

Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

PROPOSALS AND PROGRESS ON SPECIAL AND DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT

Note by the Secretariat¹

A. INTRODUCTION

1. In May 2003, the General Council requested the SPS Committee to consider five proposals on special and differential treatment as part of its ongoing work (JOB(03)/100). These proposals had previously been considered by the General Council in formal and informal consultations. In June 2003, the SPS Committee adopted a schedule of work for the consideration of these proposals, which it pursued until its conclusion in March 2004 (G/SPS/26). Unfortunately, this work programme did not result in any decisions by the SPS Committee on the five S&D proposals (G/SPS/27, G/SPS/30).

2. On 1 August 2004, the General Council decided to refer the agreement-specific proposals for special and differential treatment to the respective WTO bodies, with the stipulation that these bodies expeditiously complete the consideration of these proposals and report to the General Council, with clear recommendations for a decision, by no later than July 2005.

3. The purpose of this document is to provide a factual background to facilitate the consideration of these proposals by the SPS Committee. The first part of this document contains the five proposals for special and differential treatment, presented according to the provisions of the SPS Agreement which they propose to modify. The second part of this document provides a summary of the discussion of these proposals in the Special Sessions of the Committee on Trade and Development (CTD) held between May 2002 and February 2003², and of a joint CTD/ SPS Committee session³ that took place in November 2002. A third part of the document describes developments in recent years which address, in part, some of the concerns identified in the proposals for special and differential treatment.

B. PROPOSALS REFERRED TO THE SPS COMMITTEE

4. The proposals referred to the SPS Committee suggest interpretations and/or modifications to Articles 9 and 10 of the SPS Agreement, and in particular to paragraph 2 of Article 9, and paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 of Article 10.

Proposals related to Article 9.1

5. The African Group has presented several proposals as relating to Articles 10.1 and 10.4 which appear to also be directly related to technical assistance (Articles 9.1):

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.

² Based on the records of these meetings in TN/CTD/M/3, TN/CTD/M/4, TN/CTD/M/5, TN/CTD/M/7, TN/CTD/M/13, TN/CTD/M/14, and TN/CTD/M/15.

³ TN/CTD/M/10 and Corr.1.

- (a) "Members shall establish a facility within the Global Trust Fund for ensuring that:
- (i) developing and least-developed country Members have the financial and technical capacity to meet the requirements under the Agreement;
 - (ii) delegations from developing and least-developed country Members attend and effectively participate in meetings of the Committee and relevant international standard setting organisations;
 - (iii) developing and least-developed country Members effectively utilise the flexibility under the Agreement; and
 - (iv) measures adopted under the Agreement do not contravene the rights of developing and least-developed country Members."
- (b) "It is understood that technology transfer and any technical and financial assistance under the Agreement to developing and least-developed country Members shall be cost free."

Proposals related to Article 9.2

6. Cuba, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mauritius, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tanzania and Zimbabwe (TN/CTD/W/2) have proposed the following modification to Article 9.2:

"Where substantial investments are required in order for an exporting developing country Member to fulfil the sanitary or phytosanitary requirements of an importing Member, the latter shall ~~consider providing~~ **provide** such technical assistance as will permit the developing country Member to maintain and expand its market access opportunities for the product involved. **If an exporting developing country Member identifies specific problems of inadequate technology and infrastructure in fulfilling the sanitary or phytosanitary requirements of an importing developed country Member, the latter shall provide the former with relevant technology and technical facilities on preferential and non-commercial terms, preferably free of cost, keeping in view the development, financial and trade needs of the exporting developing country Member.**"

7. The African Group (TN/CTD/W/3/Rev.2) has suggested several additions and interpretations of Article 9.2:

- (a) "The phrase "substantial investments" in Article 9.2 shall be construed relative to resources of concerned government departments in developing and least-developed country Members and to their development needs. Any changes that would require additional resources to existing levels of current expenditure or their restructuring, or additional training or staffing, shall be construed to amount to "substantial investments".
- (b) "Where the importing Member does not actually provide such technical assistance, that Member shall withdraw the measures immediately and unconditionally; or the importing Member shall compensate the exporting developing country Members for loss resulting directly or indirectly from the measures."

- (c) "It is understood that technical assistance shall be fully funded technical assistance and shall not entail financial obligations on the part of the exporting developing and least-developed country Members."
- (d) "It is agreed that the WTO shall recommend that impact assessments shall be conducted to determine the likely effect on the trade of developing and least-developed country Members for any proposed standards before adoption, and if the impact would be adverse, the standards would not become applicable until it is established that developing and least-developed country Members that would be affected have acquired the capacity to beneficially comply with them."

Proposals related to Article 10.1

8. Cuba, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mauritius, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tanzania and Zimbabwe (TN/CTD/W/2) have suggested the following addition to Article 10.1:

"If an exporting developing country Member identifies specific problems in complying with a sanitary or phytosanitary measures of an importing developed country Member, the latter shall upon request enter into consultations with a view to finding a mutually satisfactory solution.

In this regard, such special needs shall include securing and enhancing current levels of exports from developing and least developed country members, maintain their market shares in their export markets, as well as developing their technological and infrastructural capabilities. While notifying a measure, Members shall, *inter-alia*, indicate the following: (i) systems and/or equivalent systems that could be used to comply with such a measure; (ii) the names of the developing and least-developed country Members that could be affected by the applied measure."

9. The African Group (TN/CTD/W/3/Rev.2) has suggested several interpretations of Article 10.1:

- (a) "The requirement to "take account of the special needs of developing country Members, and in particular least developed country Members" in Article 10.1 shall be understood to mean that Members shall either withdraw measures that adversely affect any developing and least-developed country Members or which they find difficult to comply with, or shall provide the technical and financial resources necessary for the developing and least-developed country Members to comply with the measures."
- (b) "The requirement shall be further understood to mean that Members shall always initiate consultations in the Committee whenever they propose or intend to take any measures that are likely to affect imports from developing and least-developed country Members. In the consultations, Members shall establish whether or not the proposed or intended measures, if justified under the Agreement, would adversely affect any developing and least-developed country Members."

Proposals related to Article 10.4

10. The proposal from the African Group identified in paragraph 5(a)(ii) above is also related to Article 10.4.

11. India has proposed (TN/CTD/W/6) an interpretation of Article 10.4:

"In Article 10.4 the term "should" be read to express "duty" rather than mere exhortation. This could be clarified through an authoritative interpretation under Article IX.2 of the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the WTO."

C. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS OF THE PROPOSALS.

12. The following paragraphs summarize the discussions of these five proposals which had occurred in the special sessions of the Committee on Trade and Development, held between May 2002 and February 2003⁴, and of a joint CTD/ SPS Committee session⁵ that took place in November 2002, as reflected in the minutes of meetings of that body.

General comments

13. A number of Members (including Australia, Canada, the European Communities, Japan, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Switzerland and the United States) expressed the view that it was necessary to make special and differential treatment provisions more effective, user friendly and profitable. They did not believe that this would be achieved by rendering some special and differential treatment provisions binding, but rather by increasing the utilization of existing provisions, upgrading information flows, and delivering more needs-driven technical assistance and capacity building – notably through a clearer expression by developing countries of the problems faced in utilizing individual special and differential treatment provisions. Furthermore, these Members shared the view that making the special and differential treatment provisions binding would imply that Member's rights to implement scientifically justified SPS measures would become conditional and not automatic as provided for in the SPS Agreement.

14. Chile suggested that any agreement-specific proposal had to be examined from the point of view of the effects it would have not only for developing countries but also among developing countries.

15. A number of Members (including the Philippines, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Uganda) stated that making the provisions binding would increase the effectiveness of technical assistance as developing countries would no longer be required to request such assistance. They, however, recognized that it would be a strain on developed countries' economies. These country Members also shared the view that technical assistance should be more needs-driven.

16. Proponents of the proposals (including Cuba, Egypt and Kenya) maintained that the aim of the proposals was to amend existing special and differential treatment provisions in order to strengthen them and to make them more responsive to the needs of developing country Members. According to Egypt, non-recorded utilization of the special and differential treatment provisions should not be a pretext to refrain from examining the proposed amendments to these provisions.

Comments on proposals related to Article 9.2

17. Norway and New Zealand noted that the proposal by the Like-Minded Group did not fit into the regular technical assistance framework as governments could not commit to providing exporting developing country Members with the technology usually provided by private companies in the importing developed countries.

⁴ TN/CTD/M/3, TN/CTD/M/4, TN/CTD/M/5, TN/CTD/M/7, TN/CTD/M/13, TN/CTD/M/14, and TN/CTD/M/15.

⁵ TN/CTD/M/10 and Corr.1.

18. Venezuela, China and Haiti shared the view that the proposal by the Like-Minded Group complemented the objectives of the SPS Agreement because if Article 9.2 was not binding it would be impossible for the developing countries to fully implement the SPS Agreement.

19. Proponents of the Like-Minded Group's proposal (including Indonesia, Pakistan and Sri Lanka) and India observed that assistance could currently only be sought bilaterally and that, as it was not mandatory, developing countries could not be assured of any assistance once it had been requested. This was why the proposals suggested that the relevant provisions of the SPS Agreement be made binding in order for them to become more flexible, effective and operational to facilitate and increase developing countries' exports. These Members also indicated that these proposals sought a clear commitment from major trading partners for technical assistance when an exporting developing country Member faced a difficulty in fulfilling the SPS requirements of an importing developed country Member.

20. Argentina maintained that it was the developed countries Members who had the technical capacity to provide technical assistance and that a simplification of their administrative procedures would make it less costly for developing country Members to export and easier for them to comply with SPS rules.

21. Malaysia indicated that there were several types of technical assistance already available to make the SPS Agreement more effective.

22. The European Communities and Switzerland indicated that the second paragraph of the African Group's proposal, which aimed to make it an obligation to pay compensation once a problem had been identified, had unacceptable budgetary implications and would be difficult to accomplish.

23. The European Communities further noted that the provision in the proposal by the Like-Minded Group, which stated that "shall consider providing" be changed into "shall provide", was actually implemented through several bilateral efforts in addition to the efforts under the Trust Fund. Although more could always be done, the real problem was how to make the assistance more effective.

24. Chile questioned what the consequences of the monitoring of special and differential treatment, as suggested in the African Group's proposal, would be for the subsidiary bodies.

Comments on proposals related to Article 10.1

25. New Zealand observed that the first paragraph of the proposal by the Like-Minded Group, as drafted, only imposed an obligation on developed country Members although South-South trade was a particularly important issue given the widely varying stages of development amongst developing countries and the size of some developing country markets.

26. Chile and New Zealand shared the view that, with regard to the first paragraph of the Like-Minded Group's proposal, a legally binding obligation to enter into consultations with a view to finding a mutually satisfactory solution was not appropriate. If a mutually satisfactory solution could not be found, the proposal might lead to legal solutions which would have other effects upon the SPS Agreement.

27. Canada indicated that its proposal (G/SPS/W/127)⁶ stemmed from the same preoccupation as expressed by the Like-Minded Group as Canada's proposal stipulated that when an importing Member

⁶ This proposal and the procedure for its implementation were subsequently adopted by the SPS Committee (G/SPS/33).

notified a measure and an interested developing country Member expressed an interest therein, there was an obligation for the notifying Member to consult with the developing countries on a means to address their concerns. Canada also believed that if the solutions found were notified, it would encourage other developing country Members to apply and/or undertake similar actions, thus allowing them to take full advantage of existing provisions.

28. Egypt noted that the Canadian proposal was a valuable contribution but did not address the requirement contained in the proposal by the Like-Minded Group, which was to secure and enhance current levels of exports from developing and least-developed country Members.

29. Malaysia considered that, with regard to the first paragraph of the Like-Minded Group's proposal, prior consultations would be complementary to the current obligation of providing a designated period for comments on notifications. However, that might not be possible for emergency measures.

30. Norway and New Zealand argued that, with regard to the second paragraph of the proposal by the Like-Minded Group, an importing Member could not be obliged to secure and enhance exports from other countries in disregard of its own national legislation under the SPS Agreement. In addition, committing to the maintenance of market shares, as proposed, would imply agreement to manage trade through a quota system that was contrary to the purpose of the SPS Agreement.

31. Proponents of the Like-Minded Group's proposal (including Pakistan and Sri Lanka) remarked that there were justifiable reasons for developed country Members to provide compensation for the loss of export revenue resulting from the imposition of SPS measures. Moreover, Members were not being asked to surrender their rights to impose SPS measures but to assist developing country Members to acquire the infrastructure capabilities they needed to comply with the SPS requirements that developed countries imposed.

Comments on proposals related to Article 10.4

32. New Zealand indicated that, with regard to the proposal by India to change or interpret the SPS Agreement so as to make participation in the relevant standard-setting bodies almost mandatory, would not deliver practical benefits.

33. The European Communities expressed the view that it would be useful to get more factual information on the effects of the Doha Decision and the status of assistance currently provided to enable the active participation of developing countries in these organizations. Canada recalled that progress had already been made with respect to the proposal made by the delegation of India, as Canada had created a specific mechanism run by the Standards Council of Canada to assist developing countries to participate in the relevant international institutions.

34. The United States drew attention to a programme, funded by several developed countries including the United States, to enable the thirty-two countries in the American and the Caribbean Region to participate in the activities of the SPS Committee since November 2002.

35. Argentina recognized that efforts had been made by some developed country Members with regard to the implementation of the provisions of this article, but suggested that improvement was still needed.

D. DEVELOPMENTS THAT ADDRESS SOME OF THE CONCERNS IN THE PROPOSALS

36. This section of the document describes a number of developments which have, *inter alia*, addressed some of the concerns underlying several of the special and differential treatment proposals.

These developments are briefly presented below according to whether their primary focus is on technical assistance (Article 9) or on special and differential treatment (Article 10).

Actions to enhance technical assistance (Article 9)

37. Technical assistance has been a regular item on the agenda of SPS Committee meetings since 1995. Under this agenda item, Members are invited to identify any specific technical assistance needs which they may have, and/or to report on any SPS-related capacity building activities in which they are involved. The WTO Secretariat, as well as observer organizations, also report on their assistance activities.

38. In July 1999, the Secretariat circulated a questionnaire seeking information on the SPS-related technical assistance provided by Members and on technical assistance needs in the context of the SPS Agreement. A number of Members provided information on their programmes and projects for SPS capacity building in reply to the questionnaire, and others submitted similar information in separate documents.⁷ The volume of information provided makes evident that a substantial amount of assistance is being provided on a bilateral basis to address some SPS-related concerns.

39. A second questionnaire, circulated in July 2001, sought information specifically on SPS-related technical assistance needs.⁸ By December 2004, 36 Members had submitted responses to the questionnaire regarding their technical assistance needs, and several Members also submitted separate documents with this information (see Attachment 1).⁹ The information provided in these responses has subsequently been used in the planning of various technical assistance activities.

40. At the request of the SPS Committee, the WTO Secretariat prepared a note on typology of technical assistance needs in order to help Members identify the most appropriate type of technical assistance.¹⁰ Furthermore, a workshop on technical assistance needs and how to best address these in relation to the SPS Agreement was organized by the WTO Secretariat in November 2002.

41. In order to address some of the concerns raised in the questionnaire responses, the Secretariat has also organized workshops and seminars on the principles and methods of risk analysis (June 2000); the processes and procedures of the relevant standard setting organizations (March 2001); and on the effective operation of national SPS enquiry points (November 2003).

42. The Secretariat initiated technical assistance activities, in the form of regional and national training workshops, in November 1994. The primary focus of these activities is to ensure that officials of developing countries are fully aware of the rights and obligations of Members under the SPS Agreement, and of how to use the provisions of the Agreement to facilitate their trade interests. The number of training activities organized by the WTO Secretariat has increased substantially in recent years. These training activities are described in more detail in document G/SPS/GEN/521.

43. The Secretariat has also developed a number of tools to assist Members with the understanding and implementation of the Agreement. In particular, a booklet discussing the text of the SPS Agreement was published under the WTO Agreements Series (Volume No. 4). The Secretariat has also issued a handbook on the application of the transparency provisions of the Agreement. Finally a CD-ROM explaining and discussing in detail the provisions of the Agreement,

⁷ A summary of the replies to this questionnaire (G/SPS/W/101) are contained in document G/SPS/GEN/143/Rev.1 and Add. 1-3. Replies to the same questionnaire have also been provided separately by Australia (G/SPS/GEN/472); the United States (G/SPS/GEN/181 and Add. 1-4); and New Zealand (G/SPS/GEN/352). Information has also been provided by the European Communities (G/SPS/GEN/244).

⁸ G/SPS/W/113.

⁹ These responses are circulated as addenda to G/SPS/GEN/295.

¹⁰ G/SPS/GEN/206.

and dealing in particular with implementation, transparency, special and differential treatment and dispute settlement issues, has been produced by the Secretariat. The inter-active CD-ROM includes text, video and audio material and is complemented by multiple-choice tests to enable users to monitor their individual progress.

44. The international standard-setting bodies have consistently provided updates to the SPS Committee on their technical assistance activities. All three organizations have developed training programmes, including conferences, seminars and workshops, to enhance national capacities on WTO matters. The IPPC developed a diagnostic tool, the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE), to help countries address their current capacity and identify needs for assistance. The PCE is available on CD-ROM and can be downloaded from the IPPC website.¹¹ In addition to information from the OIE, IPPC and the Codex, other observers organizations, including FAO, the World Bank, OIRSA, IICA, UNIDO and UNCTAD, provide regular updates to the SPS Committee on their provision of technical assistance. All of these organizations have substantial programmes related to SPS capacity building.

45. Furthermore, following the consultations between the WTO, FAO, OIE and WHO referred to in paragraph 49, the Codex, IPPC and OIE have established trust funds to assist the more effective participation of developing country Members in their standard-setting activities. These trust funds are supported through contributions by donor agencies and member countries. The OIE also continues to provide financial support for the participation of the Chief Veterinary Officers of its member countries in OIE standard-setting activities.

46. The Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) was established in September 2002 following the commitment made by the Heads of the WHO, the FAO, the WTO, the OIE and the World Bank at the Doha Ministerial Conference to explore new technical and financial mechanisms to promote the efficient use of resources in SPS-related activities.¹² The purpose of the STDF, which is administered by the WTO, is to enhance the capacity of developing countries in the standards area through co-operation between the relevant institutions in SPS-related activities, including through the development of joint institutional projects, and provision of STDF-funding to projects in developing countries. Eleven projects, related to building the capacity of developing countries to identify specific needs, make effective use of international standards, and meet the SPS requirements of their trading partners, have been approved by the STDF. The STDF also maintains a database which provides information on SPS-related technical assistance and capacity building projects.¹³

Actions to enhance the implementation of special and differential treatment (Article 10)

47. Special and differential treatment is a standing agenda item for the Committee. Under this item, Egypt proposed the inclusion of a special and differential treatment box in the SPS notification format.¹⁴ In response, Canada proposed that an importing country should consider any requests for special and differential treatment or technical assistance made in response to their notification of a new measure and notify the SPS Committee of any subsequent action.¹⁵ In March 2003, the Committee adopted in principle the Canadian proposal and in October 2004, it adopted an elaboration of the steps to implement this procedure.¹⁶ This procedure provides for the submission of specific addenda to notifications which indicate when special and differential treatment or technical assistance has been requested in the context of the notification of a new or modified SPS measure, and what response has been given to the request.

¹¹ <http://www.ippc.int>.

¹² <http://www.standardsfacility.org>.

¹³ Available on-line at <http://stdfdb.wto.org>.

¹⁴ G/SPS/GEN/358.

¹⁵ G/SPS/W/127.

¹⁶ G/SPS/33.

48. Other guidelines and decisions adopted by the Committee have taken into consideration the specific needs and concerns expressed by developing country Members. These include the recommended procedures for implementing the transparency provisions of the SPS Agreement (G/SPS/7/Rev.2 and Add.1 and 2); the guidelines to further the practical implementation of Article 5.5 (G/SPS/15), and the decision on the implementation of Article 4 of the Agreement regarding recognition of equivalence (G/SPS/19/Rev.2).

49. Following the request of the General Council in October 2000, the Director-General of the WTO organized meetings with the standard-setting organizations as well as with international financial institutions to identify ways to increase the participation of developing countries in international standard-setting activities. He provided three reports regarding his efforts in this area.¹⁷ At the Doha Ministerial Conference, Members urged him to continue his efforts to facilitate participation of developing countries in standard setting. The establishment by the standard-setting organizations of trust funds to facilitate the participation of developing country officials in their activities (see paragraph 45) has been in part in response to this request.

50. The Heads of the FAO, the OIE, the WHO, the World Bank and the WTO issued a joint statement during the Doha Ministerial Conference reaffirming their commitment to enhance developing countries' capacity to participate effectively in the development and application of international standards and in taking full advantage of trade opportunities.¹⁸ As a follow-up to this statement, the STDF (see paragraph 46) has been established.

51. The Decision on Implementation taken at the Doha Ministerial Conference in 2001 included *inter alia* a clarification on Article 10.2.¹⁹ It specifies that where the appropriate level of protection allows scope for the phased introduction of SPS measures, the "longer time-frame for compliance" referred to in Article 10.2 shall normally mean at least 6 months. Where the phased introduction of a new measure is not possible, but a Member identifies specific problems, the Member applying the new measure shall enter into consultations, upon request, to try to find a mutually satisfactory solution. The Decision also indicated that in the context of paragraph 2 of Annex B of the SPS Agreement, a period of 6 months shall normally be provided between the publication of a measure and its entry into force.

52. Finally, the Doha Ministerial Decision instructed the SPS Committee to undertake a review of the operation and implementation of the SPS Agreement every four years. This review, the second since the entry into force of the Agreement, is currently underway.

¹⁷ WT/GC/45, WT/GC/46, WT/GC/54.

¹⁸ WT/MIN(01)/ST/97.

¹⁹ WT/MIN(01)/17, paragraph 3.1.

ATTACHMENT 1

INFORMATION ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED		
Document symbol	Date of publication	Country providing
G/SPS/GEN/143/Rev.1	8 March 2000	Responses to the first questionnaire
G/SPS/GEN/143/Rev.1/Add.1	16 June 2000	<i>Idem</i> - Submission by Canada and update by Italy
G/SPS/GEN/143/Rev.1/Add.2	3 November 2000	<i>Idem</i> - Submission by Jordan
G/SPS/GEN/143/Rev.1/Add.3	3 July 2001	<i>Idem</i> - Submission by Norway
G/SPS/GEN/181	15 June 2000	Technical assistance provided by the United States
G/SPS/GEN/181/Add.1	9 July 2001	<i>Idem</i>
G/SPS/GEN/181/Add.2	25 June 2002	<i>Idem</i>
G/SPS/GEN/181/Add.3	19 June 2003	<i>Idem</i>
G/SPS/GEN/181/Add.4	22 June 2004	<i>Idem</i>
G/SPS/GEN/244	27 April 2001	Technical assistance provided by the European Communities
G/SPS/GEN/352	28 October 2002	Technical assistance provided by New Zealand
G/SPS/GEN/472	10 March 2004	Technical assistance provided by Australia
REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
Document symbol	Date of publication	Country requesting
G/SPS/GEN/174	19 April 2000	Zambia – Request for Technical Assistance
G/SPS/GEN/199	27 July 2000	Jordan – Request for Technical Assistance
G/SPS/GEN/208	1 November 2000	Jordan – Request for Technical Assistance
G/SPS/GEN/257	2 July 2001	Gabon – Communication on Technical Assistance
G/SPS/GEN/287	29 October 2001	Chile – Technical Assistance
G/SPS/GEN/295	6 February 2002	Responses to the second questionnaire
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.1	6 February 2002	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Egypt
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.2	6 February 2002	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Sri Lanka
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.2/Rev.1	30 July 2002	<i>Idem</i> – Revision
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.2/Rev.2	6 June 2003	<i>Idem</i> – Revision
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.3	8 February 2002	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Georgia
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.4	8 February 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Trinidad and Tobago
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.4/Rev.1	5 March 02	<i>Idem</i> – Revision
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.5	8 February 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Uganda
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.6	13 February 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Indonesia
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.7	1 March 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Belarus
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.8	1 March 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Saudi Arabia
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.9	1 March 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Thailand

REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (cont'd)		
Document symbol	Date of publication	Country requesting
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.10	1 March 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Colombia
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.11	1 March 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Cyprus
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.12	6 March 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Tunisia
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.13	18 March 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Cuba
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.14	27 May 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by the Philippines
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.15	6 June 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by the Maldives
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.16	10 June 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Panama
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.17	19 June 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Morocco
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.18	24 June 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Costa Rica
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.19	26 June 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by South Africa
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.19/Rev.1	16 October 02	<i>Idem</i> – Revision
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.20	8 July 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Senegal
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.20/Rev.1	20 August 02	<i>Idem</i> – Revision
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.21	16 July 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Kenya
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.22	30 July 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Guatemala
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.23	1 August 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Gambia
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.24	2 August 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by China
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.25	14 August 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Panama
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.26	29 August 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Honduras
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.27	12 September 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Mauritius
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.28	17 October 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Yugoslavia
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.29	10 December 02	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Costa Rica
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.30	5 February 03	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Barbados
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.31	6 March 03	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Peru
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.32	24 March 03	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Cyprus
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.33	25 March 03	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Dominican Republic
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.33/Corr.1	1 May 03	<i>Idem</i> – Corrigendum
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.34	15 July 03	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Paraguay
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.35	1 March 04	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Antigua and Barbuda
G/SPS/GEN/295/Add.36 & Corr.1	11 June 04	<i>Idem</i> – Submission by Nicaragua
G/SPS/GEN/401	20 May 2003	Cameroon – Technical Assistance Request
G/SPS/GEN/481	30 March 2004	Antigua and Barbuda – Technical Assistance

GENERAL PROPOSALS REGARDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
Document symbol	Date of publication	Country requesting
G/SPS/GEN/157	17 December 1999	Guatemala – Development and Adaptation of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Systems in Developing Countries
GSPS/GEN/287	29 October 2001	Chile - Technical Assistance
G/SPS/GEN/382	1 April 2003	Mexico – SPS measures technical co-operation programme
G/SPS/GEN/469	8 March 2004	Papua New Guinea – SPS and Developing Countries: Special and Differential Treatment, Technical Assistance, Transparency
