



Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

**REVIEW OF THE OPERATION AND IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE SPS AGREEMENT**

DRAFT REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Note by the Secretariat¹

Corrigendum

The list of co-sponsors listed in the following paragraphs has been corrected:

5.1. Brazil, Kenya, Madagascar, Paraguay, the United States and Uruguay proposed using fall armyworm as a case study to discuss the application of the principles in the SPS Agreement to enable greater access to tools and technologies.²⁴ The proposal recommended forming a working group to undertake several activities.

5.3. The Committee decided to hold a thematic session on fall armyworm in March 2019, and Brazil, Kenya, Madagascar, Paraguay, the United States and Uruguay circulated a proposed agenda for this session.²⁵ The Thematic Session on Fall Armyworm was held on 19 March 2019²⁶, to discuss the role of the WTO SPS Agreement in enabling access to tools and technologies and facilitating international trade, using fall armyworm as a case study. The session provided information on the nature and the impact of the spread of fall armyworm across the globe, the challenges for smallholders, and the tools and technologies available. Global, regional and domestic approaches to enable regulatory frameworks to facilitate access to safe and effective tools and technologies were presented. Members shared their experiences in dealing with fall armyworm, highlighting their successes and challenges.²⁷

6.1. Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, The Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Morocco, Nigeria, the United States and Zambia presented a joint proposal on strengthening national SPS committees, suggesting the organization of a thematic session or workshop in late 2018 or early 2019.²⁸ Several Members supported the proposal, highlighting the importance of sharing experiences with national SPS committees. Some Members emphasized that national committees were not the only way to coordinate and suggested enlarging the scope to include other national coordination mechanisms in the event. While the Trade Facilitation Agreement contained an obligation to establish a national committee, the SPS Agreement did not. What mattered was the existence of a functioning national coordination mechanism. The Secretariat reminded Members that the SPS Committee had held a Workshop on Coordination at National and Regional Levels in 2011, and invited Members to consult the materials available on the WTO website.²⁹

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.

²⁴ G/SPS/W/305.

²⁵ G/SPS/W/309 and G/SPS/W/309/Corr.1.

²⁶ The programme for this thematic session is contained in G/SPS/GEN/1676/Rev.1. Presentations from the session are also available at: https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/sps_e/workshop19032019_e.htm.

²⁷ See the summary report of the March 2019 SPS Committee meeting for an overview of the thematic session (G/SPS/R/94, forthcoming).

²⁸ G/SPS/W/297.

²⁹ Information on this workshop is available at: https://www.wto.org/english/news_e/news11_e/sps_17oct11_e.htm.

³⁶ G/SPS/W/292/Rev.4. Previous revisions of this proposal were discussed prior to the launch of the Fifth Review.

8.1. Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Japan, Kenya, Madagascar, New Zealand, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uganda, the United States and Uruguay presented a revised joint proposal on addressing the trade effects of pesticide MRLs.³⁶ The proposal contained several recommendations to advance work in the Committee on trade-related MRLs, for inclusion in the Report of the Fifth Review. The recommendations aim to enable the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) to better respond to increased demand and monitor progress on new Codex MRLs; strengthen notification practices of Members for greater transparency and predictability of MRLs; invite reports to the SPS Committee on international and regional activities on MRLs; enhance collaboration on solutions for MRLs for minor use and specialty crops; and note the role of the Committee in increasing coordination and harmonization.
