

Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

**EFFECTS OF SPS-RELATED PRIVATE STANDARDS -
COMPILATION OF REPLIES¹**

Note by the Secretariat²

Revision

1. In the context of the Committee's work on private standards and in accordance with the Committee's decision to undertake a comparative study on the effects of private SPS standards³, the Secretariat circulated a Questionnaire on SPS-related Private Standards on 5 December 2008.⁴
2. The Secretariat received a total of 40 responses to the questionnaire from 22 Members⁵ before a compilation of replies was circulated on 15 June 2009.⁶ This revised version of the compilation incorporates a number of comments from Members. The individual responses to the questionnaire, including those received after the circulation of the compilation,⁷ can be consulted through the WTO Members' website.⁸
3. The level of detail and explanations provided in the responses varies significantly, making it difficult to undertake a statistical analysis based on the replies. In addition, some of the replies refer to public as well as private standards without differentiation while others provide examples of environmental or quality requirements going beyond SPS issues. This makes it difficult to determine which trade effects can be attributed to private SPS requirements. At the same time, the Secretariat is not in a position to verify the accuracy of the replies, some of which might be questioned by other Members. Therefore, this compilation does not attempt to provide a comprehensive overview on private SPS standards but rather reflects the perceptions of the respondents to the questionnaire and highlights the main points emerging from the replies.
4. Annex II of the report includes a table showing the individual replies provided to questions 1 (HS Code and full description), 2 (main export market), 3 (entity imposing the standard), and 5 (description of private standard). The replies to the other questions have not been included in

¹ The title of this document has been modified in light of Members' comments. The current title, referring to a "compilation of replies", reflects more accurately the nature of this document than the original title, which referred to a "descriptive report".

² 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.

³ G/SPS/R/53, para. 132.

⁴ G/SPS/W/232.

⁵ Please see Annex I for a list of Members which have submitted responses to the questionnaire.

⁶ G/SPS/GEN/932.

⁷ Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago submitted responses after the circulation of the compilation. Argentina also provided additional information complementing its two original responses.

⁸ Please click on this address: 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 ad hoc working group on private standards.

Annex II as they are more descriptive and vary significantly in length. Interested Members can also access a compilation of most replies presented in an Excel sheet through the Members' website referred to above.

5. A number of concerns regarding the effects of private standards on exports of agricultural products have been raised in the responses. Some Members have also underlined the positive and trade facilitating impact of private standards.

6. Subsequent to the discussion of the compilation of replies, the SPS Committee's ad hoc working group on private standards has been considering possible actions for the SPS Committee regarding private SPS standards on the basis of proposals from Members.⁹

7. A short summary of the replies to each question is provided below.

Question 1. Product of export interest affected by private standards

8. The following products were most often identified as being affected by private standards:

- Fresh fruit (HS Codes 0804, 0805, and 0810);
- Fresh vegetables (HS Codes 0701 and 0710); and
- Fresh, chilled or frozen meat – both bovine and poultry (HS Codes 0201 and 0207).

Products that may be classified as fresh produce appear to be most affected by private standards although examples of processed foods and value-added spices have also been provided.

Question 2. Main export markets

9. This question asked Members to indicate the main export markets for the products identified, including but not limited to those where private standards might be prevalent. The replies indicate that the main markets of the concerned products are Australia, Canada, Japan, the member States of the European Union, and the United States of America. The member States of the European Union most referred to are Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Other markets that are mentioned by more than one Member in the responses include China, Switzerland, and the United Arab Emirates.

Questions 3 and 4. Retailer/company/private trader/entity imposing the private standard - Type of domestic businesses whose exports need to meet the private standards

10. It appears that the primary entities imposing private standards are retailers such as supermarkets and hypermarkets, e.g. Marks and Spencer's, Metro, Primus Labs, Tesco, and Wal-Mart. Although some replies have not mentioned specific entities imposing these standards, they have indicated that retailers in their major export markets impose private standards. All types of businesses seem to be affected by private standards, including small, medium and large-scale enterprises.

Question 5. Description of the relevant private standard(s) applied in each of the product's export markets

11. The international schemes most mentioned in the responses are GLOBALGAP, ISO 9000, ISO 22000, and SQF (Safe Quality Food). Many responses also refer to Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) requirements. It is important to note that Codex has adopted Principles on

⁹ G/SPS/W/247.

HACCP, as well as Guidelines for its Application, while recognizing that the details of application may vary depending on the circumstances of the food operation. Many national governments have also adopted mandatory HACCP requirements, based on the Codex guidelines and principles, with respect to the production of various food products. It is possible that the references to HACCP in the replies relate to some of the private schemes and certification requirements which take HACCP as basis.

12. The most frequently identified national scheme setting requirements for purchasing is the British Retail Consortiums (BRC). In their replies, certain Members also make reference to export-oriented initiatives such as Chile GAP, Kenya GAP, New Zealand GAP, and Swiss GAP, which are benchmarked against GLOBALGAP and aim to facilitate exports.

13. As regards individual firm schemes, the replies also vary greatly, but Tesco Nature's Choice is the most commonly cited retail scheme. Private standards applied by Aldi, Carrefour, Edeka/Netto, Heinz, Lidl, Marks and Spencer's, McDonald's, Metro, Norma, Plus, Rewe, Tegut, and Tengelmann are also cited.

14. Some replies to this question make reference to private standards focusing on environmental/social issues (e.g. the Rainforest Alliance) or to official government standards, which are not the focus of this study. A possible explanation for this is that, from the perspective of the producers, which have in most instances provided the inputs for the replies, what matters is the whole range of market access conditions, be they private or public, SPS- or environment-related. Many exporters are unable to differentiate between private and public requirements.

Question 6. Content of the private standard

15. Over two-thirds of the replies state that the scope of the content of the private standards is food safety, while other replies have also mentioned animal and plant health. Social and environmental issues have also been identified, although these fall beyond the scope of the SPS Agreement and of this study.

16. With respect to the date of entry into force of relevant private standards, the replies vary extensively, although it appears that the phenomenon gathered momentum in the past five to ten years. However, in some cases the identified private standards have been in existence since the early 1990s. It is pertinent to note that more than twenty responses did not address this question.

Question 7. Relevant Codex, OIE, IPPC standards (if any) for the products in question

17. With respect to the relevant international standards for the products in question, the detail provided in the replies vary greatly. In a few cases, general references are made to Codex food safety standards, OIE animal health standards, or IPPC plant health standards. Less than half of the replies identify a relatively specific standard. Overall, most references are to Codex standards, followed by OIE standards. Although there are a number of general references to IPPC standards, no specific international standard for phytosanitary measures has been identified.

18. Among the Codex food safety "standards", those cited most often are related to HACCP requirements, maximum residue limits (MRLs) for pesticides, hygienic practices for meat and fresh fruits, testing laboratories, as well as commodity specific standards such as those on bananas, olive oil, etc. In this context, the replies of Paraguay and Uruguay are particularly detailed.

19. Six replies have made reference to OIE standards although only three have provided more specific references. These include Chapters 10.4.26 (inactivation of the avian flu virus) and 11.6 (BSE) of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code, and animal welfare standards which are outside the scope of the SPS Agreement.

20. At the same time, about a third of the replies do not contain any information on whether there are any relevant international standards. Some responses indicate that producers, who provided the information, are simply not aware of international standards and focus on meeting the private standards in their export markets. In other cases, it is not clear whether there is no relevant international standard or whether this information is simply lacking.

Question 8. Do the private standard(s) requirements for the product in question correspond to the relevant Codex, IPPC or OIE standard for that same product?

21. About two-thirds of the replies indicate that at least some of the requirements of private standards exceed those of the relevant international standards although only a third of these provide references to specific international standards. The SPS-specific examples include:

- more detailed and prescriptive operational procedures, for example, compared to the Codex HACCP;
- lower MRLs than those of Codex;
- more demanding requirements regarding absence of listeria in raw meat compared to Codex standards; and
- more restrictive requirements to demonstrate absence of dura mater in matured and deboned beef compared to OIE standards.

22. Four of the replies indicate that the private standards requirements for beef, fish and certain fresh fruits do not exceed those of the relevant international standards. Five other replies do not contain specific information on this question. One specific example for cut flowers notes that most standards relate to socio-environmental issues and are therefore not comparable with the standards of Codex, OIE or the IPPC. Such issues would also fall outside the scope of the SPS Agreement and of this study.

23. One reply points to the positive role that private standards have had for beef and poultry products by addressing emerging risks (specific risk materials in beef and avian influenza in poultry) at an early stage. These standards have assisted exporters in maintaining access to certain markets while preventing the spread of diseases and have also paved the way for the eventual adoption of international and national standards to address these risks.

Questions 9 and 10. Do the private standard requirements for the product in question correspond to the relevant official import requirements for that same product?

Do the private standard requirements for the product in question correspond to official national regulatory requirements for that same product?

24. About two thirds of the replies indicate that the private standard requirements exceed official import requirements. A number of examples cite MRLs for pesticides which are significantly lower than national requirements, which are themselves at times more restrictive than MRLs set by Codex for the same products.¹⁰ Other examples provided relate to hygiene requirements, traceability, HACCP requirements and the limited number of total substance residues accepted.

25. Eight replies indicate that the private standard requirements do not exceed official requirements, while two others do not respond to this question.

¹⁰ For example, Aldi, Plus-Edeka-Rewe-Metro group, Coop, Norma, Super de Boer, Kaufland, and Tengelmann.

26. The replies regarding a comparison between private standard requirements and official national regulatory requirements of exporting Members follow a similar pattern to that found in Question 9. In some cases, there is very limited or no national SPS requirements regarding these products in the exporting Members.

Question 11. Negative (trade inhibiting) effects of the private standard(s) on the export of a product

27. Many responses indicate that compliance with private standards is considered by exporters to be the prerequisite for exporting to a large number of developed country markets. Those farmers and producers who cannot achieve compliance with private standards, even if they could meet official standards, are losing market access opportunities and trying to switch to alternative markets, e.g. in Southeast Asia and the Middle East, where official government standards still constitute the market access conditions.

28. Certain retailers require very restrictive MRLs for pesticides, determined as a percentage of national MRLs, which are themselves at times more restrictive than MRLs set by Codex for the same products. Such low MRLs result in the exclusion of certain producers from the market even though they could meet the official or international requirements. A number of replies indicate that such restrictive MRLs have neither scientific justification nor enhanced food safety outcomes for consumers.

29. Most replies highlight concerns with the high costs of compliance, which are additional to what would be incurred to comply with official standards. Some of these costs occur only initially and others on a regular basis. Costs are incurred for initial studies, investment in infrastructure, external consultant fees for implementation, training, record-keeping, conduct of internal and external audits, annual certification fees, as well as required adaptations to changing requirements over time.

30. While the cost of certification varies depending on the sector as well as the size and starting point of the farmers/producers, the examples provided indicate that the average annual certification fee may vary between US\$2,000 to US\$8,000 for a private standard (although some might also cover more than just SPS requirements). Some of the replies also make reference to costly and time-consuming private standard requirements for microbiological and chemical analyses by laboratories accredited under ISO 17025 on Competence of Testing and Calibration Laboratories. Most developing countries do not have accredited laboratories and need to send samples abroad for testing. In addition, the scientific justification for this requirement is questioned.

31. Concerns raised include the repeated annual certification requirements for firms with a good past record, as well as the non-transparent and inconsistent evaluations of certain auditors. In general, certification is accepted only from subsidiaries of foreign enterprises, which are approved by the owner of the standard, and not from existing national and local certification bodies.

32. Most responses indicate that compliance with the private standards does not necessarily deliver a price premium despite the investments needed to obtain certification. In addition, the absence of a logo or label for having achieved compliance (for example with GLOBALGAP) is seen as a disadvantage.

33. Most respondents identify the multiplicity of private standards and the lack of harmonization among them, despite some benchmarking efforts, as one of the main difficulties with private standards. This increases the complexity of requirements applicable in a certain sector as well as the compliance and certification costs. The branding aspect of private standards was considered an obstacle against much-needed harmonization among them. A related point raised is that the concept of "equivalence" in private standards is considered as an equivalence of processes and not of outcomes.

34. The Integrated Crop Management Assessment System in South Africa was described as a noteworthy effort on the supply-side to tackle the complexity of private standards. This self-assessment tool compares different relevant private standards in a single checklist.

35. Some replies indicate that the acceptance of "registered pesticides" only constitute an obstacle for farmers/producers that rely on pesticides which may not be widely used and therefore not included on the list of registered pesticides.

36. The replies point to a disproportionate effect on smallholders. While large and medium-size international and national enterprises often manage to achieve compliance with private standards, smaller ones lack the necessary infrastructure and resources and may be driven out of the market. This seems to be particularly relevant for certain commodities with export potential, such as exotic fruits, which are grown mainly by small-holders in developing country Members.

37. The replies also highlight concerns about the lack of transparency, the lack of involvement of exporters and other stakeholders in the private standard-setting process, and the lack of appeal procedures. In particular, replies raise concerns about the prescriptive nature of certain standards which might not be relevant or applicable in all circumstances.

Question 12. Positive (trade creating) effects of the private standard(s) on the export of the product

38. The replies acknowledge that those farmers/producers who manage to comply with private standards maintain a stable presence in a number of major export markets and possibly expand their market share, while those who cannot are displaced. Still, some replies note that the ability of more producers to meet private standard requirements has enhanced competition and reduced ease of market access.

39. Most replies also acknowledge that private standards may facilitate compliance with international standards, satisfy evolving consumer demands and improve the safety and quality of the traded products even if there is no price premium. They may also lead to more standardized farming, processing, and packaging activities, promoting productivity and predictability. In addition, compliance with private standards may improve a brand's reputation and facilitate access to credit and better stock market access quotation where applicable. Private standards may offer product differentiation opportunities and access to niche markets. While it may not be directly linked to SPS issues, they may also contribute towards social and environmental goals.

40. Two concrete positive examples were cited; one is FLO-CERT in Ecuador, which offers price premiums and a fund for workers. The other is New Zealand GAP, a private sector initiative which has facilitated New Zealand's access to the international market, as well as adaptation of certain prescriptive requirements of international private standard schemes to local conditions.

Question 13. Information on recognition of compliance with the private standard(s) for the export product

41. As noted above, national and local certification bodies are not normally involved in certification of compliance with private standards. This is usually done by subsidiaries of foreign enterprises, which need to be approved by the owner of the standard.

42. According to the replies, large, medium, and sometimes small-size establishments, manage to achieve compliance, although the results vary by Member and sector. Some small-scale producers manage to obtain certification by forming associations and slaughtering animals in third-party slaughterhouses.

43. Very limited information is provided in the replies regarding convergence and benchmarking trends among private standards.

44. Information available to the Secretariat from other public sources point to two major schemes with benchmarking activity.

45. Under the international scheme of GLOBALGAP, owners of good agricultural practice standards can seek to demonstrate equivalence with GLOBALGAP through an independent benchmarking scheme. Australia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Germany, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Uruguay have national GAP schemes that are recognized as equivalent or seeking such recognition.

46. Under the Global Food Safety Initiative (GFSI), eight international retailers (Ahold, Carrefour, Delhaize, ICA, Metro, Migros, Tesco, and Wal-Mart) accept the GFSI benchmarking of seven major food safety schemes BRC, Dutch HACCP, Food Safety System Certification (FSSC), Global Red Meat Standard (GRMS), GLOBALGAP (food safety aspects for fruits and vegetables), International Food Standard (IFS), and Safe Quality Food (SQF)). If a supplier has been certified under one of these food safety schemes, it does not have to be certified under the others to be able to supply any of the eight retailers (the concept of "once certified, accepted everywhere").

Question 14. Technical/financial assistance received to assist compliance with the private standard(s) and from who (government, standard setter, NGO, etc)

47. More than half of the replies state that there was some kind of assistance provided to facilitate compliance with the private standards. Governments of exporters, export promotion agencies, non-governmental organizations, and international organizations are identified as entities providing support. Reference is also made to third parties providing assistance at a charge. In a set of replies from Pakistan, it appears that support is obtained from projects funded by the Asian Development Bank. One reply states that the cost to comply with the private standards was borne by the global supplier company.

48. Most respondents do not indicate the kind of support provided to comply with private standards. In about a quarter of the replies, the assistance provided appears to be monetary assistance. The next common mode of assistance appears to be supplying information about the standards.

Question 15. What is the main concern regarding private standard(s) faced by your export product(s)?

49. Replies referred to all aspects listed under this question, namely: transparency, inclusiveness, predictability, harmonization, equivalence, scientific justification, number of standards, costs of compliance and possibility to challenge decisions of the standard-setter or of the certification body. The most commonly raised concerns relate to the number of standards imposed on a single product, the lack of harmonization, and the cost of compliance.

Question 16. Identify which, if any, provisions of the SPS Agreement are relevant with regard to the difficulties arising from the requirements of the private standard(s)

50. The provisions most frequently cited are those concerning harmonization (Article 3), equivalence (Article 4), scientific justification (Articles 5 and 6), and transparency (Article 7 and Annex B). Some replies also indicate that paragraph 1 of Article 1 on the scope of the Agreement, and Article 13 concerning implementation are applicable.

51. In two replies, Article 10 (Special and Differential Treatment) is also mentioned. Article 8, (Control, Inspection and Approval), Article 9 (Technical Assistance), and paragraph 1 of Annex A concerning the definitions of SPS measures are each cited once in the replies.

Question 17. What practical steps have been/are taken (or will be taken) with the export market to resolve the trade concerns posed by the private standard(s)?

52. Respondents note that some governments and non-governmental organizations, as well as private initiatives, have taken steps to assist businesses achieve compliance with private standards, which are considered to be the de facto entry requirement for some markets. The response from New Zealand refers to the possibility for certain exporters/suppliers to seek exemptions from the requirements of some private standards if they can provide scientific rationale to the retailer operating the private standard. However, this is dependent on the relationship between the exporter/supplier and the retailer.

Question 18. What other issues does the product face on export markets in relation to the requirements established by private standards in those markets?

53. Replies make reference to a number of issues already covered under other questions. One issue that comes up a number of times is the difficulty arising from the use of veterinary drugs and pesticides that are not necessarily approved or registered in the import market; however, the replies are not specific as to whether this is related to private standards and/or public standards.

Question 19. Are you aware of any private standards imposed by your domestic businesses, private traders, etc.? For which products? For what reasons? Which Members are affected? Any concerns raised by foreign exporters?

54. Several respondents did not answer the questions about private standards imposed domestically in their territories. An equal number of respondents state they have no knowledge of domestically imposed private standards. Chile, China, Guatemala, New Zealand, and South Africa, refer to the existence of private standards domestically, mainly arising from the presence of multinational retailers in their markets.

ANNEX I

List of Members which have replied to the Questionnaire SPS-related Private Standards
(G/SPS/W/232)

Member	Number of specific examples
1. Argentina	2
2. Belize	1
3. Brazil	1
4. Chile	1
5. China	5
6. Colombia	1
7. Costa Rica	1
8. Dominican Rep.	1
9. Ecuador	2
10. Egypt	1
11. European Union	Comments
12. Guatemala	1
13. India	7
14. Japan	Comments
15. New Zealand	1
16. Pakistan	6
17. Paraguay	1
18. South Africa	1
19. Thailand	1
20. Tunisia	1
21. United States	1
22. Uruguay	2

ANNEX II

Summary table

		1a. HS number	1b. Full description	2. Main export market	3. Entity imposing the private standard	5. Description of private standard (int'l scheme/ nat'l scheme/ individ'l firm scheme)
1	Argentina – 1	(a) 0201.30 (b) 0202.30 (c) 1602.50	(a) Meat of bovine animals, fresh or chilled, boneless. (b) Meat of bovine animals frozen, boneless. (c) Prepared or preserved meat of bovine animals	USA	All customers (importers/ distributors/ supermarkets) in the USA and EU.	ISO 22000/ISO 65 (USA) / BRC (United Kingdom)/ The large firms surveyed have to certify with specific firms such as Heinz, McDonald's (USA). They also provide Kosher and Halal certification when requested by private firms. Small-scale producers report that they do not seek this type of certification owing to the high costs of implementing and subsequently maintaining it.
2	Argentina – 2	(a) 0805.50.10 (b) 0805.40.00 (c) 0805.10.20 (d) 0805.20.50 (e) 0808.10.10 (f) 0808.20.10	(a) Lemons (b) Grapefruit (c) Mandarins (d) Oranges (e) Apples (f) Pears	European Union	Hypermarkets: Aldi, Lidl, Rewe, Edka, Plus, Tesco, Norma. Retailers in the Netherlands, United Kingdom and Germany.	GLOBALGAP/ - / Hypermarkets such as Aldi, Edeka/Netto, Lidl, Metro, Norma, Plus, Rewe, Tegut, and Tengelmann. Small firms report that they do not have access to these retail chains.
3	Belize	2009.11.10; 2009.21.30; 2009.41.10; 2009.31.11; 2009.11.20; 2009.21.90; 2009.11.20; 2009.21.90; 1211.90.90; 1211.90.90; 3301.12.00; 3301.19.10; 2309.90.90; 2309.90.90; 1211.90.90	Straight or concentrated juice from orange or grapefruits or the by-products thereof. Final products are either packed in drums, bins or tankers	Belgium, England, Germany, Holland, Italy, Switzerland, UK, and USA In own region: Barbados, Dominican Republic, Guyana, Jamaica, and Trinidad	Mainly retailers in Belgium, England, Germany, Holland, Italy, Switzerland, UK, USA	Quality Management System -ISO 9001:2000, Environmental Management System ISO 14001, HACCP, SGF (Sure Global Fair) – European Labelling standard, Kosher, AIJN/ - / -
4	Brazil	Animal and Plant Products	Fresh, raw and processed.	Some countries	Retailers, wholesalers, private traders.	Agricultural Labelling, BRC (British Retail Consortium), Farm to Fork, , GLOBALGAP, Ranch Nature's Choice, UFAS (Universal Feed Assurance Scheme), and others.

		1a. HS number	1b. Full description	2. Main export market	3. Entity imposing the private standard	5. Description of private standard (int'l scheme/ nat'l scheme/ indiv'l firm scheme)
5	Chile	-	Fresh and processed fruit and vegetables for consumption	Asia (China, Japan), European Union (United Kingdom, Germany, Spain, etc.), Latin America (Argentina, Colombia) and North America (United States of America, Mexico)	GAP standards: Primus Lab (USA); Tesco supermarkets (UK); Marks & Spencer; Wal Mart supermarkets (USA), GMP standards: British Retail Consortium (UK); SQF 2000, currently known as the world food safety standard.	Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) Standards; protocols applied in the field: Global Partnership for Good Agricultural Practices (GlobalGAP); Product Safety Enforcement Forum of Europe (Prosafe); Nature's Choice; Safe Quality Food (SQF). Good Manufacturing Practices (GMPs), Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (SSOPs), Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP), ISO Standard 22.000:2005 (including: HACCP principles, Prerequisites programme (GMPs), Quality management system (ISO 9001:2000), Interactive communication)/ ChileGAP® is a private Good Agricultural Practices (GAPs) certification programme which was developed by the Fruit- Growing Development Foundation (Fundación para el Desarrollo Frutícola, FDF) under a mandate from Chile's fruit and vegetable export industry and which harmonizes the most accepted GAP requirements in Europe and the US so domestic producers can promote the use of GAPs on their land with a view to accessing the major markets at minimum cost.
6	China -1	19022000	Processed deep frozen food made of flour and rice cake.	Deep frozen food made of flour: Japan, Rice cake: some EU member States such as Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, and the UK.	Deep frozen food made of flour: Food Safety Co., Ltd. in Japan Rice cake: ORLANDO in the Netherlands	-/ Rice cake : Collective national schemes/ Deep frozen food made of flour the total bacteria allowed should not exceed 3000 pieces per gram
7	China -2	0808.1000 0808.2012 0808.2013	Apples, Ya pears, Hsueh pears and Xiang pears	The European Union	Retailers (Supermarkets in the EU)	EurepGap, upgraded to GLOBALGAP in 2007/ - /-
8	China -3	02.03 and 02.07	Raw pork and chicken	Japan and the EU	Euro-Retailer Produce Working Group-EUREP	GLOBALGAP to the fresh farm products/ BRC or IFS - to the processed products / TNC - the standards to supply to the Tesco supermarket

		1a. HS number	1b. Full description	2. Main export market	3. Entity imposing the private standard	5. Description of private standard (int'l scheme/ nat'l scheme/ indiv'l firm scheme)
9	China -4	20081190, 1202200000, 2008112000, 1202109000	Processed; fried cashew, peanut with coat, fried peanut, peanut kernel, pinder, peanut kernel without peel	Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, the EU and the US	Companies such as Wal-Mart Stores, Woolworth, MARS, Tesco	COSHER, and HACCP/ BRC / Some private standards are individual firm schemes
10	China -5	07103000, 0710809090, 0712909090 , 0710300000, 0714903090, 0714909099, 2004900090, 0710100000, 0710290000, 070610, 070310	Raw and processed; deep frozen vegetables and dried vegetables.	Australia, the EU, Japan, South Korea, and the USA. America, Europe, Middle east Oceania, South East Asia,	Poseidon Trident, MacDonald's, Heinz	-/ EUREPGAP/ The private standards applied by Heinz
11	Colombia	Cape gooseberries (<i>Physalis peruviana</i>): 08.10.90.50.00, Purple passion fruit – gulupa (<i>Passiflora edulis</i>): 08.10.90.10.00, Yellow passion fruit – maracuyá (<i>Passiflora edulis</i>): 08.10.90.10.00, Granadilla (<i>Passiflora ligularis</i>): 08.10.90.10.00, Tree tomatoes (tamarillo) (<i>Cyphomandra betacea</i>): 08.10.90.30.00	-	Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and United Kingdom	Supermarkets	Collective international schemes, applied in a number of countries/ Collective national schemes applied by one country to the fresh fruit and vegetable market/ Company specific schemes: e.g. German supermarkets MRLs; Permitted pesticides registers United Kingdom supermarkets
12	Costa Rica	8030011	Banana	Belgium, , Germany, Italy, Russia, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the USA	GLOBALGAP	GLOBALGAP's certification system is applied the world over. Anyone wishing to obtain the certification must apply the same standards, whatever the country. / - / -

		1a. HS number	1b. Full description	2. Main export market	3. Entity imposing the private standard	5. Description of private standard (int'l scheme/ nat'l scheme/ individ'l firm scheme)
13	Dominican Republic	0804.40 – Avocados; 0804.50 – Organic Mangoes, fresh / Mangoes, fresh; 0805.20 – Mandarins, fresh; 0709.60 – Peppers, fresh; 0709.90.31 – Pumpkins, fresh; 0710.22.10 – Green Beans; 0710.80 – Aubergines; 1211.90.40 – Chinese Bitter Melon; 0709.90.90 – Other (Chinese okra)	-	Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, Japan, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK, USA	United Kingdom: Marks and Spencer, Tesco, Waitrose, Sainsbury's; United States: Primus Labs, Walmart; Japan: Japanese Agricultural Standards (JAS)	EurepGAP, GLOBALGAP, EU 2092/91, Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI), National Organic Program (NOP-USDA); Japanese Agricultural Standards (JAS), Bio Suisse, Soil Association, Linking Environment and Farming (LEAF), Field to Fork, Tesco Nature's Choice (TNC). Standards applied: Good Agricultural Practices (GAPs), Good Manufacturing Practices (GMPs), Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (SSOPs), Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP)/ The Dominican Republic has set up a Department of Food Safety which prepares guides to GAPs and GMPs and takes steps to ensure compliance with the standards./ -
14	Ecuador -1	-	Banana, Mango, Pineapple	Germany European Union	-	European Union: GLOBALGAP/ Japan: JAS; United States: NOP/ -
15	Ecuador -2	0603	Cut flowers, fresh (roses, gypsophila, carnations, chrysanthemums, tropical flowers, proteas, etc.)	Germany, Netherlands, Russia, USA	Variable, according to the standard. In Ecuador, there are many private standards for flowers	FLO-CERT; GLOBALGAP/ Rain Forest alliance (USA); VERIFLORA (USA); MPS (Netherlands); FLP (Germany)/ -
16	Egypt	Fresh fruit and vegetables - (0701-0703-0708-0710-0711-0712-0713-0803-0804-0805-0806-0809-0810-0811-0813) Processed fruit and vegetables (2009-2007) Olive oil (1509) Confectionery (1704-1806-1905)	-	Austria, the Netherlands,, Switzerland, UK, USA	GLOBALGAP, British Retail Consortium, Tesco, Metro Cash & Carry	Global GAP; ISO; HACCP/ BRC / Tesco Natural choice; Metro Cash & Carry
17	European Union	General remarks				

		1a. HS number	1b. Full description	2. Main export market	3. Entity imposing the private standard	5. Description of private standard (int'l scheme/ nat'l scheme/ indiv'l firm scheme)
18	Guatemala	Snow Peas 0708.10.00, French Beans 0708.20.00, Loquats 08.10, Strawberries 0910.10.00, 0810.20.00, Peached 2008.70.00, Lettuce 07.05, Carrots 07.06, Balsam apples 0709.90.30, Taro Root 0714.90.10, Chinese Okra and thai Okra 0709.90.40	Fresh products	France, Spain, United Kingdom United States,	Firms exporting the products require these standards of producers, most of whom are smallholders. (GLOBALGAP)	GLOBALGAP / - / -
19	India-1	Cashew Kernels 08013200 20081910	Processed	Europe, Japan, Middle East, USA etc.	Company / retailer	HACCP, GMP, ISO 9000, ISO 22000/ - / -
20	India -2	Curries (with chillies & turmeric) 09105000	Curry; value added spice	Australia, Europe, Scandinavia, USA	European Union & USFDA	Colourants – European Union; Aflatoxin – European Union; Pesticide residues - European Union; Allergens – Products exported to Europe, US & Australia should be free from allergens./ - / -
21	India – 3	Turmeric 0910 3030	Turmeric powder; value added spice	Asia, Australia, Europe, Scandinavia, USA	European Union & USFDA	Colourants – European Union; Aflatoxin – European Union; Pesticide residues - European Union; Allergens – Products exported to Europe, US & Australia should be free from allergens./ - / -
22	India – 4	Chillies 09042010, 09042020	Chilli whole, Chilli powder; value added spice	Asia, Australia, Europe, Scandinavia, USA	European Union & USFDA	Colourants – European Union; Aflatoxin – European Union; Pesticide residues - European Union; Allergens – Products exported to Europe, US & Australia should be free from allergens./ - / -
23	India – 5	09081010-in shell (Nutmeg) 09081020-Shelled (Nutmeg)	value added spice	Asia, Australia, Europe, Scandinavia, USA	European Union & USFDA	Colourants – European Union; Aflatoxin – European Union; Pesticide residues - European Union; Allergens – Products exported to Europe, US & Australia should be free from allergens./ - / -

		1a. HS number	1b. Full description	2. Main export market	3. Entity imposing the private standard	5. Description of private standard (int'l scheme/ nat'l scheme/ individ'l firm scheme)
24	India – 6	09041200, 09109100, 09092000	Spices powders and Spice Mixes (Masalas); integrated spices	-	Private traders	ISO 22000, HACCP/ EIA, Spices Board/ -
25	India – 7	0302 33 00, 03 03 32 00	Frozen Skipjack Tuna Whole round, Frozen Yellowfin Tuna Guttled	Tunisia, Turkey	Retailer	-/ - / Test results on analysis of Microbiological, Chemical or Honey Comb issued by accredited Laboratories are often required
26	Japan	No significant effect of private SPS standards				
27	New Zealand	07 03 10 01 00	Onions (<i>Allium cepa</i>) – raw	European Union (Belgium, Germany, United Kingdom)	Retailers	Good Agricultural Practice (GAP); GlobalGAP/ New Zealand GAP (based on: GAP, HACCP (Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points) and the ISO 9002 quality management system.)/ Individual retailer schemes. For example German supermarket standards for maximum residue levels (MRLs).
28	Pakistan -1	Onion 0712. 2000	Raw	Kuwait, Malaysia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, UAE	Retailers, Chain stores like Metro, Makro, Wal-Mart, Tesco, etc	GlobalGAP, ISO 22000:2005/ BRC / -
29	Pakistan – 2	Potato 0710. 1000	Raw	Kuwait, Malaysia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, UAE	Retailers, Chain stores like Metro, Makro, Wal-Mart, Tesco, etc	GlobalGAP, ISO 22000:2005/ BRC / -
30	Pakistan – 3	Dates 0804. 1010	Raw	France, Germany, India, Sri Lanka, UAE, UK	Retailers, Chain stores like Metro, Makro, Wal-Mart, Tesco, etc	GlobalGAP, ISO 22000:2005/ BRC / -
31	Pakistan – 4	Mango 0804. 5020	Raw	Afghanistan, Bahrain, Belarus, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Iran, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mauritius, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Philippine, Qatar, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, UAE, UK, and Ukraine	Retailers, Chain stores like Metro, Makro, Wal-Mart, Tesco, etc	GlobalGAP, ISO 22000:2005/ BRC / -

		1a. HS number	1b. Full description	2. Main export market	3. Entity imposing the private standard	5. Description of private standard (int'l scheme/ nat'l scheme/ indiv'l firm scheme)
32	Pakistan – 5	Mandarin (Kinnow) 0805. 2010	Raw	Afghanistan, Bahrain, Belarus, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Iran, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mauritius, Netherlands, Norway, Oman Philippine, Qatar, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, UAE, UK, and Ukraine	Retailers like Metro, Makro, Wal-Mart, Tesco, etc	GlobalGAP, ISO 22000:2005/ BRC / -
33	Pakistan -6	0805.2010, 0804.5020, 0804.1010, 0710.1000 0712.2000, 07.08, 07.09	Kinnow, mango, dates, potato, onion and other vegetables	Afghanistan, Bahrain, Belarus, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Iran, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mauritius, Netherlands, Norway, Oman Philippine, Qatar, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, UAE, UK, and Ukraine	Retailers like Metro, Makro, Wall mart, Tesco, etc	GlobalGAP, ISO 22000:2005/ BRC / -

		1a. HS number	1b. Full description	2. Main export market	3. Entity imposing the private standard	5. Description of private standard (int'l scheme/ nat'l scheme/ indivd'l firm scheme)
34	Paraguay	1202.20.90 (Groundnuts Shelled, Common Grain); 1201.00.90 (Soybean seeds); 1701.10.00 (Soybean Oil, Crude); 15.07.90.00 (Soybean Oil, refined); 1204.40.90 (Sesame Seeds); 5201.00.20 (Cotton, Ginned); 5203.00.00 (Cotton Carded or Combed); 1701.11.00 (Sugar, Raw); 1701.99.00 (Sugar, Refined)	Sesame seeds (organic); groundnut seeds (organic); cotton fibre (organic); organic sugar; soybean seeds, soybean oil	Chiefly Japan, EU, and USA	Company/private trader	ISO 22.000, adjustment in process; European ecosocial standards (for sesame and soybeans), SA 8000, social accountability; ANEC 41 and 71, commercial quality; FOSFA 51, commercial quality/ - / Some firms apply certification
35	South Africa	All fruit (stone, pome, table grapes)	-	Primarily EU (particularly UK and the Netherlands/ Germany/ plus other) and non-EU European countries, including Norway, Switzerland, Russia/ other; Middle and Far East countries/ Asian and African countries. Smaller volumes to special export markets requiring pest-risk assessment and specific phytosanitary protocols to gain market access, i.e. USA; Israel and	All major and medium size retailers, mainly in the UK and other EU countries, including service providers to retailers i.e. Importers. More recently Walmart, a retailer in the USA.	GlobalGAP; BRC (renamed Global Standard for Food Safety); SQF; ISO 22000; HACCP; ETI (Sedex); BSCI; SA 8000; Fairtrade; FLOCERT/ other; Tesco Nature's Choice; Field to Fork – (UK retailer schemes); Fruitnet – (Belgium retailer scheme), applied internationally in a number of countries./ LEAF (UK); Bench-marked GlobalGAP standards ie. ChileGAP; KenyaGAP; SwissGAP; NZ GAP; Assured Produce (UK); QS (Germany) / Fruitnet; Tesco Nature's Choice; Field to Fork; Multiple private standard retailer/ company chemical/ residue-reduction schemes

		1a. HS number	1b. Full description	2. Main export market	3. Entity imposing the private standard	5. Description of private standard (int'l scheme/ nat'l scheme/ individ'l firm scheme)
				China for table grapes; USA for stone and pome fruit (excluding apricots) and Chinese Taipei for apples.		
36	Thailand	Fresh poultry meat 0207, Fully cooked poultry products 1602 (Poultry meat = chicken and duck)	Frozen seafood and value added seafood, Ready to cook and Ready to eat	Australia, Japan, USA	Retailers/Companies, Importers, Traders	-/ -/ -
37	Tunisia	Fresh or chilled fish 03 02 Frozen fish 03 03 Fish fillets 03 04 Live bivalve molluscs 03 07	In the case of fisheries products, chilled or frozen or processed; in the case of live bivalve molluscs, live.	Cyprus, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Spain	The European Commission	Collective international schemes (some schemes are applied in a number of countries)/ - / -
38	United States	Beef (all) and processed poultry meat.	-	EU, Japan, Mexico, and USA	-	For beef: Individual firm scheme standards that required the removal of Specified Risk Materials (SRM); prohibition on the use of nonambulatory cattle; and separate equipment for removal of SRM vs. edible tissue. For poultry: Processing temperatures (development of an international standard (70° C for 3.5 sec) to inactivate the AI virus; on-farm biosecurity standards; These private standards pre-dated certain National and OIE Terrestrial Code specifications.
39	Uruguay – 1	Fresh, chilled or frozen meat 0201.10, 0201.20, 0201.30, 0202.10, 0202.30	Meat of bovine animals, fresh, chilled or frozen, boneless or with bone in	A number of beef-importing countries	Retailers, companies, private traders	Yes/ Yes / Yes

		1a. HS number	1b. Full description	2. Main export market	3. Entity imposing the private standard	5. Description of private standard (int'l scheme/ nat'l scheme/ indiv'l firm scheme)
40	Uruguay – 2	Citrus Fruit Fresh Lemons Citrus Limon 0805500000 ; Citrus Fruit Fresh Oranges 0805100000; Citrus Fruit fresh Mandarins 0805200000 ; Citrus Fruit Fresh Grapefruit 0805400000; Cranberries: 0810400000 (Fresh Blueberries); Fresh Apples 0808100000; Fresh Pears 0808201000; Fresh Peaches 0809301000; Fresh Grapes 0806100000	Fresh fruit, packed in boxes or bins; waxed/disinfected.	European Union (main destinations Netherlands, Germany, Spain, United Kingdom, Portugal, Italy), other European countries, United States, Russian Federation, Canada, Asian markets (mainly Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and China) and countries of our own region (mainly Brazil). In 2008 these destinations accounted for over 90% of export volume.	Mainly retailers and their supplier companies.	GLOBALGAP/ BRC, Fair Trade, SA8000, USAGAP/ A number of companies apply the Tesco Nature's Choice, Marks & Spencer or Carrefour Qualité Filiere protocols