

**Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures**

**SUMMARY OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27-28 OCTOBER 2004**

Note by the Secretariat<sup>2</sup>

Corrigendum

**Paragraph 133 should be replaced with the following:**

With regard to the Chairman's questions on timeframes, the OIE had clarified the differences between *technical* timeframes for the setting-up of disease-free zones (regions) based on the epidemiology of the disease (e.g., long or short incubation period, quality of tests) and *administrative* timeframes for the recognition of such zones by Member Countries based on the provision of the required information, possible site visits and negotiations between trading partners. The OIE included technical timeframes in its standards but not administrative timeframes.

**The first sentence of paragraph 167 should be replaced with the following:**

The Chairman reported that at the first informal meeting on the Review of the SPS Agreement, the Committee's discussion had benefited from written submissions by Canada, China, the European Communities, Mexico, New Zealand, Chinese Taipei and the United States.

**The first sentence of paragraph 168 should be replaced with the following:**

The Committee had then discussed the issue of transparency which Canada, China, the European Communities, Mexico and New Zealand had raised in their written submissions.

**The following paragraph should be inserted immediately following paragraph 172:**

*172bis* The representative of Mexico had stressed that the second review of the SPS Agreement should further enhance the discussion on the sustainability and durability of the effects of technical assistance, and had recalled in this context the arguments, explanations and conclusions contained in document G/SPS/GEN/382.

**Paragraph 176 should be replaced with the following:**

The representative of the United States had suggested that the Committee would benefit from an in-depth examination of the inter-relationship between Articles 2.1 and 5.6 in the application of the Agreement by Members. The representative of Mexico proposed that the discussion be broadened to include Articles 2.2, 2.3, 3.4, 5.4 and 5.6 and the issue of good regulatory practice in general. In particular, Mexico had suggested that Members exchange information on the measures and

---

<sup>1</sup> In English only

<sup>2</sup> 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.

mechanisms they used to ensure that their regulations or control, inspection and approval procedures were in accordance with the SPS Agreement. Furthermore, the representative of Mexico had proposed that the Committee consider developing guidelines on good regulatory practices that would promote the practical implementation of the SPS Agreement.

---