



Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING OF 12-14 JULY 2023

NOTE BY THE SECRETARIAT¹

Corrigendum²

Please note that paragraph 3.1 on page 6, and paragraph 3.4 on page 7, should read as follows:

3 INFORMATION SHARING

3.1 Information from Members on relevant activities

3.1.1 Japan - Update on the import measures on Japanese food regarding radionuclides (G/SPS/GEN/1233/Rev.6)

3.1 Japan drew Members' attention to document [G/SPS/GEN/1233/Rev.6](#). Japan emphasized that the health risk of food produced in Japan was negligible and that no reports of non-compliance in food imported from Japan had been received for around a decade. In its view, the assessment by the FAO/IAEA Centre of Japan's status regarding radionuclides acknowledged the effective control of the food supply chain and the safety of public food supply. As such, noting that the majority of Members had lifted measures imposed following the Fukushima nuclear accident, Japan called on those Members that continued to maintain measures to immediately review them. Japan considered such measures to be maintained without scientific evidence and to be inconsistent with the SPS Agreement. Japan noted that the comprehensive report, which was the outcome of a series of IAEA review, had been published on 4 July. Japan also noted that in the report, the IAEA had concluded that the approach to the discharge of the ALPS treated water (water treated by the Advanced Liquid Processing System) into the sea and associated activities were consistent with relevant international safety standards, and the discharge would have a negligible radiological impact on people and the environment. In addition, Japan noted that the report stated that IAEA additional review and monitoring activities were envisaged, which would continue during and after the treated water discharge occurred. Japan indicated that it would continue to provide necessary information to the international community in a transparent manner based on scientific evidence and would continue efforts to gain further understanding from the international community regarding the discharge of ALPS treated water. Therefore, the discharge of water could not justify imposing import measures on Japanese food. Japan further noted that it had provided relevant scientific updates to the IAEA, and reminded Members of its updates to the Committee, annual reports, one-stop website for information sharing, and bilateral consultations. Japan asked relevant Members to conduct risk assessments, and risk communication efforts with their citizens.

3.4 Japan thanked Members for their comments and reminded Members that Japan had measures in place to detect and monitor non-compliance cases, and that its framework prevented food exceeding Japanese maximum levels from entering the food chain or being exported. As for the food product mentioned by Korea, which was black rock fish, Japan noted that the sampling point was no fishing area. Therefore, this finding was never related to food safety in Japan. Japan also reiterated that its water discharge plans were compliant with international safety standards, the water that did not comply with these standards would never be discharged, and that the IAEA conducted a comprehensive report that concluded that Japan's approach to the discharge of the treated water

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 In English only.

into the sea, and associated activities, were consistent with relevant international safety standards. Japan also noted the IAEA had concluded the discharge would have a negligible radiological impact on people and the environment. As for the statements mentioned by China, Japan noted that the amount of tritium to be discharged was equivalent to about 1/5 to 1/7 of the amount of tritium discharged into the sea from each of the nuclear power plants in China, and that ALPS treated water, which would be discharged in compliance with international standards, should not be a problem in light of China's standards.

Paragraph 4.60 on page 17 should read as follows:

4.2 Issues previously raised

4.2.9 EU review of legislation on veterinary medicinal products (ID 446) – Concerns of the United States

4.60 Japan regretted that the European Union had not provided the necessary information, including sufficient transition periods, for the third countries to comply with the new regulations. Japan asked the European Union to provide details on the requirements to be included in the list of approved third countries, provide at least a three-year transition period before the implementation of the delegated act to third countries, clarify timelines for implementation, exempt the use of Fosfomycin in fisheries products, and avoid discrimination in the implementation of the delegated act.

Paragraph 4.85 on page 21 should read as follows:

4.2.13 China's administrative measures for registration of overseas manufacturers of imported food (26 November 2019) (ID 485) – Concerns of Australia, Japan, the United States and the European Union

4.85 Japan thanked China for its bilateral engagement and information on documents submitted by 30 June, but remained concerned that regulations lacked transparency and imposed a significant burden on foreign authorities and manufacturers. Japan requested China to establish a standard processing period for applications made through the CIFER system and clarify the processing period to the Members, notify changes in the operation of its regulations or the CIFER system with a reasonable transition period if changes were introduced, correct defects in the CIFER system as soon as possible, respond to unanswered questions within a reasonable time, provide explanations when an application was rejected through the CIFER system, and ensure consistency.
