I welcome this opportunity to present some preliminary views of the Swedish delegation regarding certain elements of the problem of the definition to be given to the term "international standard". Let me state that our goal is to achieve worldwide standards. We believe that the term "international" in the document we are now preparing should be used only to mean and reflect this ambition. For the purpose of the code which we are elaborating we thus suggest that an "international standard" should mean a standard elaborated in a body, the membership of which is open to all contracting parties. This is the first of the alternatives mentioned in the note on definitions (Spec(71)45, page 4).

The second definition referring to organizations open to all contracting parties "having a substantial - or significant - trading interest" creates problems for my delegation as well as for others who have touched upon this question during our meeting. The significance of "substantial trading interest" is not quite clear. We do not find it acceptable that the concept could be given too narrow an interpretation, as for example in the context of Article XXVIII where in practice "substantial trading interest" means some two to five countries. Furthermore, it is open to question who shall decide whether a contracting party has a "substantial - or for that matter 'significant' - trading interest". It seems appropriate that any contracting party who in his own evaluation considers that he has a right to refer to the code should be able to do so. In these circumstances the phrase should not be used.

Thirdly, there is the difficult question of how to deal with groupings that are not open to all contracting parties. In our view it is important to avoid the use of "international" to describe such limited groupings in a GATT code. A limited number of countries that have agreed upon a standard elaborated by them should not be able to claim that such a standard is international in the sense of a GATT code.

This does not mean that we do not share the view of others that limited groupings can perform - and are in fact performing - useful work. Above all - we furthermore believe that in elaborating a GATT code on standards it is necessary to recognize the existence of limited groupings.

For the purpose of the code we would like to suggest the term "multinational" to describe such limited groupings.

It is our view that the existence of such multinational standards and standards organizations must be recognized. At the same time however our code should state that multinational standards should follow the general GATT principle of affording no less
favourable treatment to one contracting party than to another. This principle would imply that multinational standards or organizations should be created with a view to achieving - or building on the principle of achieving - international standards comprising all contracting parties.

With the terminology and definitions I have suggested as well as in recognizing the principles advocated, it is my hope that the Working Group can make progress towards eliminating brackets in the text and reaching an understanding. I submit these views for consideration of such an approach to our next meeting until which my delegation also certainly wishes to use the time for further reflection.