

**Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures**

**SUMMARY OF THE MEETING HELD ON 29-30 JUNE 2005**

Note by the Secretariat<sup>1</sup>

Corrigendum

**Paragraph 66 should be replaced with the following:**

66. The representatives of Canada and the Philippines thanked the European Communities for delaying the application of the proposed debarking requirement for wood packing material. The representative of Canada hoped that the delay would be extended until the IPPC, through its Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine, in conjunction with the International Forestry Quarantine Research Group, had reviewed and assessed the technical justification for this requirement. He encouraged other countries to be supportive of this IPPC review process and to await communication of the IPPC position before implementing measures on debarking. In addition, Canada encouraged parties to work together to try to pursue a harmonized approach for the regulation of wood packaging, irrespective of the outcome of the IPPC review. The representative of the Philippines noted that debarking should not be imposed if the wood packaging was already on the market or certified to have undergone the approved treatment according to ISPM 15. He invited Members to wait for further information on the EC risk analysis and related technical justification for debarking and emphasized that the Philippines would appreciate being informed of any further developments, including on a bilateral basis.

**Paragraph 119 should be replaced with the following:**

119. The representative of Canada recalled that an international plant health risk analysis workshop was planned in Niagara Falls, Canada, in October 2005. The workshop was being jointly organised by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency and the IPPC. Detailed information had been provided by the IPPC in G/SPS/GEN/581. The goals of the workshop included: enabling information exchange among international PRA specialists, increasing awareness of some of the resource and capacity issues faced by developing countries, and offering a catalyst for providing technical assistance to developing countries in the area of pest risk analysis. Financial contributions to support participation by 20 representatives of developing countries had been received from the Canadian International Development Agency, the International Development Research Centre (Canada), and the United States Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Thirty further places for developing-country representatives were still available and contributions were welcome. An application for funding from the STDF would be submitted and Canada hoped that it would be approved before the meeting took place.

---

\* In English only.

<sup>1</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.

**The last sentence of paragraph 154 should be replaced with the following:**

154. ... Canada highlighted the disparity between the number of donors and the level of funds deposited in the trust funds of the two standard-setting bodies and encouraged countries to contribute to the IPPC Trust Fund in a way similar to the impressive levels of support shown for and contributions made to the Codex Trust Fund.

---