supported by:	Argentina
Dates raised:	October 1996 (G/SPS/R/6, para. 27), October 1997 (G/SPS/R/9/Rev.1, paras. 51-53)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/CZE/6, G/SPS/N/CZE/12, G/SPS/GEN/42
Solution:	Second active ingredient approved, imports from EC resumed.

47. In October 1996, the European Communities expressed concern that the Czech Republic had not specified a final date for comments on G/SPS/N/CZE/12. The Czech Republic committed to pursuing the matter bilaterally with the European Communities. In October 1997, the European Communities expressed concern over Czech import requirements for ware potatoes, which it did not believe to be based on scientific principles. Moreover, equivalent methods of sprout treatment were not allowed. The European Communities pointed out that a Codex standard existed for the active ingredient involved. Argentina was concerned that the treatment had to be applied before harvest, making a post-harvest decision to export to the Czech Republic impossible, although alternative treatment methods existed. Furthermore, it was not clear to Argentina whether the registration procedure concerned the entire product formula or only the active ingredient.

48. The Czech Republic explained that imported plant products could not be circulated domestically if they contained residues of active plant protection ingredients not registered in the Czech Republic. Only one active ingredient had been approved, but registration procedures for a second one were under way. The Czech Republic believed that bilateral channels for resolving the issue, notably within the framework of the European Association Agreement, were far from exhausted.

49. In February 2001, the Czech Republic reported that the second active agent had been approved since 16 March 1998, and imports from the EC had resumed.

EL SALVADOR

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY EL SALVADOR

Animal Health and Zoonoses

Other Animal Health Concerns

184. El Salvador – Restrictions on meat and dairy products

Raised by:	Uruguay
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	November 1999 (G/SPS/R/17, para. 85), November 2000 (G/SPS/R/20, para. 32)
Relevant document(s):	Raised orally
Solution (if reported):	Issue resolved.

50. In November 1999, Uruguay reported on problems with exports of meat and dairy products to El Salvador on sanitary grounds, although no concrete sanitary problems or regulations had been mentioned. The representative of El Salvador indicated that these concerns would be transmitted to the appropriate authorities. In November 2000, Uruguay reported that the issue that been resolved.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Food Safety

185. European Communities – Restrictions on honey imports

Raised by:	United States
Supported by:	China, Mexico
Dates raised:	June 2003 (G/SPS/R/30, paras. 25-27)
Relevant document(s):	Raised orally
Solution:	resolved

51. The United States stated that on 22 May 2003, the European Communities initiated administrative steps to prohibit imports of honey from the United States. EC Directive 96-23 required exporting countries to submit a residue plan. If the residue plan did not contain sufficient guarantees of compliance with EC residue limits, the country would not be authorised to export honey to the European Communities. The United States considered the EC regime to be far more trade restrictive than necessary, and whilst not having identical rules, the United States had comprehensive control mechanisms. Furthermore, honey was consumed in very small quantities and should be considered a "low risk" food. The existing rules in the United States were more than adequate to avoid harm to human health. China and Mexico supported the concerns raised by the United States.

52. The European Communities explained that it was a net importer of honey and that measures were in place to protect consumers. The request for a residue surveillance plan was a general rule which applied to all products, and a high level of surveillance was needed for honey as it tended to be consumed by children. The United States had received a warning in February 2003 that the absence

of a residue plan would lead to their removal from the list of countries approved for import of honey to the European Communities. The European Communities was, however, willing to examine any residue plans provided by the United States.

186. European Communities - Emergency measures on citrus pulp

Raised by:	Brazil
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	September 1998 (G/SPS/R/12, paras. 49-50), October 2001 (G/SPS/R/25, para. 34)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/EEC/62
Solution:	Brazil reported in October 2001 that the emergency measures had been lifted.

53. In September 1998, Brazil expressed concerns regarding EC emergency notification G/SPS/N/EEC/62, which mentioned very high levels of dioxin found in citrus pulp pellets from Brazil. Brazil pointed out that this accident had already been fully dealt with. Brazilian authorities were maintaining bilateral talks with the European Communities on the subject. The European Communities explained that this accident had involved 90 000 tonnes of contaminated citrus pulp pellets destined for animal feed. After scientific discussions, including Brazil's private sector, the EC authorities had decided that the lack of information on the origin of the contamination, the amount of stocks involved and the lack of a solution justified the emergency measure. The European Communities hoped that ongoing contacts with the Brazilian authorities would result in a solution before the end of the year.

54. In October 2001, Brazil reported that following two technical visits by EC officials to evaluate Brazilian control systems, the emergency measures on dioxin in citrus pulp had been lifted.

187. European Communities – Trade restrictions in response to cholera

Raised by:	Tanzania
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	March 1998 (G/SPS/R/10, paras. 56-57), June 1998 (G/SPS/R/11, paras. 96-99)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/EEC/54
Solution:	Measures revised.

55. In March 1998, the European Communities informed the Committee that it had taken safeguard measures with respect to imports of fruit, vegetables and fish products in light of a cholera outbreak in Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda and Mozambique. The inspection procedures in these countries had shown deficiencies, but the European Communities planned to consult with them to find arrangements by which they could put in force proper hygiene requirements. EC member States were trying to develop a joint cholera policy based on risk assessment. The WHO observer did not consider the import ban necessary, especially on fish products which were not consumed in raw form in Europe. He drew attention to the WHO Guidance on Foundation of National Policy and Control of Cholera, and particularly the conclusion in Chapter IX that: *"Although there is a theoretical risk of Cholera transmission associated with some food commodities moving in international trade, this has rarely proved significant and authorities should seek means of dealing with it other than by applying an embargo on importation"*.

56. In June 1998, Tanzania reported that the European Communities continued to prohibit the importation of fresh, frozen and processed fishery products from the four African countries, although

tests had not found the bacteria concerned. Tanzania stressed that the EC ban was having severe economic effects on the Tanzanian economy, and that according to the SPS Agreement, Members should help developing countries comply with their SPS measures. The European Communities responded that it was now satisfied the necessary guarantees were in place, and that a new measure restoring trade with the four African countries would probably enter into force on 1 July 1998.

HONDURAS

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY HONDURAS

Plant Health

188. Honduras – Restrictions on imports of rough rice

Raised by:	United States
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	March 1997 (G/SPS/R/7, para. 55), July 2001 (G/SPS/R/22, para. 127)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/GEN/265
Solution:	Honduras lifted its restrictions in 1997, and the United States considers the concern resolved.

57. In March 1997, the United States expressed concern that Honduras had not lifted its restrictions on imports of rough rice. Honduras assured the Committee that its authorities would attempt to find a rapid solution to the problem.

58. In July 2001, the United States reported that Honduras had lifted its restrictions in 1997 (G/SPS/GEN/265). The United States considers this trade concern resolved.

INDONESIA

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY INDONESIA

Plant Health

189. Indonesia - Restrictions on importation of fresh fruit

Raised by:	New Zealand
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	November 2000 (G/SPS/R/20, paras. 8-10), March 2001 (G/SPS/R/21, paras. 44-45, July 2001 (G/SPS/R/22, paras. 54-55)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/GEN/219
Solution:	Restrictions lifted on 26 October 2001.

59. In November 2000, New Zealand noted that Indonesia had imposed restrictions on fresh fruit from New Zealand since the discovery of two fruit flies in a residential area of New Zealand in May 1996. No fruit flies were ever found outside a 200 meter zone around the initial incursion, and no fruit flies were trapped after three weeks. A number of WTO Members imposed restrictions on New Zealand fruit products following the initial incursion, but these restrictions were progressively lifted. Indonesia, however, continued to prohibit imports of fruit produced within a 15-km radius of the incursion and required cold treatment of all fruit from New Zealand. At bilateral consultations held in

November 2000, Indonesia had undertaken to review the information which New Zealand had already provided. Indonesia took note of New Zealand's concerns, and clarified that it needed further documentation supporting New Zealand's claim of freedom from Mediterranean fruit fly. However, Indonesia had no intention of maintaining measures which were not justifiable under the SPS Agreement and remained open to further consultations in order to achieve an acceptable resolution.

60. In March 2001, New Zealand reported that bilateral consultations had taken place, and that Indonesia had indicated willingness to inspect the fruit fly surveillance and phytosanitary export assurance systems in New Zealand. Indonesia confirmed that officials were planning to visit New Zealand in the near future. Indonesia hoped that the visit would result in an expeditious solution. Indonesian officials visited New Zealand in May 2001 to review New Zealand's surveillance and export assurance systems. They verified that the fruit fly has been successfully eradicated. Indonesia agreed the requirement of cold treatment and Mediterranean fruit fly free production areas were no longer necessary. It advised that it would lift existing restrictions on the importation of fresh fruit from New Zealand on 1 August 2001. Indonesia notified (G/SPS/N/IDN/16) on 26 October 2001 that it was lifting its restrictions on New Zealand fresh fruit effective from the date of notification.

ISRAEL

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY ISRAEL

Animal Health and Zoonoses

Concerns related to TSEs

190. Israel – Measures affecting imports of bovine meat

Raised by:	Uruguay
Supported by:	Argentina, Brazil
Dates raised:	March 1997 (G/SPS/R/7, paras. 9-11), July 1997 (G/SPS/R/8, para. 6), November 2000 (G/SPS/R/20, para. 32)
Relevant document(s):	Raised orally
Solution:	Issue resolved.

61. In March 1997, Uruguay indicated that Israel had adopted BSE-related measures, including requirements that bovine meat come from cattle with a maximum age of 36 months, which had not been notified to WTO. Since the measure did not take into account the sanitary conditions in the country of origin, the potential effect on bilateral trade was serious. Israel replied that it had notified exporting countries of the planned measure which was based on a questionnaire circulated to beef exporting countries. Israel took note of the concerns expressed. In July 1997, Uruguay reported that bilateral consultation were taking place and that progress had been satisfactory. In November 2000, Uruguay reported that the issue had been resolved.

JAPAN

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY JAPAN

Plant Health

191. Japan – Testing requirements for different varieties of apples, cherries and nectarines

Raised by:	United States
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	October 1996 (G/SPS/R/6, paras. 11-12), March 1997 (G/SPS/R/7, para. 57), July 2001 (G/SPS/R/22, para. 127)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/GEN/265
Solution:	Dispute settlement (W/DS/76) - mutually satisfactory solution notified in August 2001.

62. In October 1996, the United States reported that, under a 1995 bilateral agreement, Japan allowed two varieties of US apples into its market. US suppliers had to conduct lengthy and expensive tests to demonstrate that combined treatment of methyl bromide and cold storage was effective in killing codling moths on both varieties. These and other tests had demonstrated that the effectiveness of this treatment did not vary among different varieties of fruit. Nevertheless, Japan continued to block the introduction of new varieties of US fruit by requiring such redundant testing. The United States had formally initiated a consultation process with Japan under Article 5.8 of the SPS Agreement. Japan indicated that the formal exchange would be followed by a clarification process involving technical experts until a solution was reached based on scientific principles. In March 1997, the United States indicated it was reviewing new information provided by Japan. Japan noted that bilateral efforts would continue in order to reach a solution.

63. In a document introduced in July 2001, the United States indicated that despite extensive consultations with Japan, the United States was still awaiting implementation of the Panel decision (G/SPS/GEN/265). A mutually satisfactory solution was notified in August 2001.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Food Safety

192. Korea – Import ban on frozen poultry

Raised by:	Thailand
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	October 1997 (G/SPS/R/9/Rev.1, para. 45), March 1998 (G/SPS/R/10, paras. 67-68), June 1998 (G/SPS/R/11, paras. 21-23), September 1998 (G/SPS/R/12, paras. 15-16)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/KOR/44
Solution:	Thailand's comments taken into account – measure amended.

64. In October 1997, Thailand indicated that Korea had banned Thai frozen poultry because of listeria, although Korean experts had been satisfied after visiting facilities of the Thai poultry

industry. This ban had not been notified in advance. Thailand was determined to resolve this matter with Korea. Korea asked for detailed information in writing.

65. In March 1998, Thailand indicated that it had submitted the requested information. It sought clarification whether the measure was based on an international standard or on a risk assessment, particularly in light of information made available by the WHO working group on food-borne listeriosis, which indicated that listeriosis had a very low incidence in Asia. Korea responded that its measure was not a ban, but that consignments had been rejected.

66. In June 1998, Thailand noted that the proposed amendment to the Korean food code had been enacted retroactively to cover the disputed testing requirements and asked Korea not to enforce the testing requirements during the process of amendment of the food code. Korea reported that bilateral consultations had been held. The food code was being reviewed to improve food safety and to harmonize Korean regulations with international standards. All comments received were currently being reviewed, although some delays had occurred. Korea promised to inform Thailand of the final outcome.

67. In September 1998, Thailand asked for confirmation that the Korean Food Code had been amended so that zero tolerance criteria for listeria would not apply to imported frozen chicken after 16 June 1998. Korea clarified that meat for further processing and cooking was excluded from the requirement and not subject to inspection under the zero tolerance criteria for listeria.

193. Korea – Shelf-life requirements

Raised by:	Australia, Canada, United States
Supported by:	Argentina, European Communities
Dates raised:	June 1995 (G/SPS/R/2, paras. 39-40), November 1995 (G/SPS/R/3, paras. 7-8), May 1996 (G/SPS/R/5, paras. 42-44), March 1997 (G/SPS/R/7, paras. 20-21), July 1997 (G/SPS/R/8, paras. 8-9), October 1997 (G/SPS/R/9/Rev.1, paras. 6-7), July 2001 (G/SPS/R/22, para. 127)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/KOR/9, G/SPS/W/27, G/SPS/W/41, G/SPS/W/43, G/SPS/GEN/40, G/SPS/GEN/265
Solution:	The United States and Korea held formal consultations under dispute settlement (W/DS5), and notified a mutually agreed solution in July 1995. In July 2001, the United States indicated that the problem was resolved. Canada initiated formal dispute settlement (W/DS20), and a mutually satisfactory solution was notified in April 1996.

68. In June 1995, the United States informed the Committee of official consultations under Dispute settlement procedures with Korea regarding its government-mandated shelf-life requirements. Canada had joined these consultations. Korea indicated that although consultations had been productive, there was a high degree of ambiguity in the implementation of the Agreement. The parties had noted the lack of international standards in the area, and countries maintained very diverse practices. A mutually agreed solution was notified in July 1995. In November 1995, the United States expressed serious concern that Korea was not implementing the agreed settlement.

69. Also in November 1995, Canada indicated that it had initiated formal consultations with Korea related to shelf-life determination for bottled water and the prohibition of the use of ozonation. Korea confirmed that bottled water was excluded from the settlement reached with the United States, but was willing to enter into consultations with Canada. A mutually satisfactory solution was notified in April 1996.

70. In May 1996 Canada noted that although a formal understanding had been reached with regard to some concerns regarding shelf life, problems with the shelf life of bottled water continued. Korea had not offered any time-table for moving to a manufacturer-determined shelf life on bottled water. Korea took note of this concern. In July 1997, Canada reported that the matter had been pursued bilaterally, but no resolution had been found.

71. In May 1996, Australia expressed serious concern with regard to Korea's shelf-life regulations on ultra heat treated milk in consumer packs (UHT milk), which remained government mandated at a period substantially shorter than that applied in most countries. Australia was unaware of any scientific justification for this limited shelf-life period, and requested Korea to permit a manufacturer-determined shelf life by 1 July 1996. Korea took note of these concerns.

72. In March 1997, Australia reported that Korea had yet to implement a manufacturer-determined shelf life for UHT milk. Australia had provided a scientific submission to Korea in November 1996, which had not been accepted. Subsequently, Australia had provided another submission upon request. Korea indicated that it was reviewing the information provided by Australia and noted that its new system for shelf-life determination set a time-frame for the implementation of a manufacturer-determined shelf-life period for UHT milk.

73. In July 1997, Australia noted that Korea had not provided any justification for its non-acceptance of manufacturer-determined shelf life, and requested an explanation in accordance with Article 5.8. Korea indicated that manufacturer-determined shelf life would be applied to UHT milk before the end of 1998. In October 1997, Australia indicated that it had not received a satisfactory answer from Korea. Korea replied that it was reviewing the possibility of extending the current mandatory shelf-life period for UHT milk even before manufacturer-determined shelf life applied at the end of 1998.

74. In July 2001, the United States indicated that it considered the trade concern to be resolved (G/SPS/GEN/265).

Other Concerns

194. Korea – Import clearance measures and practices

Raised by:	United States
Supported by:	Several delegations
Dates raised:	June 1995 (G/SPS/R/2, paras. 39-40), May 1996 (G/SPS/R/5, paras. 4-5), October 1996 (G/SPS/R/6, para. 54), March 1997 (G/SPS/R/7, para. 54), July 1997 (G/SPS/R/8, para. 77), October 1997 (G/SPS/R/9/Rev.1, paras. 42-43), July 2001 (G/SPS/R/22, para. 127)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/W/64, G/SPS/W/66, G/SPS/GN/6, G/SPS/GEN/265
Solution:	Consultations under Dispute Settlement initiated (WT/DS3, WT/DS41); mutually satisfactory solution found.

75. In June 1995, the United States informed the Committee that it had held formal consultations with Korea regarding its inspection and testing methods. Korea indicated that although consultations had been productive, there was a high degree of ambiguity in the implementation of the Agreement. The parties had noted the lack of international standards in the area, and countries maintained very diverse practices. In May 1996, the United States expressed serious concern regarding Korea's import clearance measures and practices, which were not based on science, did not conform to international practice or standards, and were deliberately employed to discourage food and agricultural imports. The United States had submitted a formal request for consultations. Korea replied that these issues

had been discussed extensively in a series of bilateral consultations with the United States and other countries. Korea had taken various measures to comply with the SPS Agreement, but encountered problems common to developing countries: a low level of sanitary infrastructure, lack of experience and information, and lack of relevant international standards. However, Korea would continue to adapt its measures to the SPS Agreement.

76. In October 1996, the United States reported on ongoing discussions with Korea. The United States expected reforms to shorten the import clearance process in Korea without additional burdensome requirements, with a period for comments by WTO Members. Korea answered that an ambitious reform programme had been launched the previous year, including the establishment of an advanced inspection and quarantine system by the end of 1996. In March 1997, the United States noted that consultations continued. Although Korea had implemented some changes, concerns remained. Korea indicated that it would continue its efforts to conform its sanitary and phytosanitary legislation to the SPS Agreement.

77. In July 1997, the United States reported that after five rounds of consultations under the WTO dispute settlement procedure, some Korean import clearance laws and regulations had been reformed. However, since January new problems had arisen. The United States would continue to address these concerns in bilateral consultations until clearance times in Korean ports were similar to those in similar ports. Korea took note of the US comments. In October 1997, the United States noted that although some progress had been made, there seemed to be problems with the implementation of certain changes Korea had agreed to make. The representative of Korea indicated that in his view the new import clearance system was in full compliance with the SPS Agreement, however, the US concerns would be conveyed to the competent authorities in the capital.

78. In July 2001, the United States indicated that bilateral consultations initiated under the dispute settlement framework resulted in a mutually satisfactory and positive outcome (G/SPS/GEN/265). The United States considered this trade concern resolved.

MALAYSIA

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY MALAYSIA

Food Safety

195. Malaysia and Singapore - Notifications related to dioxin

Raised by:	Switzerland
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	July 1999 (G/SPS/R/15, para. 16)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/MYS/6, G/SPS/N/SGP/7
Solution (if reported):	Problems with Malaysia and Singapore were resolved in July 1999.

79. Switzerland expressed concern that it had been affected by restrictions on imports of European goods in response to the dioxin crisis in Belgium. Some Members had not targeted their measures only to affected areas. Switzerland reported that a solution had been found with Malaysia, and that the last few problems with Singapore would be resolved soon.

MEXICO

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY MEXICO

Plant Health

196. Mexico – Import prohibition of milled rice

Raised by:	Thailand
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	October 1997 (G/SPS/R/9/Rev.1, para. 44), March 1998 (G/SPS/R/10, paras. 69-70), June 1998 (G/SPS/R/11, para. 24), September 1998 (G/SPS/R/12, paras. 17-18), November 1998 (G/SPS/R/13, paras. 14-16), March 1999 (G/SPS/R/14, para. 15), July 1999 (G/SPS/R/15, para. 7), November 1999 (G/SPS/R/17, para. 86), March 2000 (G/SPS/R/18, para. 26), June 2000 (G/SPS/R/19, paras. 22-23), November 2000 (G/SPS/R/20, paras. 23-25), March 2001 (G/SPS/R/21, paras. 46-47), October 2001 (G/SPS/R/25, paras. 112-113), March 2002 (G/SPS/R/26, para. 138), June 2002 (G/SPS/R/27, para. 131)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/MEX/44, G/SPS/N/MEX/45, G/SPS/N/MEX/55, G/SPS/N/MEX/153, G/SPS/N/MEX/172, G/SPS/GEN/82, G/SPS/GEN/105, G/SPS/GEN/172, G/SPS/GEN/216
Solution:	Revised regulation published on 15 April 2002.

80. In October 1997, Thailand reported that Mexico prohibited importation of Thai milled rice because of the fungus *tilletia barclayana* (Kernel smut), although Mexican experts visiting Thailand had concluded the fungus would be removed during milling, and although the fungus existed in Mexico. Mexico had informed Thailand that the prohibition would be replaced by a new regulation, but despite high-level consultations no progress had been achieved. Mexico assured the Committee that the matter would be followed up. In March 1998, Thailand indicated that it had received no replies to its written communication to Mexico. The Mexican delegate replied that he would convey the information to his authorities, who were studying the matter. Thailand expressed its disappointment at the lack of progress again in June 1998, and Mexico stated that the issue was still under consideration. In September 1998, Mexico reported on official contacts between the two countries. Mexico was conducting a risk assessment, but had not received the necessary information from Thailand.

81. In November 1998, Thailand reported that it had proposed holding consultations with the Chairman, but that Mexico had not agreed. He stressed that there was no data demonstrating the risk of transmission of the fungus *tilletia barclayana* from Thai milled rice. Mexico had requested information on a different pest for its risk assessment, but Thailand did not see the connection between the two issues, as this new pest was not listed in the regulation establishing the Mexican quarantine measures. Thailand was concerned that Mexico might request information on one pest after another. Mexico repeated that the requested information had not been provided. Both countries indicated consultations would continue.

82. In March 1999, Thailand indicated that although it had no obligation to do so, it was providing the information requested by Mexico. Mexico noted that its measures had been notified, and the text of the measures provided to Thailand. Mexico would review the latest information and act accordingly. In July 1999, Thailand reported that it had handed over additional documents to Mexico. Some progress had been made at bilateral consultations, where it had been clarified that *tilletia barclayana* was a quarantine disease only for seed imports, not with regard to rice imported for

consumption. Mexico had also found no reports of the presence of the khapra beetle in Thailand, and would thus modify its regulation which had listed Thailand as a country affected by this pest.

83. In November 1999, Mexico informed the Committee that the phytosanitary regulations were being revised and would be published for comments. Mexico had provided Thailand with the text of the draft measures. Thailand indicated it was looking forward to the publication of the final measure and its notification to WTO. In March 2000, Thailand noted that Mexico had taken new measures replacing the ban, but these measures included unusual and unnecessary requirements such as fumigation at point of entry. Mexico invited Thailand to send official comments on the new draft regulation.

84. In June 2000, Thailand reported that bilateral consultations had taken place. Thailand had posed a list of questions regarding the measure notified in G/SPS/N/MEX/153. Mexico explained that the questions and comments from Thailand were being reviewed by the competent Mexican authorities. The sub-committee considering the matter would meet in July 2000, and responses to each of the comments would be published in the Official Journal before the final standard was published.

85. In November 2000, Thailand reported that although every effort had been made to find resolution to this problem, the issue was still unresolved. Thailand had not been informed of the status of the matter since the meeting of the Mexican phytosanitary committee in July and August 2000, and was interested in the expected date of amendment of the relevant Mexican standard. Mexico had no further information.

86. In March 2001, Thailand reported that during bilateral consultations, Mexico had indicated that it had removed the prohibition on Thai milled rice, and that Thailand was no longer listed as a country under quarantine against Khapra beetle. Thailand requested that Mexico notify this amendment to the SPS Committee. Thailand was satisfied with the interim measure which allowed for the importation of Thai rice upon request by importers. However, Thailand was concerned that the final publication of the phytosanitary requirements had not yet been adopted, meaning that the lifting of the ban could not be implemented on a permanent basis. Thailand would pursue the measure bilaterally with Mexico. Mexico explained that the definitive publication of the measure in the Official Journal had not yet been possible due to administrative procedures requiring legislation. However, Mexico would issue phytosanitary certificates until the time of publication. Imports had to fulfill certain criteria, including international phytosanitary certificates, inspection at point of entry, sampling for laboratory analysis and fumigation with methyl bromide. Fumigation at place of origin would only be accepted if the product was in plastic bags.

87. In October 2001, Thailand recalled that in March 2001 Mexico had announced that restrictions against Thai milled rice had been lifted on condition that it underwent fumigation treatment. Despite this statement, notification G/SPS/N/MEX/172 showed that Thailand remained on Mexico's list of countries affected by the Khapra beetle and subject to quarantine requirements. In subsequent bilateral consultations, Thailand had been informed that it would be removed from the list. Mexico expressed surprise at Thailand's statement since as of March, Mexico had imported over 1,000 tonnes of Thai rice. The product mentioned on the notification in question was not Thai rice.

88. In March 2002, Thailand noted that a bilateral meeting with Mexico on the matter had been held earlier in the week. Mexico reported that restrictions on milled rice from Thailand had been lifted as of March 2001, however the publication of the modified regulation had been delayed but would take place within 30 days.

89. In June 2002, Thailand informed the Committee that on 15 April 2002, Mexico had published the revised regulation. Thailand appreciated Mexico's cooperation on this matter.

NEW ZEALAND

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY NEW ZEALAND

Plant Health

197. New Zealand - Proposed import prohibition of commodity-country combinations of fresh cut flowers and foliage

Raised by:	European Communities
Supported by:	Colombia
Dates raised:	July 2001 (G/SPS/R/22, paras. 68-70), March 2002 (G/SPS/R/26, para. 44)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/NZL/24, G/SPS/N/NZL/142
Solution:	Proposed measures withdrawn

90. The European Communities was concerned that according to the proposed measure, plants not traded for two years might be subject to a prohibition, pending a new risk assessment. This practice was not in accordance with international standards, and was unnecessary and unjustified. Colombia expressed interest in participating in bilateral exchanges and in receiving relevant information. New Zealand explained that in 1997 it had commenced a review of its import requirements for cut flowers as imports were steadily growing. New draft standards had been approved and notified in 1998, and were being reviewed in light of the most up to date scientific data. At an initial step the review included the suspension of historic phytosanitary requirements for some countries. New Zealand had notified its plan to further consolidate the approved country-commodity schedules to include only those commodities that had actually been exported to New Zealand in the past two years. New Zealand would continue to address the EC concerns on a bilateral basis.

91. In March 2002, New Zealand stated that the proposed measures had been withdrawn.

NORWAY

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Animal Health and Zoonoses

Concerns related to FMD

198. Norway – Restrictions on gelatin imports

Raised by:	Brazil
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	March 1996 (G/SPS/R/4, para. 47), September 1998 (G/SPS/R/12, paras. 24-25), November 1998 (G/SPS/R/13, paras. 19-20)
Relevant document(s):	Raised orally
Solution:	Import conditions clarified.

92. In March 1996, Brazil informed the Committee that Norway had halted the issuance of import licenses for Brazilian gelatin because of the existence of FMD in Brazil. Consultations with Norway had been initiated in 1995, and Norwegian authorities had reportedly declared the problem was solved. Nevertheless, import licenses continued to be denied. Norway stated that the ban on gelatin

imports from Brazil would be lifted in the context of recent changes to import regulations. The two Members agreed to continue their consultations.

93. In September 1998, Brazil reported that bilateral contacts had not resulted in a lifting of the ban. Norway explained the conditions it applied to imports of Brazilian gelatin, and stated that applications fulfilling these conditions would be accepted. In November 1998, Brazil thanked Norway for having clarified its import requirements. Brazil would have no problem meeting these requirements and looked forward to resuming its gelatin exports to Norway.

PANAMA

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY PANAMA

Plant Health

199. Panama – Requirements for certification of consumer rice

Raised by:	United States
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	March 1997 (G/SPS/R/7, para. 15), July 2001 (G/SPS/R/22, para. 127)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/GEN/265
Solution:	Import restrictions removed in 1997, concern resolved.

94. In March 1997, the United States noted that Panama required imports of consumer rice to be certified free from the fungus *tilletia barclayana* (Kernel smut), although this fungus already existed in Panama. Furthermore, the fungus in question could not be transmitted through milled rice. Panamanian officials had allegedly suggested that current domestic supply conditions had influenced their decisions. The representative of Panama replied that she would forward a report from capital to the US Department of Agriculture.

95. In July 2001, the United States indicated that Panama had removed its import restrictions on rice in late 1997, and that the matter was resolved (G/SPS/GEN/265).

PHILIPPINES

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY THE PHILIPPINES

Food Safety

200. Philippines – Certification of meat and dairy products

Raised by:	Canada
Supported by:	Australia, European Communities, Korea, New Zealand, United States
Dates raised:	November 2002 (G/SPS/R/28, paras. 98-100), April 2003 (G/SPS/R/29, paras. 70-71)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/PHL/44
Solution:	Implementation of MO7 deferred indefinitely

96. Canada expressed concerns about the effects of the memorandum order MO7 from the Philippines Department of Agriculture, noting that it would have serious effects upon its exports of

meat and dairy products. While Canada did not quarrel with the requirement that imports be produced in plants applying HACCP procedures and that there be a certification to this effect, it was not clear whether Philippine producers were subject to similar requirements. The requirement of a third party independent certification was unwarranted and not the least trade restrictive option. Canada's governmental authority, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, was prepared to certify that exports to the Philippines had been produced in HACCP compliant plants and there was no need for additional certification by a third party. The European Communities, Australia, Korea, New Zealand and the United States shared this concern. The EC certification requirements already put a lot of emphasis on HACCP compliance. Australia felt that the Philippines's proposed measures were not in accordance with SPS obligations.

97. The Philippines clarified that certification of HACCP compliance by third party auditors was required in the light of several documented cases of contaminated products entering the country. The Philippines was concerned that not all shipments came from well established HACCP compliant plants. The measures were not meant to replace or duplicate the exporting country's inspection system but to complement it. The Philippines believed that appropriate and sufficient time had been provided to trading partners and foresaw no problem that trade restrictions might occur especially for countries claiming to be HACCP compliant. The Philippines indicated that HACCP was a universal guideline approved and propagated by FAO and WHO.

98. In April 2003, Canada reported that on 24 February 2003, the Minister of Agriculture of the Philippines had announced that implementation of Memorandum Order 7 requiring third party certification for HACCP plants had been postponed. The European Communities, New Zealand and the United States shared Canada's appreciation of this decision. The Philippines confirmed that MO7 had been deferred indefinitely.

Plant Health

201. Philippines - Notification on Chinese fruit imports

Raised by:	China
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	March 2002 (G/SPS/R/26, para. 141)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/PHL/35 and Add.1
Solution:	Temporary ban lifted on the condition that those places identified as sources of infested exports undertake treatment to effectively kill the insect

99. China reported that the Philippines had applied an emergency restriction on imports of fruit from China, notified in G/SPS/N/PHL/35. The notification indicated that the measure was imposed because codling moth had been detected in imports of certain fruits. However, technical experts of both countries had re-identified the intercepted insect as peach fruit moth, a common pest. On this basis, the Philippines lifted the quarantine ban, but the addendum to the notification did not clarify the mistaken identification of the pest (G/SPS/N/PHL/35/Add.1).

100. The Philippines confirmed that further investigation had revealed that the intercepted insect was not codling moth, but *Carposina nipponensis*, a species not previously known in the Philippines. The Philippines had lifted the temporary ban on the condition that those places identified as sources of infested exports would undertake treatment to effectively kill the insect. This decision was reflected in the addendum to the notification, although the Philippines agreed to further correct the information provided in the notification, to avoid confusion and possible unnecessary restrictions on Chinese agricultural products by other Members.

POLAND

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY POLAND

Animal Health and Zoonoses

Concerns related to TSEs

202. Poland - Notifications on veterinary measures and measures on animal products including gelatin

Raised by:	Switzerland, United States
Supported by:	Brazil, European Communities
Dates raised:	June 1998 (G/SPS/R/11, paras. 48-49), September 1998 (G/SPS/R/12, paras. 46-48), July 2001 (G/SPS/R/22, para. 127), June 2002 (G/SPS/R/27, paras. 40-42)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/POL/3, G/SPS/N/POL/5, G/SPS/N/POL/13, G/SPS/N/POL/14 and Add.1, G/SPS/N/POL/25, G/SPS/GEN/265, G/SPS/GEN/322
Solution:	In June 2002, Poland noted that the regulation had been amended and restrictions on gelatine from bovine hides removed

101. In June 1998, the United States sought clarification of the status of this temporary ban, its scientific basis, and whether future amendments were being considered. Brazil, the European Communities, Switzerland and the United States expressed hope that the disease status of the supplying country, scientific factors related to the infectivity of gelatin and gelatin-containing products, as identified by the OIE, and non-discrimination between suppliers with similar BSE conditions would all be taken into account in future amendments. Poland indicated that the measure in question would remain in force until the end of June 1998, and would be replaced by a measure reflecting the present state of scientific knowledge. Regarding different treatment of Switzerland, the United Kingdom and Ireland, the new regulations had not yet been adopted by the Polish Government. Poland committed to providing a response on the basis of written questions from Switzerland.

102. In September 1998, Switzerland reported on informal consultations with Poland regarding border measures in relation to BSE which differentiated only between countries with a higher incidence of BSE and those of low incidence. This constituted a departure from OIE recommendations, which also took into account surveillance and prevention systems. The European Communities indicated that imports from herds without BSE history should be accepted even for products in the highest risk category. Poland explained that the measure had been taken in relation to the BSE situation in the concerned countries. Bilateral consultations were ongoing with the United Kingdom, Ireland and Switzerland. The BSE situation was under permanent surveillance and all results would be taken into account during the year-end review of Poland's regulations.

103. In July 2001, the United States indicated that bilateral discussions on certification requirements for bovine gelatin continued (G/SPS/GEN/265).

104. In June 2002, Switzerland stated that Poland continued to restrict imports of bovine semen and gelatin from Switzerland although the OIE had concluded that bovine semen and gelatine did not present a risk regardless of the BSE status of the exporting country (G/SPS/GEN/322). The representative of the European Communities indicated that EC member States had similar concerns regarding Poland's measure. The representative of the OIE clarified that Chapter 4 of the International Animal Health Code recommended no restriction on bovine semen. No BSE risk had

been identified from gelatin made exclusively from hides, however certain treatments were recommended with respect to gelatin made from bones if the exporting country were not free from BSE.

105. Poland clarified that bovine semen had never been covered by the Polish regulation in question. Its restrictions on imports of several animal products from Switzerland had been notified in G/SPS/N/POL/25. Furthermore, there had just been further amendments to the regulation, and restrictions on gelatine from bovine hides had been removed. Poland announced its intention to notify this new regulation.

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Plant Health

203. Slovak Republic – Restrictions on imports of apples, pears and quinces

Raised by:	Hungary
Supported by:	European Communities, Bulgaria
Dates raised:	March 1998 (G/SPS/R/10, paras. 20-21), June 1998 (G/SPS/R/11, paras. 27-30), September 1998 (G/SPS/R/12 and Corr.1, paras. 31-34), October 2001 (G/SPS/R/25, para. 33)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/SVK/8 and Rev.1, G/SPS/N/SVK/11, G/SPS/GEN/79
Solution:	Hungary reported a mutually acceptable solution in October 2001.

106. In March 1998, Hungary indicated that although the Slovak Republic had made changes to its measure on importation of apples, pears and quinces as notified, the certification and information requirements were extremely burdensome. The measure appeared to be more restrictive than required to protect health, was not based on scientific principles and constituted a disguised restriction on trade. The Slovak Republic answered that the measure was intended for protection against the introduction of fire blight (*Erwinia amylovora*), which did not occur in Slovakia. The revised measure, which extended import possibilities, was consistent with the SPS Agreement, but the Slovak Republic remained open to bilateral discussions.

107. In June 1998, Hungary acknowledged improvements made by the Slovak Republic, but stressed that the measure was not consistent with recommendations by the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO). The licensing system, which applied to each consignment, remained too burdensome. The Slovak Republic replied that it imported 35 per cent of its apples, pears and quinces, which showed that there were no serious market access impediments. Given the potential economic costs of introduction of the disease, and since available scientific information was not sufficient, a precautionary approach was adopted in line with Article 5.7. The Slovak Republic was exchanging information with countries applying similar phytosanitary measures, and was ready to continue discussion with its trading partners. In September 1998, Hungary again acknowledged that the Slovak measure had been improved, although a partial ban still applied, for which no scientific justification had been given. The Slovak Republic reiterated its earlier arguments that it had put in place a temporary measure according to Article 5.7. In October 2001, Hungary reported that a mutually acceptable solution had been found.

UNITED STATES

CONCERNS RELATED TO MEASURES MAINTAINED BY THE UNITED STATES

Plant Health

204. United States – Import restrictions on rhododendrons in growing medium

Raised by:	European Communities
Supported by:	
Dates raised:	July 1999 (G/SPS/R/15, para. 66), November 1999 (G/SPS/R/17, para. 83), March 2000 (G/SPS/R/18, para. 68)
Relevant document(s):	G/SPS/N/USA/121
Solution:	Final rule published in December 1999, importation allowed under certain conditions.

108. In March 1999, the European Communities indicated that delays in the publication of a final rule on the importation of rhododendrons were resulting in de facto restrictions on EC exports. The representative of the European Communities asked for information on the status of the pest risk analysis and of the final rule. The United States replied that the final rule for the importation of rhododendrons in growing medium from the EC had been completed pending final review, and would be published within one month after the meeting. The European Communities requested an update on the status of the rule in November 1999, and the United States answered that it would be published in the near future. In March 2000, the United States informed the Committee that the final rule had been published on 30 December 1999, allowing the importation of rhododendrons under conditions designed to prevent the introduction of pests.
