

**Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures**

**POSSIBLE ACTIONS FOR THE SPS COMMITTEE REGARDING  
PRIVATE SPS STANDARDS**

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

1. The SPS Committee has been discussing the issue of private SPS standards since June 2005, when Saint Vincent and the Grenadines raised a specific trade concern regarding EurepGAP (now called GLOBALGAP) requirements for bananas destined for sale in the United Kingdom.<sup>2</sup> Since then this issue has been on the agenda of every SPS Committee meeting.<sup>3</sup>
2. In an effort to bring more structure and concrete examples to its discussions on private standards, the SPS Committee decided in October 2008 to undertake a three-step study on the effects of private SPS standards.<sup>4</sup>
3. As the first step of this process, the Secretariat circulated a Questionnaire on SPS-related Private Standards on 5 December 2008.<sup>5</sup> The questionnaire sought information from Members regarding products and markets of concern, the relevant private and international standards, trade effects, costs of compliance and a number of related elements.
4. As the second step, a descriptive report summarizing the information contained in the 40 responses received from 22 Members was circulated on 15 June 2009.<sup>6</sup> The individual responses, including responses received after the circulation of the descriptive report<sup>7</sup>, can be consulted through the WTO Members' website.<sup>8</sup> Most of the responses reiterated a number of concerns regarding private standards, which had already been raised on various occasions at the Committee. Some responses also underlined the positive and trade facilitating impact of private standards.
5. The descriptive report was discussed during the SPS Committee's meetings held in June 2009. In addition, a number of Members submitted written comments on the descriptive report following the Committee meetings. While some Members found the report to be an useful basis for the Committee's deliberations, others raised concerns about the limitations of the report, especially with regard to the accuracy, precision and scope of some of the data provided in the replies to the

---

<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.

<sup>2</sup> G/SPS/GEN/766; specific trade concern no: 219.

<sup>3</sup> A list of all SPS Committee documents referring to private standards can be found in Annex 1.

<sup>4</sup> G/SPS/R/53, para. 132.

<sup>5</sup> G/SPS/W/232.

<sup>6</sup> G/SPS/GEN/932.

<sup>7</sup> Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago submitted responses after the circulation of the descriptive report. Argentina also provided additional information, complementing its two original responses.

<sup>8</sup> Please click on this address: [http://members.wto.org/WTO\\_resources/SPS/SPS-Private-Standards\\_tri.htm](http://members.wto.org/WTO_resources/SPS/SPS-Private-Standards_tri.htm). All responses are available in English and Spanish as these are the working languages of the 30 Members participating in the SPS Committee's ad hoc working group on private standards.

questionnaire. For example, some replies were found to be very general and lacking specificity and others went beyond SPS issues to include references to quality, environmental, and social standards.

6. As the third step, the Secretariat was requested to prepare an analytical report, identifying possible actions by the SPS Committee and/or Members. In light of the concerns raised regarding some of the examples in the descriptive report, this draft report does not purport to provide a substantive analysis of the matter but rather focuses on possible actions that could be taken by the SPS Committee and/or Members to enhance the benefits of private standards and address their negative effects on market access, especially for producers/exporters in developing countries. The report draws upon the Committee's discussions to date on this topic, Members' and observers' specific written contributions, and the descriptive report, keeping in mind its limitations.

7. This draft report will be discussed during the SPS Committee's meetings on 28-29 October 2009. It will then be revised further in light of the Committee's discussions, any subsequent written submissions from Members, and further information from the three international standard-setting bodies referenced in the SPS Agreement ("the three sisters"), in particular Codex and the OIE.

### **POSSIBLE ACTIONS**

8. The recommendations below have been compiled in light of Members' and observers' oral and written inputs on this topic. Some of them focus on practical approaches for the Committee to address concerns raised regarding private standards. Others address systemic and legal questions. At this stage, the recommendations are in no particular order of importance, priority, or acceptability. It should be noted, however, that the outcome on some of them could be regarded as a precondition for the pursuit of others.

9. The SPS Committee can only take decisions by consensus. Therefore, there will need to be agreement by the Committee to pursue any of these recommendations.

#### **Recommendation 1: SPS Committee to develop a working definition of private SPS standards**

10. It is apparent from the discussions in the WTO and from the literature on this issue that private standards play an increasingly important role in international trade and pose new challenges as well as opportunities for producers and exporters. They can cover safety, quality, social and environmental issues and affect a wide range of products.

11. Given its mandate, the SPS Committee is trying to focus its discussions on private SPS standards, most of which are currently in the area of food safety. However, some Members have expressed concerns that the discussions are digressing to issues beyond private SPS standards. One of the reasons for this is that some private standards, such as GLOBALGAP, cover food safety as well as other requirements, making it more difficult to single out the SPS requirements and determine whether any trade effects can be attributed directly to these. At the same time, producers/exporters do not necessarily focus on the distinction between SPS versus TBT measures or public versus private standards, but rather on whether they are able to fulfill the totality of the requirements imposed by the importer.

12. Some Members have proposed that the Committee develop a definition of SPS-related private standards and limit its discussion to these. For this purpose, a working definition could refer to "any private standard applied to fulfill one of the four objectives stated in Annex A, paragraph 1 of the SPS Agreement."

13. More specifically, given the differing ownership structures of private standards,<sup>9</sup> the working definition could refer to "any private standard elaborated at the firm-level, at the collective national level, or at the international level, which is applied to fulfill one of the four objectives stated in Annex A, paragraph 1 of the SPS Agreement."

14. As elaborated in the paper on private standards prepared for the FAO/WHO for discussion during the 32<sup>nd</sup> Codex Alimentarius Commission<sup>10</sup>, it is also useful to distinguish between different functions that are implicated in private standard schemes; i.e. standard-setting, adoption, implementation, conformity assessment and enforcement. Therefore, when discussing private standards, it would be useful to clarify that the focus of the SPS Committee could cover all five functions, each of which might pose different challenges.

**Recommendation 2: SPS Committee to work with other international organizations to prepare a guidebook explaining the differences between public and private standards**

15. The responses to the Secretariat's questionnaire revealed that not all producers might be aware of the differences between public and private SPS standards. Therefore, it has been suggested that the SPS Committee work with other international organizations to prepare a guide for growers, shippers, importers, and retailers. Such a guide would explain the difference between governmental SPS standards and private SPS standards.

**Recommendation 3: SPS and TBT Committees to develop a joint working group**

16. In view of the intertwined nature of SPS and TBT-related requirements in certain private standards, a joint SPS/TBT working group could be established to monitor developments and focus on common concerns.

17. There has thus far been limited discussion on the issue of private standards in the TBT Committee. During the March 2009 TBT Workshop on the Role of International Standards in Economic Development, several participants expressed concerns about the proliferation of private standards that could result in unnecessary barriers to trade and create confusion in the market place.<sup>11</sup> In the context of the Fifth Triennial Review of the TBT Agreement, which is expected to be concluded in November 2009, the issue of private standards has been raised for discussion.<sup>12</sup> What future action, if any, the TBT Committee may agree to take on this topic is not yet clear.

**Recommendation 4: SPS Committee to hold periodic meetings with entities involved in private SPS standards**

18. Members have raised a number of concerns regarding private SPS standards, including:

- the multiplicity of standards and the lack of harmonization among them;
- deviations from international standards or from official governmental requirements (for example, for maximum residue limits);
- the costs of compliance and certification, especially with a multitude of standards;
- the lack of transparency, consultation and appeal mechanisms;

---

<sup>9</sup> G/SPS/GEN/746, paras. 3-8.

<sup>10</sup> ALINORM 09/32/9D-Part II: The Impacts of Private Food Safety Standards on the Food Chain and on the Public Standards-Setting Process, paper prepared for FAO/WHO by Spencer Henson and John Humphrey.

<sup>11</sup> G/TBT/W/310, para. 63.

<sup>12</sup> G/TBT/W/318.

- the prescriptive, rather than outcome-based, operational procedures required by private standards; and
- the disproportionate effect on small- and medium-sized producers/exporters in developing countries.

19. A number of positive aspects have also been highlighted, including:

- the facilitation of compliance with national and international standards, whereby private schemes take as a basis these standards and provide comprehensive guidance on achieving them;
- the promotion of best-practices and productivity;
- improved brand reputation and facilitation of access to markets and credits; and
- the ability to address emerging risks in a rapid manner and pave the way for eventual adoption of international standards.

20. While a number of Members would like to see the SPS Committee play a formal role in addressing concerns related to private standards, others are of the view that it is not for the governments of Members to interfere in the private contractual relations of firms, except when these result in deceptive practices or distortions of competition.

21. One practical approach the SPS Committee may pursue would be to hold periodic theme-based meetings with all relevant stakeholders, including international organizations; entities developing, adopting and certifying private standards; as well as producers and/or exporters who need to meet these standards. To underline their practical nature, such meetings could be held as information sessions back-to-back with SPS Committee meetings. They could assist in exchanging information regarding best practices and specific problems faced by exporters.

22. For example, the Global Food Safety Initiative (GFSI) could be invited to provide the Committee with an update on the number of firms and private food safety standards involved in their "once certified, accepted everywhere" initiative, on the development and implementation of the scheme, and on the recently launched Food Safety Knowledge Network (together with Michigan State University), which aims to build food safety capacity in developing countries.

23. GLOBALGAP could be invited to present an update on their work, including their global consultation mechanisms and on their partnership with GFSI.

24. Another meeting could focus on the experience of export-oriented initiatives such as Chile GAP and New Zealand GAP.

**Recommendation 5: SPS Committee, Codex, the OIE, and the IPPC to update each other regularly regarding developments in their respective bodies on private standards**

25. One of the concerns raised regarding private SPS standards has been that they sometimes deviate from international standards set by the three sisters. For example, in the area of food safety, some retail schemes have been identified as having MRLs which are more restrictive than those set by the Codex. In the area of animal health, examples of private standards with more trade-restricting BSE requirements than those of the OIE have been provided. Given the interlinkages between private SPS standards and the standards developed by the sisters, the SPS Committee should liaise regularly with the sisters regarding this issue.

26. The Codex Alimentarius Commission considered the issue of private standards during its 32<sup>nd</sup> session held in July 2009.<sup>13</sup> A paper commissioned by the FAO and the WHO regarding the impact of private food safety standards on the food chain and on the public standard-setting process was also presented during the session.<sup>14</sup> The Commission was of the opinion that Codex standards should be benchmarks for private food safety standards and agreed to monitor developments in the WTO and work in cooperation with the OIE and the IPPC to consult on a common position on this matter. The Commission also agreed that a study be conducted to analyze the role, cost, and benefits of private standards for consideration by the Executive Committee and the Commission. In addition, the Codex Secretariat was asked to prepare an analysis of the speed of the Codex standard-setting process, as this had been identified as one of the possible reasons for the emergence of private standards.

27. OIE members adopted a resolution regarding the implication of private standards in international trade of animals and animal products in May 2008.<sup>15</sup> This resolution asks the Director General of the OIE, among others, "to work with relevant public and private international organizations with the objective that concerns of Members are taken into consideration and that private standards, where used, are consistent with and do not conflict those of the OIE."

28. The OIE Secretariat has provided regular updates to the SPS Committee and submitted a document entitled "Considerations Relevant to Private Standards in the Field of Animal Health, Food Safety, and Animal Welfare".<sup>16</sup> Also, an OIE ad hoc working group has been established to consider private standards in the area of animal health and welfare. This group will meet in October 2009 to review the results of a questionnaire sent to Members and relevant organizations and prepare recommendations for future action by the OIE, which will be reviewed by the Code Commission in February 2010. The report of the Code Commission will be considered by the World Assembly in May 2010, which is when any recommendations would be adopted.

29. There has thus far been limited discussion of private standards at the IPPC.

**Recommendation 6: SPS Committee to develop a transparency and/or monitoring mechanism regarding private standards**

30. Transparency is one of the key principles of the SPS Agreement, requiring Members to notify their new or modified SPS measures while they are in draft form so that others Members have an opportunity to comment on them and producers/exporters have time to adapt their production and/or processing methods as necessary. One of the concerns raised regarding private SPS standards has been that there are limited opportunities to provide comments during the development of private standards and that it is very difficult to have an overview of the plethora of private standards. Some Members have proposed a transparency mechanism through the SPS Committee. If this proposal is to be pursued, it would have to be clarified which entities would have the responsibility to notify, what form notifications would take, and what status they would have.

31. A similar proposal is for the SPS Committee to take on a monitoring role regarding private standards. This might not rely on notifications as such but on inputs from Members, Observers, and the Secretariat regarding developments in the area of private standards, including harmonization efforts and technical assistance programmes. It could also provide a forum to raise specific trade

---

<sup>13</sup> ALINORM 09/32/REP, paras. 246-271.

<sup>14</sup> ALINORM 09/32/9D-Part II (The Impacts of Private Food Safety Standards on the Food Chain and on the Public Standards-Setting Process, Paper prepared for FAO/WHO by Spencer Henson and John Humphrey.

<sup>15</sup> Resolution No. XXXII

<sup>16</sup> G/SPS/GEN/822.

concerns related to private SPS standards. One possibility is that the current agenda item on private standards could serve this monitoring function to a certain extent.

**Recommendation 7: SPS Committee to seek clarification as to whether the SPS Agreement applies to private SPS standards**

32. A number of factors have led to the proliferation of private standards and associated certification requirements. These include the high profile of a number of food safety scares and reduced confidence in regulatory agencies; legal requirements on companies to demonstrate "due diligence" in the prevention of food safety risks; growing attention to "corporate social responsibility" and a drive by companies to minimize "reputational risks"; globalization and vertical integration of supply chains; and the expansion of supermarkets nationally and internationally.

33. The SPS Agreement was negotiated during the Uruguay Round (1986-1994) as part of the Single Undertaking. At the time, one of the main concerns of the negotiators was to ensure that the expected reduction of tariffs and elimination of quantitative restrictions would not be circumvented by governments through the use of protectionist measures disguised as sanitary or phytosanitary measures. The proliferation of private SPS standards, due mainly to the factors listed above, had not been anticipated and no explicit reference to "private standards" is included in the text of the Agreement.

34. Currently, Members have differing views as to whether the SPS Agreement applies to private standards. Article 1.1 states that the Agreement applies to "all sanitary and phytosanitary measures which may, directly or indirectly, affect international trade" (emphasis added) without explicitly limiting this application to SPS measures taken by government authorities. Likewise, the definition of an SPS measure in Annex A(1) and the accompanying illustrative list of SPS measures does not explicitly limit these to governmental measures. On the other hand, other provisions of the SPS Agreement explicitly refer to measures "taken" (Article 2.1), "established" (Article 5.6), "maintained" (Articles 2.2 and 5.6) or "adopted" (Article 5.7) by Members. It is also not clear whether the certification requirements necessary to demonstrate compliance with private standards would be within the scope of Article 8 and Annex C of the Agreement.

35. Article 13 has been brought up numerous times in Committee discussions. The Article reads:

"Members are fully responsible under this Agreement for the observance of all obligations set forth herein. Members shall formulate and implement positive measures and mechanisms in support of the observance of the provisions of this Agreement by other than central government bodies. Members shall take such reasonable measures as may be available to them to ensure that non-governmental entities within their territories, as well as regional bodies in which relevant entities within their territories are members, comply with the relevant provisions of this Agreement. In addition, Members shall not take measures which have the effect of, directly or indirectly, requiring or encouraging such regional or non-governmental entities, or local governmental bodies, to act in a manner inconsistent with the provisions of this Agreement. Members shall ensure that they rely on the services of non-governmental entities for implementing sanitary or phytosanitary measures only if these entities comply with the provisions of this Agreement." (emphasis added)

36. Currently, there is no further guidance on Article 13 and Members have differing views as to whether "non-governmental entities" referred to therein includes entities involved in the development, adoption, implementation, certification, and enforcement of private standards.

37. The SPS Committee could pursue further work in clarifying the relationship between private standards and the SPS Agreement. This work could be based on specific written submissions from Members, which could be based on their own legal views or views developed by a private legal entity. Alternatively, the Committee could instruct the Secretariat to seek a legal opinion on this question from a qualified private legal entity, for consideration by the Committee.

38. If Members reach consensus on a decision, for example clarifying the scope of Article 13, it could be forwarded to the Council for Trade in Goods and eventually to the General Council and/or the Ministerial Conference for formal adoption. This work could be undertaken in the context a periodic review of the Agreement. In accordance with Article 12.7 of the SPS Agreement and the decision of the Fourth Session of the Ministerial Conference, Members are instructed to review the operation of the SPS Agreement at least once every four years.

39. Article 12.7 states that "Where appropriate, the Committee may submit to the General Council for Trade in Goods proposals to amend the text of this Agreement having regard, *inter alia*, to the experience gained in its implementation.". Unlike an agreement on the clarification of a particular provision, any formal amendment of the text of the SPS Agreement would presumably need to be pursued in accordance with Article X of the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization.

**Recommendation 8: SPS Committee to develop guidelines on the implementation of Article 13 of the SPS Agreement**

40. Members are investing their time and resources to work on systemic and specific issues in the SPS Committee with the goal of facilitating trade and ultimately drawing benefits from the multilateral trading system. However, the increased prevalence of private standards is perceived by some Members to undermine this investment and devalue the principles and relevance of the SPS Agreement. Developing guidelines regarding the implementation of Article 13 and its application to private standards could be one way to reinforce the key principles of the SPS Agreement, such as scientific justification, transparency, and equivalence, in the private standards arena.

41. Such guidelines could also shed light on the "reasonable measures as may be available to Members" to ensure that entities involved with private standards comply with the "relevant" provisions of the SPS Agreement.

42. Specific proposals in this regard were put forth by India<sup>17</sup> and MERCOSUR members (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay)<sup>18</sup> in the context of the Third Review of the Implementation of the SPS Agreement.

**Recommendation 9: SPS Committee to develop a Code of Good Practice**

43. Some Members have proposed the development of a Code of Good Practice similar to that found in Annex 3 of the TBT Agreement. It provides disciplines, including those related to transparency, for the preparation, adoption and application of standards by central, governmental, local, non-governmental and regional standardizing bodies, all of which can formally submit their acceptance of the Code. Members are required to take such reasonable measures as may be available to them to ensure that local government and non-governmental standardizing bodies within their territories accept and comply with the Code.

---

<sup>17</sup> G/SPS/W/236.

<sup>18</sup> G/SPS/W/245.

44. From 1 January 1995 until 31 December 2008, 159 standardizing bodies from 119 Members have accepted the Code of Good Practice. Among them are 85 central governmental standardizing bodies, 63 non-governmental standardizing bodies, three statutory bodies, two parastatal bodies, three non-governmental regional bodies, one central governmental/non-governmental body, one central governmental/local governmental body and one autonomous body.<sup>19</sup>

45. A similar SPS Code of Good Practice could take the form of an SPS Committee recommendation, or could be submitted through the Committee's parent bodies to the Ministerial Conference for adoption. Alternatively, given that a number of private standards contain SPS as well as TBT-related elements, entities involved in private standards could be encouraged to sign on to the TBT Code of Good Practice. However, questions could arise as to whether the "non-governmental standardizing bodies" referred to in the TBT Code of Good Practice would cover the type of private standard-setting entities referred to in the SPS Committee discussions.

**Recommendation 10: WTO Members to hold regular meetings with entities involved in private SPS standards**

46. Given the diverse nature of entities involved in private SPS standards such as retail firms, producers, certifiers, and NGOs, Member governments may be best placed to convene meetings of all stakeholders to sensitize them to the issues raised in the Committee and receive feedback. Members could then report back to the Committee (possibly under a monitoring mechanism).

**Recommendation 11: SPS Committee to develop guidelines for Member governments to liaise with entities involved in private standards**

47. The SPS Committee is the forum convening WTO Member governments to focus on systemic and specific implementation issues arising from the SPS Agreement. At the same time, Member governments need to consult regularly with their domestic stakeholders, be they governmental or non-governmental, export or import-oriented, regarding the implementation of the SPS Agreement. In an effort to facilitate the exchange of information between Member governments and entities involved with private SPS standards in their territories, the SPS Committee could develop guidelines for Member governments. Such guidelines could underline the importance of relaying the concerns raised in the Committee to these entities and of encouraging the application of the key principles of the SPS Agreement. Some Member governments may wish to encourage entities developing private standards to develop their own codes of good practice.

---

<sup>19</sup> G/TBT/CS/2/Rev.15.



**Annex 1. SPS Committee documents referring to private standards**

<b>Document Symbol</b>	<b>Date of distribution</b>	<b>Submitted by</b>	<b>Document title</b>	<b>Links to documents</b>		
G/SPS/W/246	30/09/2009	Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay	Legal Framework for private standards in the WTO	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/W/245	15/09/2009	Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay	Third Review of the SPS Agreement - Guidelines on the Implementation of Article 13 of the SPS Agreement	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/932	15/06/2009	WTO Secretariat	Effects of SPS-Related Private Standards - Descriptive Report	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/W/237	08/05/2009	WTO Secretariat	Review of the Operation and Implementation of the SPS Agreement	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/W/236	17/04/2009	India	Third Review of the WTO/SPS Agreement	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/911	16/03/2009	Belize	Private and Commercial Standards - Statement at the Meeting of 25 - 26 February 2009	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/W/232	08/12/2008	WTO Secretariat	Questionnaire on SPS-Related Private Standards	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/891	08/12/2008	WTO Secretariat	Research and Researchers on Private Standards	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
JOB(08)/97	25/09/2008	WTO Secretariat	Private Standards and Practical Actions for the SPS Committee - Compilation of responses to the questionnaire	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/W/230	25/09/2008	WTO Secretariat	Private Standards - Identifying Practical Actions for the SPS Committee - Summary of Responses	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/R/50	24/07/2008	WTO Secretariat	Report of the STDF Information Session on Private Standards (26 June 2008)	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>

Document Symbol	Date of distribution	Submitted by	Document title	Links to documents		
G/SPS/GEN/865	11/07/2008	WTO Secretariat	Documents and Other Information on Private Standards	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
Job(08)/58	03/07/2008	WTO Secretariat	Private Standards - Identifying Practical Actions for the SPS Committee	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/W/225	18/06/2008	Uruguay	Terms of Reference for the Working Group on Private Standards	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/843	21/05/2008	Uruguay	Private Standards - Statement by Uruguay at the Meeting of 2 - 3 April 2008	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/822	25/02/2008	World Organization for Animal Health (OIE)	Considerations Relevant to Private Standards in the Field of Animal Health, Food Safety and Animal Welfare	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/802	09/10/2007	United Kingdom	Private Voluntary Standards within the WTO Multilateral Framework	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/792	05/07/2007	Ecuador	Private and Commercial Standards - Statement by Ecuador at the Meeting of 27 - 28 June 2007	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
JOB(07)/89/Rev.1	15/06/2007	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), World Trade Organization (WTO)	Joint UNCTAD/WTO Informal Information Session on Private Standards - Revision	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>

Document Symbol	Date of distribution	Submitted by	Document title	Links to documents		
G/SPS/GEN/761/Corr.1	09/03/2007	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)	Private Sector Standards and Developing Country Exports of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables - Communication from the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) - Corrigendum	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/766	28/02/2007	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Private Industry Standards	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/764	28/02/2007	Bahamas	Report by the Commonwealth of the Bahamas to the WTO-SPS Committee on Private Standards and the SPS Agreement : the Bahamas Experience	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/763	27/02/2007	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	Private Voluntary Standards and Developing Country Market Access: Preliminary Results	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/761	26/02/2007	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)	Private Sector Standards and Developing Country Exports of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/760	26/02/2007	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)	Typology of Global Standards	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/750	16/02/2007	International Organization for Standardization (ISO)	Submission by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) to the SPS Committee Meeting - 28 February and 1 March 2007	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>
G/SPS/GEN/746	24/01/2007	WTO Secretariat	Private Standards and the SPS Agreement	<a href="#">EN</a>	<a href="#">ES</a>	<a href="#">FR</a>