RESTRICTED

G/SPS/R/121

31 July 2026

(26-5506) Page: 1/58

**Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures**

# SUMMARY OF THE MEETING OF 24-26 JUNE 2026

INTERIM CHAIRPERSON: MS. CECILIA RISOLO (ARGENTINA)

NOTE BY THE SECRETARIAT[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 and obligations under the WTO.

## 1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1.1. The Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the Committee) held its 95th regular meeting on 24-26 June 2026. The meeting was held in hybrid format, with many delegates attending in person and others joining via a virtual platform. The proposed agenda for the meeting (WTO/AIR/SPS/57) was adopted with amendments.

1.2. The Secretariat reminded the Committee that delegates wishing to be added to its e-mail distribution list needed to register on E-Delegate. Members were also reminded that they could use eAgenda[2] to submit agenda items, support specific trade concerns (STCs) and other agenda items, and upload statements, as well as circulate statements as GEN documents. Only oral interventions made during the meeting would be reflected in the summary report.

## 2 ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON

2.1. The Chairperson reminded the Committee that, according to the Rules of Procedure, the term of office of the Committee Chairperson finished with the conclusion of the first meeting of every year. However, the Chairperson of the CTG had not yet concluded consultations on chairpersons for the CTG subsidiary bodies under the Guidelines for Appointment of Officers to WTO bodies (WT/L/31). Ms Maria Cosme, of France, former Chairperson of the Committee, had left Geneva and was unavailable to chair the June 2026 meeting. Ms Cecilia Risolo, of Argentina, had been appointed as interim Chairperson through a written procedure until a new Chairperson could be elected. The Committee agreed to elect its next Chairperson through a written procedure before the November 2026 meeting.

## 3 INFORMATION SHARING

### 3.1 Information from Members on relevant activities

#### 3.1.1 Ukraine - Measures taken to strengthen Ukraine's SPS control system and promote safe trade

3.1. Ukraine informed Members about its continued efforts to strengthen its SPS control system under exceptionally difficult circumstances resulting from the Russian Federation's aggression against Ukraine. In the area of animal health, Ukraine had undertaken a major reform with the entry into force of a new Law on Veterinary Medicine and Animal Welfare to strengthen disease prevention and early warning systems, modernize official controls and outbreak response mechanisms, introduce higher animal welfare standards, and establish stricter controls on the use of antimicrobials. In the phytosanitary area, Ukraine was working on a comprehensive modernization of its phytosanitary system. A new law on plant protection had been adopted, introducing risk-based controls and mandatory registration of professional operators, strengthening traceability requirements, expanding the use of plant passports, digitalization of procedures and registers, and bringing closer alignment with European approaches to the sustainable use of plant protection products. In the area of food safety, digitalization remained a key priority. Ukraine had adopted the regulatory framework necessary for the launch of the Unified State Electronic System for Food Safety and Consumer Protection (eFood) to digitalize operations between businesses and competent authorities, support electronic registration procedures, provide operators access to inspection and audit histories of Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP), improve risk-based planning of official controls, and strengthen traceability. Ukraine further informed the Committee about the harmonization of its SPS legislation, official control systems, and laboratory procedures with European requirements.

3.2. Having highlighted throughout its intervention the role of international cooperation to support its various efforts and other sector-specific reforms, Ukraine concluded that these had helped preserve functioning institutions, including laboratory networks and control systems. Ukraine was maintaining effective oversight of animal health, plant health, and food safety despite extraordinary

[2] eAgenda is being increasingly used. An overwhelming majority of Members making interventions in the meeting uploaded their statements in eAgenda prior to or during the meeting.

challenges given the Russian Federation's aggression, and the continued international trade in Ukrainian agricultural products provided evidence of the resilience and reliability of its SPS system.

3.3. Canada, the European Union, Australia, the United Kingdom, Japan, Norway, Switzerland, and New Zealand expressed their appreciation for Ukraine's resilience and efforts to report to the Committee and strengthen its SPS regime under extraordinary wartime conditions. The European Union welcomed reports on international cooperation and related tangible improvements in various agri-food sectors. Australia and Japan commended Ukraine for advancing digitalization of its SPS systems. Members strongly condemned the Russian Federation's illegal and unprovoked military actions in Ukraine and called on the Russian Federation to respect its obligations under international law and cease military operations in Ukraine. Several Members also noted the invasion was exacerbating food security issues.

3.4. The Russian Federation responded that the Committee should refrain from discussing issues not within its mandate and was of the view that certain delegations attempted to politicize the Committee. In its view, claims that the situation in Ukraine contributed to the global food crisis were ridiculous, given other systemic factors, such as rising interest rates and currency depreciation in developing countries; booming commodity prices; bad weather conditions in the territory of certain agricultural exporters; green protectionism; forced introduction of biofuel technologies; and economic sanctions imposed by several WTO Members. According to the Russian Federation, Ukraine's role as Europe's breadbasket was also blown out of proportion as it accounted for a small portion of wheat exports, and Ukraine's grain exports were in fact continuing. Meanwhile, the Russian Federation further recommended radioactive testing on imported grains from Ukraine to ensure consumption safety, as some crops and corn had been cultivated and harvested for many years in the Chernobyl exclusion zone. In its statement, the Russian Federation referred to official information from the Ukrainian authorities on the industrial crop production on radiation-contaminated lands.

### 3.1.2 Japan - Update on the safety of Japanese food products regarding radioactive materials (G/SPS/GEN/1233/Rev.9)

3.5. Referring to its communication in G/SPS/GEN/1233/Rev.9, Japan underscored the robustness of its food monitoring and control systems, as well as the confidence in the safety of the food supply as assessed by the joint centre of FAO and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Japan recalled that fifteen years had passed since the Great East Japan Earthquake and the subsequent nuclear power station accident, and that no cases of exceeding maximum limits (MLs) had been detected since 2014 in countries that maintained restrictions. Japan was of the view that the import restrictions still maintained by five Members lacked scientific basis and were inconsistent with the SPS Agreement and urged those Members to lift the measures immediately. Import restriction measures taken after the discharge of water treated by the Advanced Liquid Processing System (ALPS) into the sea were addressed under STC ID 574).

3.6. Korea thanked Japan for sharing information on the current food safety management status and made reference to its statements at previous Committee meetings.

### 3.1.3 Tanzania - Recent developments in the implementation of SPS measures for food safety

3.7. Tanzania shared information on developments in the implementation of SPS measures for food safety. Tanzania had recently completed a comprehensive assessment of its food safety system using the FAO/WHO food control system assessment tool. The assessment had been conducted as part of a project to strengthen food safety standards for trade and public health promotion and had provided a qualitative baseline to help guide reforms and prioritize SPS-related investments.

## 3.2 Information from Codex, IPPC and WOAH on relevant activities

### 3.2.1 WOAH (G/SPS/GEN/2418)

3.8. WOAH reported on the 93rd General Session of its World Assembly of Delegates held in May 2026, which had included a forum on Investing in Animal Health to Secure Everyone's Future and launched the 2026 WOAH report on the State of the World's Animal Health, providing an overview

of the animal health landscape and highlighting the importance of this area as a strategic investment. WOAH detailed some of its standard setting activities, including revised provisions in the Terrestrial Code on trade measures, border inspections, animal welfare, and a new chapter on biosecurity. Numerous aquatic standards were also adapted to strengthen coherence and clarity. Finally, WOAH reported about its 8th Strategic Plan for 2027-2031, and a new public-private platform to strengthen animal disease prevention, promote transparency, consistency, and mutual recognition of veterinary certification.

### 3.2.2 IPPC (G/SPS/GEN/2420)

3.9. The IPPC highlighted key points from the 20th session of its Commission on Phytosanitary Measures held in March 2026, noting significant progress on digitalization and the IPPC ePhyto Solution as well as advances in the work of its Standards Committee. The IPPC referred to new guidance that was being developed on risk-based inspection for imported consignments and on audit of phytosanitary context. In addition, new e-learning courses were being developed on the IPPC ePhyto Solution and other priority topics. Finally, the IPPC announced its upcoming initiative to hold a side event to introduce its Plant Health Campus during the November 2026 SPS Committee week.

### 3.2.3 Codex (G/SPS/GEN/2424)

3.10. Codex highlighted ongoing work from four of its committees. The Codex Committee on Fats and Oils had worked on a standard for microbial omega-3 oils, considered amendments to the "Code of Practice for the Storage and Transport of Edible Fats and Oils in Bulk", and discussed a proposal to modify the current entry for ethanol in the "List of Acceptable Previous Cargoes". Its Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling had continued its systematic review and update of Codex reference methods, and the Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods had adopted the first maximum residue limits (MRLs) for camelids and the new "action levels" concept to address very low levels of unexpected veterinary drug residues in food resulting from cross-contamination in feed, marking an important step toward expanding Codex coverage to emerging food safety issues in trade. The Codex Committee on Food Additives had advanced its work on forward-looking areas, in particular to develop possible guidance for the safety assessment of cell culture media components used in the production of cell-based foods. Finally, on monitoring, Codex had continued to strengthen collaboration with the Committee, and had contributed to the SPS Transparency Working Group, together with the IPPC and WOAH.

## 4 CROSS—CUTTING ISSUES

### 4.1 MC 14 Decision on Enhancing the Precise, Effective and Operational Implementation of Special and Differential Treatment Provisions of the SPS and TBT Agreements (WT/MIN(26)/37)

### 4.1.1 Update from the Chairperson

4.1. The Chairperson drew the Committee's attention to the MC14 Ministerial Decision on Enhancing the Precise, Effective and Operational Implementation of Special and Differential Treatment Provisions of the SPS and TBT Agreements, contained in document WT/MIN(26)/37 (MC14 S&DT Decision). The MC14 S&DT Decision indicated that the Committee on Trade and Development in Special Session (CTD-SS) had fulfilled its commitment to undertake the work on SPS and TBT as instructed by Ministers at MC13 in document WT/MIN(24)/36 and WT/L/1191, and acknowledged the importance of cross-collaboration between the CTD-SS and the SPS and TBT Committees. The MC14 S&DT Decision mentioned that the SPS and TBT Committees may continue discussions on improving implementation of the provisions of the SPS and TBT Agreements, including those related to special and differential treatment, based on proposals from Members.

### 4.1.2 Information from Members

4.2. No Member provided any information under this agenda item. Later in the meeting, Namibia, on behalf of the G-90 made a related intervention under agenda item 6.5 on special and differential treatment and Burkina Faso, on behalf of WAEMU members, made a related intervention under agenda item 7 on technical assistance and cooperation.

### 4.2 Upcoming thematic sessions

4.3. The Chairperson reminded the Committee of the scheduled thematic sessions:

a. November 2026 – thematic session on promoting transparency in sampling, testing, and analytic methods used to determine compliance with SPS measures, based on a proposal from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, Ecuador, New Zealand, and the United States (G/SPS/GEN/2387/Rev.1) – Draft programme circulated as G/SPS/GEN/2416);

b. November 2026 – thematic session on hitchhiker pests in international trade, based on a proposal by Australia and Canada (G/SPS/GEN/2389) – Draft programme circulated as G/SPS/GEN/2426; and

c. March 2027 – thematic session on artificial intelligence and emerging technologies in the SPS area, based on a proposal from Saudi Arabia (G/SPS/GEN/2381).

4.4. No Member took the floor under this agenda item.

## 5 SPECIFIC TRADE CONCERNS

5.1. Before the adoption of the agenda, and thanking both Canada and the European Union for their bilateral engagement, China withdrew one new STC: Canada's proposal to transfer the maximum levels for ethyl carbamate in alcoholic beverages to the list of contaminants and other adulterating substances in foods; and one previously raised STC: EU notifications of matrine and oxymatrine in honey (ID 546). These STCs had been included in the annotated draft agenda circulated in document WTO/AIR/SPS/57. In addition, Malaysia requested the inclusion of two new STCs: Thailand's protracted ban on imports of five species of shrimp[3]; and Viet Nam's delay in approval and listing of establishments for the export of Poultry Products, Pasteurised Eggs, Animal Feed (Feather Meal), and Bird's Nests. Australia also requested the inclusion of a new STC: UK's undue delay in approving Australia's hormone growth promotant (HGP)-free assurance scheme.

### 5.1 New issues

#### 5.1.1 EU regulation on mineral oil aromatic hydrocarbons in various plant products (ID 632) - Concerns of Sri Lanka

5.2. Sri Lanka referred to document G/SPS/GEN/2421 and raised a new concern regarding EU proposed maximum limits (MLs) for mineral oil aromatic hydrocarbons (MOAH) in various plant products, thanking the European Union for detailed responses provided to the questions raised. While recognizing the EU objective of protecting human health and food safety, Sri Lanka expressed concerns about the considerable implementation burden that the proposed requirements could impose on smaller developing country exporters, in particular small and medium enterprises (SMEs), as exporters and competent authorities would be required to strengthen sampling, testing, monitoring, and certification capacities, the costs of which were likely to be substantial. Sri Lanka requested the European Union to consider extending the implementation timeline by an additional three years, beyond 2030, to allow time to develop the necessary technical capacity, testing infrastructure, and compliance system. Sri Lanka would welcome engagement with the European Union on technical assistance and capacity building, including with respect to laboratory infrastructure, analytical methods, sampling procedures, testing, accreditation, and exporter awareness. Sri Lanka stressed the importance of addressing this matter within Codex, as detailed technical discussion was needed, in particular concerning sampling and testing standards.

5.3. Referring to the information shared in response to comments on notification G/SPS/N/EU/930, the European Union underscored the genotoxicity of some MOAH in food. The European Union indicated that most contamination with MOAH could be avoided by following good practices at all stages of production. Since 2022, whenever MOAH were detected in food, the EU member States had taken enforcement action under the EU General Food Law. The EU Commission had started discussions on setting MLs for MOAH in food, following the 2023 updated risk assessment by the

[3] After the meeting, this concern was merged with STC ID 607: Thailand's ban on imports of aquaculture shrimp - Concerns of India.

European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) confirming the health risks related to MOAH in food. The European Union emphasized that comments from stakeholders and third countries had been considered during these discussions and that the question of developing Codex standards needed to be discussed within Codex. The European Union further emphasized communication efforts, including AGRINFO seminars and a dedicated website, as well as opportunities for capacity building. Finally, the European Union reported that MLs for most commodities were foreseen to become applicable on 1 January 2027, while deferred application dates were foreseen for other commodities. Through the establishment of temporary higher MLs and deferred application dates for MLs in certain foods, concerned food sectors would be granted more time to adapt their production process and implement mitigation measures. In addition to these transitory measures, the scope of the products had been selected to attain the objective of health protection while minimizing the impact on trade.

### 5.1.2 Korea's pesticide MRL for imidacloprid in cabbage (ID 633) - Concerns of China

5.4. China expressed concerns with the revised MRL for imidacloprid in cabbage from 0.5 mg/kg to 0.05 mg/kg due to take effect in October 2026, noting the new limit was significantly more stringent than the relevant Codex standard. China stated that Korea had not sufficiently explained the scientific basis for deviating from the international standard and had not made the risk assessment available. According to China, the measure was not consistent with the SPS Agreement, including provisions concerning the use of international standards, risk assessment, transparency, and the avoidance of unnecessary restrictions to trade. China suggested that Korea align to the relevant Codex international standard and, otherwise, requested that Korea provide the complete risk assessment report and scientific basis for its MRL revision. Finally, China suggested that Korea establish or clarify the application and assessment mechanism for import tolerances and provide reasonable arrangements for Chinese cabbage to maintain the stability of China-Korea agricultural trade.

5.5. Korea had revised the MRL for imidacloprid in cabbage from 0.5 mg/kg to 0.05 mg/kg and had newly established an MRL of 1.0 mg/kg for Brussels sprouts in August 2025. The revised MRL was established through scientific risk assessment, based on pesticide residue test results, pesticide registration information, and good agricultural practices (GAP). Korea further noted that the revision had been circulated in advance, namely, in January 2025 (G/SPS/N/KOR/816). Korea had given due consideration to China's request to extend the implementation date for the revised MRL for cabbage and had adjusted the implementation date from 27 October 2025 to 1 October 2026. Korea operated an import tolerance system, which allowed individual MRLs to be established for imported agricultural products upon application from an exporting country when there was either no domestic MRL or a lower domestic MRL. If China submitted such an application for imidacloprid in cabbage with scientific evidence, Korea would review it promptly.

### 5.1.3 EU MRL for pesticides in spices (ID 634) - Concerns of India

5.6. India highlighted the challenges faced by exporters of dried spice products, as the current approach to ensure food safety through the establishment and enforcement of pesticide MRLs did not appear to fully account for scientifically established dehydration or processing concentration factors. Noting that spices were predominantly traded and consumed in dried form, India stated that residues might become concentrated during processing without a corresponding increase in consumer exposure or health risk, and MRLs established for fresh commodities might not accurately reflect residue levels in the dried products. India encouraged the European Union to consider appropriate processing and dehydration factors to ensure a more risk-based and proportionate assessment of compliance. India also noted the importance of taking into account consumption patterns and dietary exposure when establishing MRLs and of establishing adequate transition periods, especially for seasonal agricultural products with extended storage and export cycles. India encouraged the European Union to continue efforts towards harmonization with relevant international standards, including Codex standards, to enhance predictability, reduce regulatory complexity, and facilitate safe and efficient trade.

5.7. While expressing appreciation for the continued EU engagement and support on SPS matters and acknowledging EU efforts to promote sustainable agriculture and food systems, Tanzania expressed concerns about certain EU measures under discussion as part of the EU Omnibus package and proposals related to pesticide MRLs, noting that implementation could have unintended consequences for developing Members whose agricultural sector was predominantly driven by smallholder farmers and SMEs. In particular, Tanzania expressed concerns about stringent MRL

requirements, which could increase the risk of market exclusion for producers in developing Members and compliance costs associated with adapting production systems, monitoring, certification, testing, and verification. Tanzania requested the European Union to carefully consider potential trade and development implications and encouraged the European Union to continue pursuing science- and risk-based approaches, give due consideration to international standards, provide appropriate transition periods, technical support and capacity building, and recognize equivalent systems.

5.8. In responding, the European Union indicated that it would provide information relevant to Tanzania's comments on pesticide-related issues under its Omnibus proposal under STC ID 621. Turning to India's concern, the European Union expressed appreciation for clarifications India had provided ahead of this meeting and pointed to the "Information note on Article 20 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 as regards processing factors, processed and composite food and feed", which included calculation examples and additional links to relevant information. The European Union clarified that, as a basic rule, EU MRLs for pesticides were set for raw agricultural commodities. While only the requirements in Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 were legally binding, the EU pesticides database also included some dried commodities for which MRLs were set, for example spices. For mixtures of spices, the ingredients should be considered individually when checking compliance with MRLs. The European Union remained available for further bilateral exchanges.

### 5.1.4 Korea's delays in market access approval for poultry meat and products (ID 635) - Concerns of Ukraine

5.9. Ukraine raised concerns regarding continued delays in the procedures related to the approval of imports of poultry meat and poultry products. In 2016, Ukraine had provided responses to the relevant questionnaire to the Korean Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs and, in 2017, it had provided a completed questionnaire to the Korean Ministry of Food and Drug Safety. In 2018-2023, Ukraine had responded to various additional requests concerning sanitary controls, the poultry sector, and the relevant legislative framework, and the process had also included inspection visits. Following these assessments, Ukraine had implemented corrective actions and had provided relevant materials in 2023, but Ukraine had not received any indication of the expected timeline for the completion of the import risk assessment. Ukraine requested Korea to proceed with the finalization of the review of the materials already submitted, and remained open for on-site or remote audits, technical consultations, and additional verification measures. Acknowledging recent intensification of engagement with Korea regarding other commodities, including in the margins of the WOAH General Session in May 2026, Ukraine invited Korea to intensify communication via SPS enquiry points.

5.10. Korea responded that it was conducting import risk assessments in accordance with established rules and procedures under the SPS Agreement, and that the relevant risk assessment report was being prepared following the on-site inspection. Korea had exchanged views with Ukraine on the progress of the procedures and next steps in the margins of the WOAH General Session in May 2026. Korea was not intentionally delaying import approval procedures.

### 5.1.5 EU undue delays in granting market access to gelatin-based products (ID 636) - Concerns of Peru

5.11. Peru noted the process to grant market access to gelatin-based products had begun in 2022, when Peru had presented all required information for evaluation. Subsequently, in November 2024, the European Union had informed Peru that it was still analysing the information received. In December 2025, the European Union had further informed Peru that the technical evaluation had been successfully concluded and that the process had reached the administrative phase aimed at updating the relevant regulation to include Peru in the list of authorized third countries. However, in May 2026, the European Union had decided to change its approach and Peru would no longer be included in the list of authorized third countries. To date, no concrete deadlines had been set out for the adoption of this new approach, nor had the scope of the proposed modification been clearly specified. Emphasizing that administrative procedures needed to be conducted in a transparent and predictable manner and within reasonable timeframes, Peru requested that the European Union provide updated information on the status of the process for granting market access, specify the scope of the products that would be covered by the modification announced in May 2026, and provide information on the estimated timeline for its adoption and implementation.

5.12. The European Union responded that it was in the process of amending Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/2292 as regards the requirements for the entry into the European Union of certain composite products and highly refined products. The amendment would allow third countries authorized to export meat products or dairy products or egg products or fishery products to the European Union to export also shelf-stable composite products containing gelatin, collagen, or highly refined products. The European Union further explained that a third country authorized to export gelatin, collagen, or highly refined products to the European Union might also export shelf-stable composite products if the only processed products of animal origin contained in the composite products were gelatin, collagen, or highly refined products for which imports from the third country were authorized. The European Union would notify the proposal to the WTO in due course and looked forward to continuing bilateral discussions with Peru.

### 5.1.6 Malaysia's suspension of shrimp imports (ID 637) - Concerns of Thailand

5.13. Thailand raised concerns regarding Malaysia's unjustified emergency suspension of shrimp imports from Thailand. Thailand reported that, in May 2026 Malaysia had announced a temporary suspension of imports of three shrimp species, and the measure had entered into force three days thereafter, causing immediate major trade disruption and significant economic losses. Thailand had engaged with Malaysia to seek a scientific rationale for the measure and had requested technical consultations to resolve this trade issue. However, to date, Malaysia has neither provided any explanation nor supporting evidence and had not responded to Thailand's request. Instead, Malaysia had required Thailand to complete a questionnaire, which Thailand had provided. Thailand urged Malaysia to accept its request for technical consultations at the earliest opportunity and resume imports of Thai shrimps without undue delays.

5.14. Malaysia took note of the concerns raised, which were being handled by the competent authorities.

### 5.1.7 Indonesia's import restrictions due to African swine fever (ID 638) - Concerns of the European Union

5.15. The European Union highlighted serious concerns regarding the countrywide import ban imposed by Indonesia on pork products from an EU member State that had reported outbreaks of African swine fever (ASF) in wild boar. The countrywide ban was imposed despite the implementation of disease management measures in the European Union. Indonesia did not currently recognize the ASF-stringent regionalization measures implemented in the European Union. These EU control and monitoring measures were fully in line with the international standards and were strictly applied, guaranteeing that safe trade of pork continued to take place. The European Union urged Indonesia to lift the unjustified countrywide ban without further delay and recognize the ASF-regionalization measures at EU level. The European Union further recalled that, under their bilateral Free Trade Agreement, they had agreed to recognize the concept of regionalization and respect the SPS Agreement.

5.16. Indonesia responded that ASF was a highly contagious viral disease affecting domestic and wild pigs, with potentially devastating economic consequences. Indonesia pointed to the WOAH ASF situation report of April 2026, which indicated that several EU member States had continued to report ASF events, and Indonesia had temporarily suspended the issuance of import recommendations for pork products from Spain. Having recalled relevant domestic regulations, Indonesia emphasized that its measures were based on official notifications and scientific information provided by WOAH and relevant veterinary authorities, and its measures were consistent with the SPS Agreement. Indonesia would continue to monitor the global ASF situation and remained committed to constructive engagement with the European Union.

### 5.1.8 Thailand's protracted ban on imports of five species of shrimp – Concerns of Malaysia[4]

5.17. Malaysia raised concerns regarding Thailand's ban on imports of five species of shrimp applied since 2017, which was discriminatory, more trade restrictive than necessary, and not in line with the SPS Agreement and WOAH standards. Malaysia was willing to find a mutually acceptable solution

[4] After the meeting, this concern was merged with STC ID 607: Thailand's ban on imports of aquaculture shrimp - Concerns of India.

and regretted that, despite bilateral efforts to resolve the issue, it had not received any positive response from Thailand.

5.18. Thailand informed Members that the temporary suspension of shrimp imports from Malaysia had been introduced in 2017 following the occurrence of the infectious myonecrosis virus in Malaysia, where Thailand was free from the virus. In 2018, Thailand had sent a questionnaire to Malaysia and only three years later had Malaysia submitted the questionnaire. In 2022-2025, there had been periodic communication in an effort to finalize the complete questionnaire. In March 2026, Thailand had accepted the completed questionnaire, the next step being an on-site evaluation. Thailand encouraged the competent authorities of both Members to identify dates for the on-site evaluation at the earliest opportunity, and remained committed to working constructively with Malaysia through bilateral channels and existing cooperation mechanisms.

### 5.1.9 Viet Nam's delay in approval and listing of establishments for the export of Poultry Products, Pasteurised Eggs, Animal Feed (Feather Meal), and Bird's Nests (ID 639) – Concerns of Malaysia

5.19. Raising this concern, Malaysia noted that delays in approval and listing of establishments had been affecting exports to Viet Nam for several key products, such as poultry products, pasteurised eggs, animal feed, and bird's nests, since 2020. Malaysia regretted the significant delays at the border and the lack of clarity of requests for additional information in order to list exporting establishments. Despite readiness to resolve the issue bilaterally, Malaysia had not received definitive responses and the issue remained pending. Taking the suspension of exports of prepackaged food of poultry origin as an example, Malaysia had been informed that licence registration for exports was required. However, Malaysia's understanding was that the products at issue were exempted from registration requirements and Malaysia thus requested Viet Nam to review the suspension. Recalling that SPS measures needed to be science based and not more trade restrictive than necessary, Malaysia requested Viet Nam to be responsive and engage bilaterally.

5.20. Viet Nam took note of the concern and would convey this matter to the competent authorities for prompt review and consideration.

### 5.1.10 UK's undue delay in approving Australia's Hormone Growth Promotant (HGP)-free assurance scheme (ID 640) – Concerns of Australia

5.21. Australia reported that, in October 2025, the United Kingdom had positively assessed Australia's modernized HGP-free assurance scheme for beef. Despite this positive assessment, the United Kingdom had indicated that final approval would not progress due to the ongoing UK-EU SPS alignment negotiations, delays in which limited Australia's beef market access and prevented Australia from utilising the beef quota established under the Australia-UK Free Trade Agreement. Australia advised that the United Kingdom had completed its audit and technical assessment of Australia's proposed assurance system, with positive findings, had assessed Australia's responses to the audit recommendations as satisfactory, and there was no apparent science- or risk-based basis for delaying final approval of the scheme, raising concerns under several SPS Agreement provisions. Australia considered that the continued delay was more trade-restrictive than required to achieve the United Kingdom's appropriate level of sanitary protection, as its own positive technical assessment recognized that Australia's assurance scheme was objectively effective, while being significantly less trade restrictive. Emphasizing that the recognition of Australia's modernized HGP-free assurance system represented a reasonably available alternative measure, Australia welcomed continued engagement with the United Kingdom.

5.22. The United Kingdom noted that it had been advised of Australia's intention to raise this concern just before the meeting and was not in a position to provide a full response. The United Kingdom noted the concern, had been engaging on this matter, and would review Australia's statement at the earliest opportunity and respond accordingly.

## 5.2 Issues previously raised

### 5.2.1 EU MRLs for alpha-cypermethrin, buprofezin, chlorothalonil, chlorpyrifos, chlorpyrifos-methyl, cypermethrin, diflubenzuron, ethoxysulfuron, glufosinate, imazalil, ioxynil, iprodione, mancozeb, molinate, picoxystrobin and tepraloxydim (ID 448 - See also related STCs ID 453, 454, 457, 474, 475, 517) - Concerns of China, the United States, India, Paraguay and Brazil

5.23. China raised concerns about the proposed amendment to Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 notified in G/SPS/N/EU/702 and G/SPS/N/EU/702/Add.1, noting that the revised MRL for cypermethrin in tea, set at 0.05 mg/kg (limit of quantification or LOQ), remained significantly more stringent than Codex standards and those of major Members, and introduced trade-restrictive elements such as dual MRLs, immediate application without transition, and additional compliance obligations. The measure lacked sufficient scientific justification, citing shortcomings in the EFSA assessment (including absence of tea-specific data, overly conservative methodology, lack of validated detection methods, and inappropriate exposure modelling), and was inconsistent with the SPS Agreement principles on scientific basis, harmonization, and transparency. China urged the European Union to suspend the measure, maintain the current MRL, and provide a tea-specific risk assessment while fulfilling transparency obligations.

5.24. The United States reiterated concerns that the European Union's MRL determinations, including G/SPS/N/EU/916, relied on hazard-based cut-off criteria rather than risk-based assessments, leading to default reductions not supported by Codex or EFSA analyses. The United States cited the example of thiophanate-methyl, where EFSA identified data gaps and did not find cherry-specific risks, yet the EU proposed lowering MRLs broadly to the limit of quantification (LOQ) without adequate scientific justification or transition periods, warning that such measures could create unnecessary trade barriers and economic disruption. The United States called for more transparent, science-based approaches and flexible transitional arrangements. The United States submitted its statement in document G/SPS/GEN/2429.

5.25. India stated that EFSA's risk assessments indicated that alpha-cypermethrin did not pose an unacceptable risk to human health when used in line with GAP, which was supported by relevant FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) evaluations. India also indicated that an acceptable daily intake of 0-0.02 mg/kg per body weight per day had been established, and that the recommended MRLs covered a broad range of commodities, aligning with international food safety standards. JMPR had further concluded that theoretical dietary exposure to cypermethrin residues remained well below the acceptable daily intake, indicating a substantial safety margin. Noting that any regulatory decisions should take into account JMPR's comprehensive findings, India requested that the European Union refrain from withdrawing alpha-cypermethrin or further reducing its MRLs without conducting a thorough and transparent risk assessment that reflected these international evaluations.

5.26. Paraguay reiterated concerns that the European Union reduced MRLs to limits of detection without sufficient scientific evidence, contrary to the SPS Agreement, and noted that EU decisions disregarded EFSA conclusions finding substances safe, citing triciclazol as an example. Paraguay questioned the rejection of import tolerances supported by scientific data under Article 2.2 of the SPS Agreement, warned that such approaches undermined the use of essential crop protection tools and food production, and urged the European Union to align with Codex standards and address concerns raised in document G/SPS/GEN/2395, noting that responses provided to date had been insufficient.

5.27. Brazil reiterated concerns about the EU systemic approach to reviewing and non-renewing active substances, leading to reductions in MRLs. Brazil noted the lack of progress despite repeated discussions, and considered that these measures were inconsistent with Articles 2.2, 3.1, and 5.6 of the SPS Agreement and Codex standards. It highlighted disproportionate impacts due to uniform MRL application across differing agricultural conditions and regulatory inconsistencies, such as domestic emergency authorizations, and urged the European Union to ensure science-based justifications, improve transparency, and provide adequate transition periods.

5.28. Ecuador reiterated concerns that the EU reductions in MRLs, including setting limits at detection levels and non-renewal of substances such as chlorothalonil, lacked sufficient scientific

justification and adversely affected tropical agriculture, particularly banana production, contrary to SPS Agreement requirements. It urged alignment with Codex standards, raised concerns about precautionary approaches in the absence of data and regulatory inconsistencies linked to emergency authorizations, and requested responses to issues raised in document G/SPS/GEN/2395, further information on alternative substances and transition support. Ecuador emphasized the need for transparency, risk-based decision-making, and technical assistance tailored to developing countries.

5.29. Guatemala reiterated its position expressed in previous meetings, supported the concern, and emphasized the need for technical, scientific, and transparent criteria in setting pesticide MRLs, requesting clear and substantive responses to issues raised jointly with other Members. Guatemala noted that information provided by the European Union through websites or guidance documents had not adequately addressed these concerns.

5.30. Panama associated itself with concerns expressed by other Members and reiterated its previous points, emphasizing that SPS measures should be based on scientific principles, take into account relevant international standards, and consider potential impacts on producers and exporters in developing countries. It further referred to its full statement uploaded to eAgenda.

5.31. Canada supported this concern about the trade implications of the EU regulatory approach to residues of plant protection products, emphasizing the need for science- and risk-based frameworks when setting MRLs, guided by internationally agreed methodologies. Canada encouraged the European Union to align its limits with Codex standards or to maintain existing MRLs for substances where no unacceptable dietary risk had been identified, noting that this would safeguard public health without unnecessarily disrupting trade.

5.32. Uruguay reiterated concerns regarding the EU reduction of MRLs for certain active substances, particularly setting limits at detection levels without conclusive risk assessment, recalling obligations under Articles 2.2 and 5 of the SPS Agreement and the relevance of Codex standards to ensure predictability and avoid unnecessary trade restrictions. It underscored technical challenges linked to proposed differentiated MRLs for alpha-cypermethrin and cypermethrin, including analytical limitations and the need for method validation, and requested adequate transition periods, clarification on analytical methods, and guidance on compliance verification.

5.33. Argentina supported the concern, noting it had been raised 22 times since 2018, and emphasized that the EU approach to lowering MRLs without risk assessments based on scientific criteria created unjustified trade restrictions and negatively affected agricultural exporters, particularly developing countries. Argentina noted that automatic reductions to detection levels disregarded Codex standards and exposure assessments, that import tolerances imposed disproportionate burdens on third countries and reflected regulatory inconsistencies with domestic emergency authorizations. Argentina urged the European Union to align its measures with the SPS Agreement and international standards.

5.34. Colombia supported and co-sponsored the concern, noting the withdrawal of notification G/SPS/N/EU/788 on dithiocarbamates and stressing that future EU measures should rely on scientifically validated analytical methods capable of distinguishing between residues from active substances and naturally occurring compounds. It requested detailed information on residue definitions, analytical methods, limits of determination, monitoring data, exposure and risk assessments, and treatment of Codex limits and import tolerances, as well as clarification on Regulation (EU) 2025/1163 and related procedures, and called for adequate transition periods while expressing willingness to engage in technical dialogue to avoid unnecessary trade barriers in line with the SPS Agreement.

5.35. Kenya expressed support for the concern and urged the European Union to align its MRL determination processes with internationally recognized risk-based approaches, noting that hazard-based cut-off criteria not grounded in Codex or EFSA risk assessments created unnecessary trade barriers. It highlighted the negative impact on key export crops and livelihoods, particularly for vulnerable groups dependent on agriculture, and called for the use of internationally agreed risk assessment methodologies in policy decisions.

5.36. The European Union noted that concerns on its MRL policies had been raised repeatedly, reiterated that its previous explanations remained valid, and highlighted continued engagement

through dedicated communications and meetings. It reported recent regulatory developments, including the adoption process for revised cypermethrin MRLs under Regulation (EC) No 396/2005, transitional provisions for products already on the market, and updates on draft regulations lowering MRLs for carbendazim, thiophanate-methyl and benomyl with deferred implementation, as well as progress on imazalil MRL adjustments, including measures voted in May 2026 and notification G/SPS/N/EU/943.The European Union was open to further discussions to facilitate trade.

### 5.2.2 EU proposal to eliminate pesticide import tolerances (ID 621) - Concerns of Argentina, Canada, Brazil, Australia, the United States and Paraguay

5.37. Argentina reiterated concern about the EU proposal of December 2025 under the Omnibus legislation to eliminate import tolerances and prohibit residues of non-authorized substances even where no consumer risk existed, arguing that such measures were inconsistent with the SPS Agreement, particularly Articles 2.2, 2.3, 3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.5 and 5.6, which required scientific basis, risk assessment, and avoidance of unjustified or overly trade-restrictive measures. The approach would create uncertainty across the agri-food value chain and disrupt international trade. Argentina urged the European Union to align its MRL framework with SPS obligations to safeguard predictability while ensuring consumer protection.

5.38. Brazil reiterated serious concerns that the European Union's Omnibus Simplification Package would eliminate import tolerances and establish MRLs at the limit of quantification for certain active substances based on hazard-based criteria rather than scientific risk assessment, contrary to Articles 2.2, 3 and 5 of the WTO SPS Agreement and Codex standards; it argued that the proposal imposed EU production conditions extraterritorially, disregarded differing agricultural realities, created inconsistencies through the continued use of emergency authorizations within the EU, and risked disrupting trade, reducing predictability, and undermining the rules-based trading system, while calling for transparent risk and impact assessments, consideration of international standards, and adequate transition periods.

5.39. Canada reiterated deep concern that the EU proposed reciprocity mechanism under the Food and Feed Omnibus would eliminate MRLs and import tolerances for non-approved pesticides and shift MRLs away from science-based risk assessment toward extraterritorial application of EU production standards. This approach undermined established Codex-based practices, introduced case-by-case processes inconsistent with risk assessment frameworks, failed to account for differing agricultural conditions, and risked creating unnecessary trade barriers and uncertainty. Canada highlighted EU member States' divergent measures and urged the European Union to maintain a science-based, proportionate framework consistent with WTO SPS obligations.

5.40. Australia acknowledged the European Union's Food and Feed Safety Omnibus and welcomed its objectives of streamlining regulation and supporting risk-based approaches, but expressed concern that proposed amendments to Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 could shift MRL setting away from science-based risk assessment toward hazard-based criteria and restrict import tolerances without demonstrated consumer risk, contrary to WTO SPS principles. Australia argued that the European Union should not use MRLs as a tool to address competitiveness concerns, as SPS measures must be scientifically justified, proportionate, and no more trade restrictive than necessary to protect human, animal, or plant health. In Australia's view, applying import tolerances without adequately recognising different agricultural conditions and production practices outside the EU risks arbitrary and unjustifiable discrimination and may be inconsistent with both WTO obligations and the principle of equal treatment under EU law. Applying EU production conditions extraterritorially and maintaining emergency authorizations domestically risked inconsistency and discrimination. Australia requested clarification of the criteria, methodologies, and implementation of the proposal to ensure decisions remained based on objective risk assessment and proportionate to food safety objectives.

5.41. The United States noted the EU proposal to disallow residues of non-approved pesticides on imported products and expressed concern that MRL reductions without completed risk assessments, including those aligned with Codex, could create unnecessary trade restrictions and depart from the scientific basis required under the SPS Agreement. The United States urged the European Union to maintain import tolerances supported by robust risk assessment, ensure any divergences were non-discriminatory and not more trade-restrictive than necessary, and avoid using MRLs policies to advance political and economic objectives unrelated to food safety, particularly ahead of the

completion of ongoing impact assessments, warning of significant potential implications for agricultural trade. The United States submitted its statement in document G/SPS/GEN/2432.

5.42. Paraguay reiterated concerns regarding the EU proposal under notification G/SPS/N/EU/911, arguing that eliminating import tolerances and reducing MRLs to the LOQ based on hazard rather than risk assessment was inconsistent with Articles 2, 3 and 5 of the SPS Agreement and raised issues previously outlined in G/SPS/GEN/2393. Paraguay questioned the scientific basis and non-discriminatory nature of the approach, particularly given continued EU emergency authorizations under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, and warned that the measures could effectively restrict imports despite compliance with Codex standards and GAP, including through expanded criteria in the 8 May 2026 compromise text. 5.42. Paraguay requested clarification on the treatment of third-country conditions, compatibility with Articles 2.3 and 5.5 of the SPS Agreement, and the absence of a proper risk assessment under Article 5.1, while urging the European Union to ensure science-based decisions, complete impact assessments, and alignment with international obligations.

5.43. Japan expressed concern about the withdrawal of import tolerances that had been set based on GAP in third countries or on Codex MRLs, which it viewed as inconsistent with the SPS Agreement. Japan would continue to closely monitor developments on this issue.

5.44. Ecuador expressed concern regarding the EU proposal under notification G/SPS/N/EU/911, particularly the potential elimination of import tolerances, noting that this could negatively affect trade by limiting the ability to set MRLs based on scientific risk assessments. Such mechanisms were essential to ensure consistency with Codex standards and the SPS Agreement. Ecuador warned that default MRLs could be more trade-restrictive than necessary and disproportionately affect developing countries, and urged the European Union to respond to G/SPS/GEN/2393 and preserve risk-based, transparent approaches through continued technical dialogue.

5.45. Panama reiterated its concerns on this issue as expressed in previous interventions, emphasizing that such measures should be grounded in scientific evidence and take into account their potential impacts on developing countries, and indicated that its full statement would be uploaded to eAgenda.

5.46. Reiterating that science-based risk assessment was a cornerstone of the SPS Agreement, India echoed concerns regarding a shift from a risk-based assessment framework to a hazard-based approach. India was of the view that the proposed measure might be more trade-restrictive than necessary to achieve the European Union's appropriate level of protection and could result in unnecessary barriers to international trade. India encouraged the European Union to ensure that any measures adopted were grounded in scientific evidence, proportionate to the identified risks, and implemented in a manner that minimized trade impacts.

5.47. Chinese Taipei expressed concern about the EU approach to lowering MRLs, noting the continued practical need for substances such as thiophanate-methyl, carbendazim, and benomyl for pest control. Chinese Taipei suggested maintaining current standards to avoid unnecessary trade barriers, while urging the European Union to apply science- and risk-based methodologies consistent with its SPS Agreement obligations and continue dialogue.

5.48. Colombia supported and co-sponsored the concern, noting that the EU proposal could revoke MRLs based on Codex or third-country GAP and replace them with limits of quantification without sufficient justification, and stressed that any decisions should rely on complete, transparent, product-specific risk assessments. Colombia highlighted potential impacts on key exports such as bananas, coffee, tropical fruits, cocoa, and flowers, emphasized the need to distinguish hazard identification from risk assessment, and requested detailed information on affected substances, scientific evaluations, treatment of Codex limits, and procedures for import tolerances, along with adequate transition periods and support measures for developing countries.

5.49. Referring to notification G/SPS/N/EU/911, Chile supported concerns raised by other Members and requested further clarification on the EU methodology for linking intrinsic substance properties to MRL setting, particularly the use of limits of quantification without clear alignment to consumer exposure risk assessments. Chile acknowledged some explanations provided but emphasized remaining uncertainties regarding the scientific basis, treatment of Codex standards, and consideration of differing production conditions, and highlighted potential trade-restrictive effects,

calling for greater transparency, consistency, and exploration of less trade-restrictive alternatives while respecting SPS Agreement principles.

5.50. Uruguay supported the concern regarding the EU Food and Feed Omnibus proposal, noting that eliminating import tolerances could lead to setting MRLs at the LOQ without sufficient scientific risk assessment, contrary to the SPS Agreement. Non-approval of substances in the European Union did not in itself justify restrictions on imports. Uruguay warned that the approach could impose EU production conditions extraterritorially and create regulatory inconsistencies, particularly with continued emergency authorizations, and urged the European Union to ensure alignment with SPS principles, including non-discrimination and science-based decision-making.

5.51. Costa Rica reiterated its support for concerns regarding the EU proposed modification of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005, noting that the approach, including setting MRLs at the LOQ for non-approved substances, could create de facto trade restrictions even where existing MRLs were based on Codex standards or third-country GAP. Costa Rica stressed the need for science-based measures consistent with the SPS Agreement, adequate transition periods, and strengthened technical cooperation, and urged the European Union to assess external impacts and pursue continued dialogue to avoid unjustified trade barriers.

5.52. Guatemala supported the concern regarding the EU approach to determining MRLs, stressing that they should be based on scientific criteria, risk assessment, and transparency. The simplification proposal did not reflect Members' views, particularly regarding the elimination of import tolerances and the continued use of emergency authorizations for EU producers, which could create unequal treatment for third countries.

5.53. Egypt expressed concerns regarding the EU measure notified in document G/SPS/N/EU/911. Egypt noted the implication of this measure for developing countries particularly in its region. Egypt encouraged its EU partners to engage in constructive dialogue. Egypt noted with apprehension the shift of the European Union from a risk-based to a hazard-based approach, highlighted the increased risk associated with possible shipment rejections and relevant developmental and economic impact, and required clarifications on changes in LOQs and how they would reconcile with the list of approved substances. In concluding, Egypt highlighted the need for flexible arrangements including transition periods to allow for adaptation on the side of EU trading partners.

5.54. Kenya noted that the EU proposal notified as document G/SPS/N/EU/911 introduced a hazard-based approach to MRL setting that restricted import tolerances, departing from established science- and risk-based frameworks, and failed to consider differing agricultural conditions in tropical regions. Kenya warned of significant negative impacts on exports, livelihoods, and agricultural innovation, and called on the European Union to withdraw the amendment and apply internationally agreed risk assessment approaches to avoid unnecessary trade barriers.

5.55. Tanzania asked the European Union whether, considering the concerns expressed by several Members and the potential impacts on farmers worldwide, it would consider postponing the entry into force of its measure. Tanzania noted the absence of sufficient time for adaptation, and its potentially disruptive impacts on developing country producers, particularly smallholder farmers.

5.56. The European Union noted Member concerns regarding the Food and Feed Safety Simplification Package notified under G/SPS/N/EU/911, indicating that the proposal, adopted in December 2025, aimed to simplify and modernize legislation while maintaining high protection levels. Changes to import tolerances were primarily terminological, with Codex-based and third-country MRLs remaining possible except for substances deemed particularly hazardous under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009. The European Union highlighted expanded transitional measures for products already on the market, ongoing review by co-legislators, and a forthcoming global impact assessment supported by a Joint Research Centre study, and reaffirmed its intention to ensure that any final measures would remain proportionate, science-based, and consistent with international obligations.

5.57. Australia asked when the EU's global impact assessment would be published and whether third countries would have access to it.

5.58. The European Union replied that it was not in a position to provide further information on this matter.

### 5.2.3 France - Suspension of food imports containing residues of glufosinate, mancozeb, thiophanate-methyl, carbendazim and benomyl (ID 620) - Concerns of Argentina, Brazil and Paraguay

5.59. Argentina reiterated strong concern regarding France's suspension of imports of products containing residues of substances such as glufosinate, mancozeb, thiophanate-methyl, carbendazim and benomyl, arguing that the measure lacked scientific justification, disregarded existing EU MRLs and Codex standards, and was not based on a proper risk assessment, making it inconsistent with SPS Agreement obligations. Such measures fragmented the regulatory framework and created legal and commercial uncertainty. Argentina called on France and other Members to align their measures with international commitments.

5.60. Brazil reiterated serious concern regarding France's measure notified under G/SPS/N/FRA/22 prohibiting imports of products containing residues of certain substances, noting that it lacked scientific justification and risk assessment contrary to Articles 2.2 and 5.1 of the SPS Agreement, and raised transparency concerns under Article 7 and Annex B due to immediate implementation without consultation or transition periods. Brazil further highlighted inconsistencies with the EU regulatory framework and risks of trade disruption and regulatory fragmentation, and urged France to withdraw the measure or provide the supporting scientific evidence while ensuring alignment with SPS principles.

5.61. Paraguay reiterated systemic concerns regarding France's measure and referred to issues raised in G/SPS/GEN/2394, stating that the import ban on products containing residues of substances prohibited in the European Union, despite existing EU import tolerances and Codex standards, lacked scientific justification and constituted an arbitrary measure inconsistent with the SPS Agreement. Paraguay noted that reliance on detection alone without proper risk assessment was unjustified, highlighted disproportionate impacts on developing countries and market access, and called for alignment with international obligations to avoid unjustified trade restrictions.

5.62. Emphasizing that MRLs should be supported by risk assessments based on scientific principles, Japan requested France and the European Union to ensure that any measures taken were consistent with the SPS Agreement and no more trade-restrictive than necessary.

5.63. Referring to notification G/SPS/N/FRA/22, Ecuador expressed concern that France's suspension of imports of products containing residues of certain active substances had significant trade and systemic implications, noting that it restricted products compliant with EU and Codex MRLs without a comprehensive risk assessment and appeared based on detection rather than exposure risk. This hazard-based approach could exceed what is necessary under the SPS Agreement, risk regulatory fragmentation, and disproportionately affect developing countries. Ecuador requested a response to G/SPS/GEN/2394, calling for scientific justification, transparency, and continued technical dialogue to avoid unjustified trade barriers.

5.64. Panama noted the information provided and reiterated that measures should be based on scientific principles and relevant international standards, indicating it would continue to monitor the issue and that its full statement would be circulated in eAgenda.

5.65. Uruguay reiterated, in line with its earlier statement under STC ID 621, concerns regarding France's measure suspending imports and marketing of food and feed containing residues of certain active substances, noting that it appeared to shift from MRLs based on scientific risk assessment toward a detection-based approach despite existing EU and Codex standards. Such measures should comply with the SPS Agreement by being science-based, risk-assessed, and not more trade-restrictive than necessary. Uruguay warned that national measures could create inconsistencies within the EU regulatory framework and undermine trade predictability, while encouraging continued dialogue.

5.66. Costa Rica maintained support for the concern regarding France's emergency measure, noting heightened concern about the EU approach to setting MRLs at the LOQ for substances critical to tropical agriculture, and warning of spillover effects including similar measures such as Poland's

notification G/SPS/N/POL/26. In cases where EFSA lacked conclusive risk assessments and no direct consumer risk was identified, Codex standards should guide decisions in line with the SPS Agreement (Annex A, paragraph 3(a)). Costa Rica raised concerns about potential discrimination and protectionist effects, and urged that measures be science-based, transparent, and non-trade-restrictive while calling for clarification and continued technical dialogue.

5.67. Guatemala supported the concern regarding France's suspension of imports of products containing residues of certain substances, emphasizing that measures should be based on scientific criteria, risk assessment, and transparency, and reiterated the questions raised in document G/SPS/GEN/2394, expressing expectation of a response.

5.68. The European Union noted Member interest in the issue and indicated that it had no new updates regarding the French measure notified under G/SPS/N/FRA/22, referring back to information provided at the March 2026 Committee, including details on the interim emergency measure, relevant EU procedures such as discussions in the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed, and publicly available information from French authorities.

### 5.2.4 EU legislation on endocrine disruptors (ID 382) - Concerns of Paraguay and Brazil

5.69. Paraguay reiterated concern that regulations on substances with endocrine-disrupting potential should be based on conclusive, science-based risk assessments consistent with international standards, recalling SPS Agreement obligations to rely on international guidelines or scientific evidence. The use of hazard-based approaches and cut-off criteria were inconsistent with the SPS Agreement. Paraguay urged the European Union to consider Codex assessments and base its decisions on robust scientific evidence and evaluation of actual risks.

5.70. Brazil reiterated concern about the EU approach to endocrine-disrupting substances, noting that this issue had been raised 35 times and that reliance on hazard-based criteria rather than comprehensive risk assessment led to reductions of MRLs to de facto zero tolerance without conclusive scientific evidence, contrary to Article 5 of the SPS Agreement. Maintaining restrictive measures pending further scientific review created uncertainty and disproportionately affected tropical agriculture. Brazil urged the European Union to ensure transparent, science-based risk assessments, alignment with international standards, and measures no more trade-restrictive than necessary.

5.71. Ecuador maintained concern about the EU approach to endocrine disruptors, urging compliance with the SPS Agreement through science-based risk assessment to avoid disguised trade restrictions. Ecuador requested technical evidence supporting the classification of thiacloprid and clarification on criteria, methodologies, and timelines used in such assessments, and called for transparent, internationally aligned decision-making with timely notification to Members.

5.72. Canada reiterated support for concerns raised regarding the EU approach to endocrine disruptors, emphasizing that MRL decisions should combine hazard identification with science-based risk assessment reflecting real-world exposure, and cautioning that reliance on hazard-based criteria could undermine internationally accepted regulatory systems, restrict access to plant protection tools, create compliance burdens, and generate disproportionate trade impacts. Canada urged the European Union to apply internationally recognized risk assessment methodologies consistent with Articles 2 and 5 of the SPS Agreement to ensure predictability, proportionality, and resilience in global food systems.

5.73. Uruguay reiterated concern regarding the EU approach to identifying and regulating endocrine-disrupting substances, emphasizing that SPS measures should be grounded in scientific evidence and risk assessment, taking into account both hazard and actual exposure in line with the SPS Agreement, and underscored the importance of international standards while encouraging continued dialogue to ensure measures were not more trade-restrictive than necessary.

5.74. Guatemala supported the concern, reiterating that the EU approach to regulating endocrine-disrupting substances should be based on scientific principles, conclusive risk assessment, and transparent procedures, given its implications for MRL determination.

5.75. Kenya supported the concern and highlighted that the EU approach to reducing MRLs for substances classified as endocrine disruptors was not risk-based, warning that it could be trade-restrictive and negatively affect food security, and urged the European Union to reconsider its approach.

5.76. The European Union took note of the continued interest of Members regarding its provisions on endocrine disruptors and referred to its previous explanations on this topic, which remained fully valid. The European Union indicated that it had no new information or updates to provide concerning endocrine disruptors in general or the active substance thiacloprid in particular, which was separately discussed under STC ID 585. The European Union reiterated its readiness to further clarify any aspects of this issue.

### 5.2.5 EU import tolerances for certain pesticides to achieve environmental outcomes in third countries (ID 534) - Concerns of Australia, the United States, India and Brazil

5.77. Australia indicated that it would continue formally raising the concern but would limit interventions to one substantive statement on EU agrichemical policies, and referred to its previous statements under this item and STC ID 621 regarding objections to the EU approach to import tolerances for neonicotinoids.

5.78. The United States expressed disappointment with the EU limited engagement on Commission Regulation (EU) 2023/334, which reduced MRLs for clothianidin and thiamethoxam to the LOQ for environmental reasons, and urged the European Union to avoid using MRLs to pursue objectives unrelated to food safety, emphasizing that such measures should align with SPS Agreement obligations and support sustainable pest management globally without unduly restricting agricultural tools. The United States submitted its statement in document G/SPS/GEN/2430.

5.79. India remained concerned that the reduction of MRLs for certain pesticides, particularly neonicotinoids, appeared to be driven by environmental objectives. India explained that the proposed reduction to the LOQ would significantly impact its tea exports. India would welcome further engagement with the European Union to explore science-based and least trade-restrictive approaches, consistent with the principles of the SPS Agreement, while addressing the concerns of all stakeholders.

5.80. Brazil reiterated concern – raised for the fifteenth time – that the European Union used import tolerances and MRL reductions, including for clothianidin and thiamethoxam, to pursue environmental objectives unrelated to food safety, departing from the risk-based, Codex-aligned role of MRLs. This approach lacked scientific basis, created extraterritorial effects, increased trade restrictions and uncertainty, and was compounded by domestic emergency authorizations. Brazil urged the European Union to align with Codex standards, ensure robust scientific justification, and address environmental objectives through appropriate multilateral fora.

5.81. Japan reiterated its concerns about the EU reduction of MRLs for clothianidin and thiamethoxam to protect the environment, applicable since 7 March 2026. Japan stated that the EU measure was a deviation from current MRL-setting principles and harmonized MRLs. Underscoring the importance of respecting each country's regulatory decisions, Japan urged the European Union to refrain from judging the appropriateness of pesticide use in other countries, through the application of measures taken within the European Union.

5.82. Ecuador reiterated concern about the EU use of non-tariff measures, including MRL reductions to the limit of detection following non-renewal of substances, arguing that such measures—when driven by environmental objectives without conclusive scientific justification on food safety—could create de facto market closures, extraterritorial effects, and inconsistencies with SPS Agreement principles. Ecuador stressed risks of undermining other countries' regulatory autonomy, raised concerns about unnecessary trade restrictions, and encouraged continued dialogue to ensure measures remained science-based and trade-facilitating.

5.83. Guatemala reiterated concern as to how technically and scientifically environmental measures may affect MRL determinations, in particular in the absence of risk analysis and scientific evidence supporting limit determinations.

5.84. Panama noted the concerns raised by Members and followed discussions on regulatory approaches to MRLs and import tolerances, acknowledging the importance of protecting health, biodiversity, and the environment while emphasizing that SPS measures should be based on scientific principles, appropriate risk assessment, and the SPS Agreement. Panama highlighted the need for transparency, predictability, and adequate transition periods for developing countries, and encouraged continued technical dialogue to better understand the scientific basis and trade implications of such measures.

5.85. Canada supported concerns raised by Members regarding the EU approach to MRL setting, particularly reductions to the LOQ based on environmental considerations rather than dietary risk assessment, warning that this created uncertainty, risked disrupting supply chains, and could affect food security. Canada emphasized that such measures should comply with SPS Agreement requirements, including being no more trade-restrictive than necessary, highlighted the importance of science-based regulatory frameworks grounded in risk assessment, and urged the European Union to clarify how recent policy developments, including the Omnibus package, would remain consistent with WTO obligations.

5.86. Uruguay acknowledged the legitimacy of environmental and pollinator protection objectives but expressed concern that the European Union used MRLs – intended as food safety tools – to pursue environmental goals beyond its jurisdiction, raising issues under the SPS Agreement. Uruguay emphasized that SPS measures should remain science-based, founded on risk assessment, and respect principles of necessity and proportionality, and urged the European Union to reconsider its approach to preserve predictability and avoid unnecessary trade restrictions.

5.87. Argentina supported the concern, noting it had been raised continuously in the past 13 Committee meetings, underscoring its importance, and expressed concern that the European Union used MRLs extraterritorially to pursue environmental objectives without sufficient scientific basis, contrary to WTO SPS principles. Argentina stressed that MRLs were intended for food safety rather than environmental protection, questioned the effectiveness of such measures for pollinator protection, and noted that they imposed unnecessary and disproportionate trade restrictions on developing country exporters, urging the European Union to reconsider its approach in line with international standards and respect for Members' regulatory frameworks.

5.88. Colombia supported and co-sponsored the concern, noting that Commission Regulation (EU) 2023/334 reduced MRLs for clothianidin and thiamethoxam to limits of determination, affecting key exports such as bananas, fruits, coffee, and cocoa, and stressed that non-authorization or hazard identification alone should not replace transparent, product-specific risk assessments. Colombia requested clarification on the scientific basis for deviations from Codex standards, criteria for pollinator protection, and procedures for import tolerances, including accessibility for developing countries, while recalling SPS Agreement requirements on scientific justification and avoidance of unnecessary trade restrictions.

5.89. Chile welcomed continued discussion of Commission Regulation (EU) 2023/334 on MRLs for clothianidin and thiamethoxam, noting that reductions to the LOQ were based on environmental considerations and raising questions about using food safety tools such as MRLs to pursue such objectives. Chile highlighted differences in agricultural conditions across countries, emphasized the need to assess consistency with SPS Agreement principles, particularly scientific basis and avoidance of unnecessary trade restrictions, and encouraged continued dialogue to reconcile environmental goals with trade and production sustainability.

5.90. Costa Rica maintained support for the concern regarding the EU use of MRLs to pursue environmental objectives in third countries, noting potential negative trade effects, and referred to its statements in previous Committee meetings.

5.91. Paraguay reiterated that MRLs were instruments to ensure food safety rather than to achieve environmental objectives, expressing concern that their use to regulate agricultural practices in third countries imposed an extraterritorial application of EU standards without considering differing production conditions, thereby negatively affecting international trade. Lowering MRLs for clothianidin and thiamethoxam to the LOQ did not protect consumers or pollinators but restricted exports despite safe residue levels. Paraguay highlighted reliance on emergency authorizations

within the EU despite limited alternatives, and referred to concerns under STC ID 621 regarding the removal of import tolerances and lack of information on procedures, timelines, and costs.

5.92. Kenya expressed concern that the EU reduction of MRLs for neonicotinoids such as clothianidin and thiamethoxam to the limit of detection for environmental objectives in third countries was not science-based and failed to consider tropical pest conditions, noting the importance of these substances for controlling pests and sustaining crop yields. Kenya warned of negative impacts on exports and livelihoods, and urged the European Union to apply internationally recognized risk assessment approaches to avoid unnecessary trade barriers.

5.93. Tanzania aligned with the concerns raised by other Members on this EU measure, noting that the proposal to reduce MRLs to the LOQ could create unnecessary trade barriers. Tanzania further urged the European Union to make sure its measures are science based and consider the necessary transition periods for adaptation on the side of its trading partners.

5.94. The European Union noted interest expressed by several Members and reiterated that it considered environmental objectives of global concern when setting MRLs for substances no longer approved, while ensuring compliance with WTO obligations and applying a case-by-case, science-based approach. The European Union highlighted scientific evidence linking neonicotinoids such as clothianidin and thiamethoxam to pollinator decline, explaining the reduction of MRLs to the limit of determination under Commission Regulation (EU) 2023/334, which had been notified to the TBT Committee and had become applicable on 7 March 2026 with extended transition periods. The European Union clarified that the measure did not prohibit use in third countries but required compliance for products placed on the EU market, and maintained that no less trade-restrictive alternative was available to achieve the objective of protecting pollinators, while remaining open to further dialogue.

### 5.2.6 EU regulation No 396/2005 setting pesticide MRLs in food and feed of plant and animal origin (ID 549) - Concerns of India

5.95. India referred to the EU notification G/SPS/N/EU/804, which temporarily increased official controls and emergency measures governing imports into the European Union. India appreciated the removal of increased physical checks on certain Indian goods such as sesamum seed and food supplements for ethylene oxide, but was still concerned over the increased control frequency on a wide range of Indian agricultural and food products – including okra, cumin seeds, betel leaves, drumsticks, yard-long beans, tamarind-containing foods, vanilla, cloves, Indian curry leaves, groundnuts, peanut butter, peppers, cinnamon, nutmeg, ginger, and saffron – under Annexes I and II of the notified regulations. India noted concerns about the proportionality and trade-restrictiveness of the measures, which had not been similarly applied to other trading partners with higher instances of non-compliance. India was of the view that the measures were at odds with Articles 2.2 and 2.3 of the Agreement, and proposed holding technical consultations with the European Union to ensure that sampling frequencies and controls were in line with SPS obligations.

5.96. The European Union noted India's interest and explained that Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/1793 established special import conditions and increased controls for certain food and feed of non-animal origin to protect consumer health or address widespread non-compliance, with updates conducted at least every six months under Article 12. It reported the latest amendment adopted through Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2026/1206, notified under G/SPS/N/EU/957, and recalled earlier guidance in G/SPS/GEN/1968, highlighting that India had been regularly informed through official channels and bilateral contacts, and that further technical discussions and detailed information on controls could be provided bilaterally.

### 5.2.7 EU non-renewal of the approval of the active substance thiacloprid (ID 585) - Concerns of India

5.97. India reiterated its concerns regarding the EU lowering of its MRLs for certain neonicotinoids in tea to the limit of detection, what would impact tea cultivation and exports, particularly given the limited availability of effective alternatives. Stating that the current limits were based on GAP and scientific field trial data, India reiterated that measures affecting international trade should be supported by appropriate scientific evidence and risk assessment, taking into account relevant international standards and the practical realities of agricultural production in exporting countries.

India encouraged continued technical engagement with the European Union to explore science-based, transparent, and least trade-restrictive solutions.

5.98. Paraguay supported the concern and requested that its position be recorded, referring to comments previously made under STC ID 382.

5.99. Referring to discussions on thiacloprid held under STC ID 382, the European Union stated that no further information was available since the last Committee meeting. The European Union remained open to further contacts with Members to provide any information they may require.

### 5.2.8 European Union - Maximum residue limits of pesticides (ID 306) - Concerns of India

5.100. India reiterated its concern about the EU practice of setting MRLs for pesticides at the limit of detection and shared the view that EU measures were inconsistent with Articles 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 5.1, and 5.4 of the SPS Agreement. India was of the view that the EU approach on tricyclazole disregarded EFSA's 2023 conclusion and failed to consider Codex's efforts to set more balanced MRLs. India asked the European Union to provide updates on other pesticides of concern, including acequinocyl, carbendazim, cyfluthrin, and imidacloprid, and adopt science-based, transparent, and proportionate measures consistent with the SPS Agreement.

5.101. Costa Rica reiterated its support for the concern, stating that the EU regulatory approach to MRLs did not align with the principles of the SPS Agreement or Codex recommendations, and referred to its statements in previous Committee meetings.

5.102. The European Union noted renewed interest from India and indicated that there were no new developments regarding tricyclazole, while providing updates on other pesticides, including increased MRLs for acequinocyl in strawberries under Commission Regulation (EU) 2026/140 based on EFSA opinions from 2024 and 2025 and a forthcoming proposal to extend similar increases to other berries. For carbendazim, the European Union referred to the information provided in the context of STC ID 448.

### 5.2.9 EU restrictions on spice imports and other food products due to European Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2021/2246 of 15 December 2021 (ID 533) - Concerns of India

5.103. India remained concerned about the stringent EU MLs applicable to chilli and ginger, which varied within the spices category and differed from those adopted by other trading partners. Noting the low consumption volumes of spices and the reports of natural occurrence of ethylene oxide (EtO)-related residues in certain plant products, India underscored the appropriateness of science-based approaches taking into account dietary exposure and consumption patterns in the determination of such limits. India sought further clarification regarding the scientific basis and risk assessment underpinning the EU EtO limits and encouraged continued technical bilateral engagement to explore the possibility of greater harmonization and consistency in the application of EtO limits across spices.

5.104. The European Union reiterated that EtO was not approved as an active substance for use in plant protection products in the European Union due to the health risks identified. India was regularly informed about non-compliances related to this substance through the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed. The European Union further reported that India had received a letter to inform of the changes envisaged with the last amendment of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/1793, Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2026/1206, that would enter into force on 30 June 2026. The European Union had submitted notification G/SPS/N/EU/957 following the publication of the amendment in the EU Official Journal. Referring to information shared in previous statements, the European Union noted the ongoing bilateral discussions and reiterated its availability to continue the technical discussions.

### 5.2.10 Japan's revision of butachlor MRL for brown rice (ID 622) - Concerns of India

5.105. India expressed concern regarding Japan's proposal to reduce the MRL for butachlor in brown rice to 0.01 mg/kg, noting that this was more stringent than India's existing standard of 0.05 mg/kg and could affect its rice exports, including to Japan. India submitted that the proposed limit appeared

to lack transparent scientific justification and could create unnecessary barriers to trade. India requested Japan to provide a detailed scientific risk assessment and the justification supporting the revised MRL, taking into account India's trade interests.

5.106. Japan reiterated that it had set the MRL for butachlor in brown rice at 0.01 mg/kg based on sufficient scientific evidence in crop residual studies and had notified the draft measure on 17 July 2025 as G/SPS/N/JPN/1355. Japan expressed its deep concern that India continued to raise this concern despite not having contacted Japan's competent authority (Consumer Affairs Agency), following the previous Committee meeting. Japan reaffirmed its readiness to closely communicate with India regarding this concern.

### 5.2.11 Thailand's new regulation to mitigate presence of aflatoxins in peanut kernels (G/SPS/N/THA/216/Add.1) (ID 606) - Concerns of India

5.107. India reiterated its view that measures introduced in Thailand's draft agricultural standard to mitigate aflatoxin presence in peanut imports (G/SPS/N/THA/216/Add.1) might create unnecessary restrictions to trade. India urged Thailand to clearly define and notify risk-based criteria for country classification and ensure these assessments were regularly reviewed, aligning with Articles 2.2 and 5.6 of the SPS Agreement. Advocating for the use of less trade-restrictive measures, India called for a phased approach for the implementation of the draft standard until the inspection mechanism was reviewed. India reaffirmed its commitment to a collaborative dialogue and requested Thailand to engage constructively with trading partners.

5.108. Thailand reiterated that aflatoxins were carcinogenic and posed serious health risks and that import monitoring had revealed repeated non-compliance in peanut kernels. Thailand had introduced a transparent, risk-based inspection system with three control levels, based on non-compliance rates, to protect public health. Sampling frequencies had been applied according to risk and the measure had been notified to WTO Members and implemented in line with the SPS Agreement. Thailand maintained that the measure was consistent with Articles 2.2 and 5.6 and remained open to further discussions to facilitate safe trade.

### 5.2.12 EU review of legislation on veterinary medicinal products (ID 446) - Concerns of the United States and Brazil

5.109. The United States recalled that it had raised the concern since 2018 and that this would likely be its final intervention before the September 2026 implementation. The European Union had committed to a risk-based approach but had not published a supporting risk assessment or scientific justification for the restrictions. The EU measure did not appear science- or risk-based nor aligned with Codex guidance on antimicrobial resistance (AMR). The United States requested exemptions for low-risk products while indicating continued engagement to avoid trade disruptions. The United States submitted its statement in document G/SPS/GEN/2428.

5.110. Brazil reiterated its concern regarding the EU implementation of Article 118 of Regulation (EU) 2019/6, noting trade implications ahead of the full application in September 2026. Brazil supported efforts to combat AMR but noted that the EU measures imposed burdensome certification and extraterritorial requirements without a sufficiently robust risk assessment, contrary to the SPS Agreement, and departed from internationally recognized risk-based approaches of WOAH, Codex, and FAO, creating uncertainty and disproportionate impacts, particularly on developing countries. Brazil requested greater transparency, clarification of the review process for reserved antimicrobials, and an extended transition period to facilitate implementation.

5.111. Uruguay recognized the importance of combating AMR but stressed that related measures should be based on scientific evidence and proper risk assessment in line with the SPS Agreement. Their implementation could create disproportionate administrative burdens and unnecessarily restrict market access, particularly for developing countries. Uruguay urged the European Union to reconsider its approach to ensure measures achieved public health objectives without excessive trade restrictions.

5.112. Paraguay thanked the delegations for raising this concern and asked that its support be duly recorded.

5.113. The European Union thanked the United States and Brazil, noting that this was the 22nd time the concern was raised in the Committee. The European Union had kept WTO Members regularly informed throughout the development and adoption of its veterinary medicinal products framework through notifications, responses to comments, information sessions, bilateral engagements and a dedicated website. The European Union reiterated that the measures formed part of its efforts to combat AMR through a One Health approach, which it noted was internationally recognized and endorsed by relevant international organizations. The European Union further informed Members that the list of authorized third countries had recently been updated, consolidated and incorporated into Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2021/405 through Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2026/1189, with a view to enhancing transparency and facilitating enforcement.

### 5.2.13 Hong Kong, China; Macao, China; Russian Federation – Import restrictions on aquatic products after the discharge of ALPS treated water (ID 574) - Concerns of Japan

5.114. Japan considered that the measures restricting imports of Japanese aquatic and other products imposed by Hong Kong, China; Macao, China; and the Russian Federation in response to Japan's discharge of ALPS treated water into the sea were not based on scientific principles and were completely unacceptable. The results of evaluation and monitoring conducted by the IAEA had concluded that the discharge of water was consistent with relevant international safety standards. Japan stated that most countries had expressed their understanding regarding the discharge of ALPS treated water due to the efforts of Japan and the IAEA and had not imposed import restrictions, and urged Hong Kong, China; Macao, China; and the Russian Federation to lift the imposed measures. Japan would continue to cooperate closely with the IAEA and share transparent, evidence-based information on this issue to interested partners.

5.115. Hong Kong, China took note of recent developments and referred to its previous statements, indicating that it would continue monitoring the discharge through surveillance and scientific data to safeguard food safety and public health.

5.116. Macao, China stated that it had been closely monitoring the discharge of Fukushima nuclear-contaminated water and its potential impact, noting that its precautionary measures were based on evidence-based risk assessments to protect public health. Macao, China would continue monitoring scientific data and engage constructively with stakeholders.

5.117. The Russian Federation reiterated concerns regarding the safety of Japanese aquatic exports in light of the continued discharge of ALPS-treated water from the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant since August 2023, noting uncertainty about long-term impacts on health and the environment. In accordance with Article 5.7 of the SPS Agreement, the Russian Federation maintained restrictions introduced in 2023 on the certification of Japanese-origin aquatic products.

5.118. Japan reiterated that information on ALPS-treated water had been shared in a transparent manner based on scientific evidence. Japan noted that it had also provided individual briefings to interested parties, and highlighted its availability to continue engaging in good faith with interested partners on these issues.

### 5.2.14 Korea's requirements for the use of food additives in imported food products (ID 626) - Concerns of China

5.119. China expressed concern about Korea's repeated non-compliance notifications on food exports, attributing them to misapplication of additive rules, including failure to recognize "reasonable carry-over via raw materials", inconsistent treatment of naturally occurring substances, and overly stringent limits on preservatives such as sorbic acid compared to Codex standards and assessments by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA). These practices were inconsistent with SPS Agreement principles and international standards. China called on Korea to clarify procedures, expand recognition of naturally occurring substances, reassess preservative standards based on CAC, and reduce trade-restrictive measures to facilitate bilateral food trade.

5.120. Korea took note of China's concerns and reiterated that its standards for food additives were established under the Standards and Specifications for Food Additives, based on scientific evidence, including the acceptable daily intake, Codex standards, consumption patterns, and technological necessity, and that differences in national conditions limited direct application of international

standards. This approach was consistent with Members' rights under Articles 2 and 3 of the SPS Agreement., Korea outlined procedures for revising additive standards and recognizing naturally occurring substances based on specified thresholds and case-by-case scientific assessment, and indicated willingness to continue technical discussions through established bilateral mechanisms.

### 5.2.15 India's Draft Food Safety and Standards (Import) Amendment Regulation (ID 553) - Concerns of the European Union

5.121. The European Union expressed concern that, despite the absence of trade disruption to date, lack of clarity and delays in listing registered facilities could affect future trade, highlighting missing criteria for inspections, audits, risk definitions, and procedures for listing and delisting. The European Union requested India to provide guidance and clarify procedures for updating facility lists and reiterated the need to notify any related measures or amendments to the SPS and TBT Committees for transparency purposes.

5.122. India advised stakeholders to register or update their facilities through the online portal in advance, preferably 30 days prior to the shipment, as communicated through an order of the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (FSSAI) dated 4 April 2024. Regarding inspections and audits, India clarified that, at present, the inspection of foreign food manufacturing facilities was not mandatory. In cases where inspections might be undertaken, based on risk assessment or other relevant factors, the concerned exporting countries would be duly informed and notified in advance of the inspection requirements and procedures. India reaffirmed its commitment to transparency, international cooperation, and constructive engagement to address trading partners' concerns in a timely and effective manner.

### 5.2.16 EU restrictions on the importation of collagen for human consumption (ID 535) - Concerns of China

5.123. China stressed that its position remained unchanged on this STC, and reiterated that, despite Regulation (EU) 2021/405 and Regulation (EU) 2022/2292 confirming through risk assessments that Chinese collagen met EU safety requirements and posed low residue risks, the European Union continued to prohibit imports under Commission Decision 2002/994/EC due to its exclusion from the annex, creating unjustified trade restrictions. China urged the European Union to amend Decision 2002/994/EC to include collagen in line with current regulations and risk assessment conclusions or clarify interim export procedures and provide a clear pathway and timeline for resolution. China referred to the full version of its statement uploaded on eAgenda.

5.124. The European Union stated that no new information was available to be shared on this issue, and referred to its previous statements on this same matter.

### 5.2.17 India's requirements for veterinary-health certificates for imported food consignments of various animal products (ID 554) - Concerns of the European Union

5.125. The European Union reiterated concerns that India's harmonized veterinary-health certificates, including those already applied to dairy and newly introduced for multiple animal products, deviated from Codex and WOAH standards without scientific justification, contrary to the SPS Agreement requirement that measures be science-based and not more trade-restrictive than necessary. Comments submitted to WTO notifications had not been addressed and final certificates adopted with limited consultation and short transition periods, causing trade disruption. The European Union requested alignment with international standards or provision of scientific evidence, reconsideration of certain import conditions such as systematic post-import controls, and adequate transition timelines, while urging notification of future measures.

5.126. Japan reiterated its concerns about India's order on health certificate requirements for imported milk, pork, fish, and related products. Japan urged India to revise and amend the current requirements to align with international standards, noting that some provisions were stricter than those applied to domestic producers. Given the impact of the measures on international trade, Japan requested that India notify the order to the Committee. In addition, Japan called for full alignment of future drafts of new health certificates for pork, fish, and related products with international standards and India's own domestic regulations. Acknowledging India's extension of the implementation timeline, Japan underscored the importance of providing at least a six-month

transition period for exporters to adapt their certification system. Japan looked forward to India's review of the draft health certificate for milk and milk products submitted in May and to receiving a prompt response.

5.127. Australia acknowledged India's updates to veterinary-health certification requirements for various products and welcomed alignment with international standards such as those of Codex and WOAH. Australia also appreciated transitional arrangements and coordination across agencies to avoid trade disruptions, while indicating a commitment to continued collaborative technical engagement to ensure appropriate implementation.

5.128. Canada acknowledged India's decision to delay implementation of FSSAI's new certification requirements until further notice, giving sufficient time to India's competent authorities to develop joint certificates. Canada further reiterated its concern with a number of new FSSAI requirements and implored India to streamline certification requirements based on international standards. Canada further requested India to notify these requirements to the Committee because of the nature of the measure. Noting that some of the proposed amendments in the draft certification requirements might create unnecessary barriers to trade, Canada appreciated the opportunity to comment on notification G/SPS/N/IND/348. Expressing availability to collaborate with FSSAI, Canada asked India to consider the review of these requirements based on scientific evidence and risk analysis.

5.129. Reiterating its position from previous meetings, India said that the requirement for the Integrated Veterinary-Health Certificate applied exclusively to imports of milk and milk products, was based on scientific risk assessment, and was considered essential to safeguard public health. India added that a sufficient transition period had been provided, and no systemic delays or denials in registration had been reported. India indicated that it remained open to addressing specific, evidence-based concerns, and invited Members to share specific instances to enable focused examination through the appropriate channels. India emphasized that the protection of public health remained a paramount objective.

### 5.2.18 The Russian Federation's delay in listing of establishments for export of dairy products (ID 586) - Concerns of India

5.130. Welcoming the approval of additional Indian dairy establishments, India sought further clarity regarding the status of remaining applications. Noting that 14 dairy establishments were still awaiting approval, India looked forward to greater transparency and indicative timelines for the completion of the approval process. India had submitted corrective action plans for three dairy establishments and was finalizing plans for the remaining eight establishments with pending approval. India had also submitted applications for the approval of two further dairy establishments. India believed that a systems-based approach would provide a more efficient and sustainable framework for facilitating trade. India had invited the Russian Federation to consider renewing and expanding the scope of the existing memorandum of understanding (MoU) to cover all relevant food categories to make the approval process more efficient, minimize unnecessary procedures, and facilitate smoother trade in dairy products. India remained committed to working closely with the Russian Federation and looked forward to continued cooperation and timely consideration of the pending applications.

5.131. The Russian Federation welcomed India's interest in exporting dairy products and reported that it had authorized several Indian milk establishments in 2023 and 2025, while noting that inspections of 11 plants had been conducted in late 2025 and a preliminary report issued indicating non-inclusion of certain facilities. The Russian Federation highlighted that no comments had yet been received from India and indicated that, in March 2026, it had proposed bilateral consultations between competent authorities, but was still awaiting a response.

### 5.2.19 Qatar's new import rules for dairy products (ID 529) - Concerns of the European Union

5.132. The European Union noted ongoing dialogue with Qatar and its interest in resolving the issue, but reiterated concerns that Qatar's import measures on dairy products, particularly short shelf-life requirements, lacked scientific justification and were not aligned with international standards, effectively restricting market access. The European Union requested Qatar to lift these measures

and adopt a permanent WTO-consistent solution, which should be notified at a draft stage to this Committee.

5.133. Qatar noted the continued concerns expressed by the European Union. A technical decision had just been issued adopting a new technical regulation on shelf live for food products. This new framework replaced previously applicable technical regulations and standards. Quatar highlighted that the new regulation was fully aligned with modern international standards and science-based principles and that it shifted the responsibility for validating the shelf-life period for food products towards importing and exporting companies.

### 5.2.20 China's delay in approving requests for new listing and reinstatement of export establishments (ID 516) - Concerns of Japan

5.134. Japan reiterated concerns about China's establishment listing, citing lack of scientific basis and transparency, unjustified trade barriers, and technical issues in the China Import Food Enterprise Registration (CIFER) system. Japan requested clearer timelines, transparent rejection criteria, and prompt completion of pending registrations of more than 700 export-related establishments for aquatic products. Reaffirming its commitment to constructive engagement, Japan urged China to take concrete and timely actions to address these concerns, establish a standard processing period for registration procedures, and clearly communicate the information to WTO Members. Japan also raised concerns regarding Decree 280, and urged China to provide Members with essential information in this respect. Finally, Japan strongly requested China to proceed without delay to the procedures with regard to the exportation of Japanese aquatic products by re-registered export-related establishments.

5.135. China stated that bilateral communication with Japan on food import enterprise registration had remained smooth, highlighting exchanges including training and written responses, and emphasized that its registration system, established under the Food Safety Law of China and the Regulations on the Registration and Administration of Overseas Manufacturers of Imported Food, was consistent with international practices. It noted the use of the CIFER system to support procedures and transparency, ongoing training efforts, and willingness to address specific registration issues raised by Japan.

### 5.2.21 India's approval procedures to import plants, animals and their products (ID 565) - Concerns of the European Union

5.136. The European Union reiterated concerns about long and unjustified delays in India's import approval procedures for plants, animals, and their products, welcoming some progress but also highlighting recent slowdown for plant products and no progress or transparency for animal product applications, some pending since 2016–2017. India's practices did not comply with SPS Agreement obligations on transparency and avoidance of undue delays. The European Union urged India to ensure transparent implementation, engage with the European Union, and expedite approvals to prevent unnecessary trade disruptions.

5.137. India reiterated that it had been efficiently processing all import applications for plants, animals, and related products submitted by EU member States, and had established multiple joint and technical working groups to address these issues. In several cases, India had requested additional technical details and had shared the status of applications with the concerned EU member States. Taking into account administrative and scientific considerations, India reaffirmed its commitment to constructive bilateral engagement under the WTO SPS framework and to ensuring the appropriate level of protection while facilitating trade through transparent and science-based risk assessment processes.

### 5.2.22 Indonesia's approval procedures for animal and plant products (ID 441) - Concerns of the European Union and India

5.138. The European Union reiterated concerns about undue delays, lack of predictability, and insufficient transparency in Indonesia's approval procedures for imports of plants, animals, and their products, noting that many applications had remained pending for nearly a decade without explanation and that applicants were not adequately informed of deficiencies. These practices were inconsistent with Annex C of the SPS Agreement, which required procedures to be completed without

undue delay and information requests to be limited to what was necessary. The European Union urged Indonesia to simplify procedures, ensure transparency, and accelerate approvals while remaining open to technical discussions.

5.139. India noted that applications for three dairy establishments, two egg and egg product establishments, and one gelatin establishment were still pending. India sought further information regarding the status and anticipated timelines for these applications and the proposed next steps following India's invitation for on-site inspections. India looked forward to continuing constructive engagement with Indonesia to facilitate a transparent, timely, and science-based approval process for products of animal origin.

5.140. Ukraine supported concerns regarding Indonesia's approval procedures for plant and animal product imports, highlighting lack of transparency, absence of feedback, and prolonged delays in processing applications for multiple commodities despite submissions and fees having been completed. Ukraine emphasized the importance of compliance with Article 8 and Annex C of the SPS Agreement on transparent and timely procedures and called for enhanced technical dialogue to improve certification processes and ensure more predictable approval systems.

5.141. Indonesia provided updates on approval procedures, indicating ongoing processing of 17 establishment applications from the European Union for pork, offal, and dairy products, while noting withdrawals by Italy and the Netherlands, and confirmed continued engagement within the Committee framework. Indonesia explained that applications from India were under review and emphasized that evaluations would proceed based on compliance with sanitary requirements. Indonesia highlighted bilateral exchanges with Ukraine and stated that concerns raised would be reviewed by the relevant authorities with further updates to be communicated through established channels.

### 5.2.23 Panama - Import restrictions on bovine meat products due to limitations on authorizations for Federal Inspection Type establishments (ID 617) - Concerns of Mexico

5.142. Mexico stated that, following a 2022 on-site audit by the Panama of nine federal inspection type (FIT) establishments, Panama had not issued a final report and had authorized only limited exports of bovine offal. Subsequent bilateral engagements in 2023–2025 had failed to resolve issues on product scope, validity, and new approvals, partly due to the expiry of a zoosanitary risk analysis. A 2026 resolution granted a six-month extension for the same limited products, while approvals remained restricted and pending responses on inspections and broader market access for additional establishments. Mexico referred to its full statement uploaded on eAgenda.

5.143. Costa Rica stated that it shared concerns regarding Panama's practices affecting trade, noting that certain SPS measures did not appear to be based on scientific evidence or risk assessment and had resulted in significant restrictions on market access, particularly for agricultural products. Costa Rica urged Panama to address concerns raised by Members in line with its obligations under the SPS Agreement.

5.144. Panama highlighted that its decisions on the authorization of establishments and products were based on technical evaluations, national legislation, and international obligations under the SPS Agreement, noting ongoing bilateral engagement with Mexico to address pending issues. Panama reported that 37 Mexican establishments were currently authorized across several product categories with validity extending to 2026–2029, emphasized its commitment to transparency and continued technical dialogue, and indicated that Members' comments would be transmitted to the competent authorities for further consideration.

### 5.2.24 EU increased sampling frequency for inspection of farmed shrimps and newly listed fishery establishments not permitted to export aquaculture products (ID 552) - Concerns of India

5.145. India acknowledged the listing of 102 shrimp farming units in 2025 and the EU recognition of the improvements made in India's residue monitoring and control systems. India reiterated its concerns about the EU increased sampling and testing frequency for farmed shrimp imports, despite a proven reduction in antibiotic residue rejections and corrective actions taken following EU audits. India urged the European Union to reduce the sampling frequency of aquaculture consignments and

requested that sampling and testing regulations be aligned with trade facilitation principles to ensure fair and predictable market access. India looked forward to continuing constructive technical engagement with the European Union on this matter.

5.146. The European Union referred to its previous statements on this issue and added that despite a decline in non-compliance cases for nitrofurans and chloramphenicol in previous years, notifications had increased again in 2025 and continued into 2026, indicating that it remained premature to lift reinforced control measures. The European Union highlighted ongoing cooperation with India, including the listing of new fisheries establishments since 2025 in the context of Free Trade Agreement negotiations, and expressed confidence that SPS cooperation would support further progress while indicating continued engagement on the issue.

### 5.2.25 Saudi Arabia's undue delay in listing of fishery establishments (ID 612) - Concerns of India

5.147. Acknowledging recent bilateral contacts, India reiterated its concern about Saudi Arabia's continued suspension of shrimp and lobster imports since March 2023 following detections of the White Spot Syndrome Virus. India was still waiting for detailed test reports and exporter-specific data, which was constraining its ability to take corrective actions. India requested Saudi Arabia to adopt a system-based recognition approach, discontinue the requirement for third-party certification, and recognize India's official control and certification system issued by the Export Inspection Council, which ensured full traceability and compliance with food safety standards for exported fish and fishery products. India invited the Saudi Food and Drug Authority to audit India's official control system and urged timely listing of establishments to facilitate fair, transparent, and science-based trade in seafood.

5.148. Saudi Arabia reaffirmed its commitment to facilitating safe trade consistent with the SPS Agreement and WOAH standards, noting ongoing bilateral engagement with India's Export Inspection Council and progress in addressing technical matters. It maintained that the temporary ban on certain crustaceans due to White Spot Syndrome Virus remained in place pending fulfilment of requirements, including updated WOAH disease status, surveillance data, and official assurances. Saudi Arabia indicated that further consideration depended on submission of outstanding information, while encouraging continued cooperation to resolve the issue.

### 5.2.26 Viet Nam's delay in listing of establishments for export of fishery products (ID 613) - Concerns of India

5.149. Acknowledging the removal of duplication in the listing of certain fisheries establishments, India regretted that Viet Nam had not updated the listing of Indian fishery establishments since September 2023. India informed the Committee that the listing of 64 new establishments and modifications of 51 already listed establishments was still pending. India urged Viet Nam to expedite these approvals to facilitate trade and also proposed renewing and expanding the scope of the existing MoU between the respective competent authorities to adopt a systems-based audit approach.

5.150. Viet Nam stated that 461 Indian seafood establishments and over 2,000 products had been approved for export, noting that India represented a large share of applications, which had led to delays due to volume and complexity. Viet Nam reported recent progress in assessing dossiers, indicated that remaining applications were under review, and affirmed its commitment to expediting the approval and listing process.

### 5.2.27 Panama's undue delays in the renewal of authorizations for plants of fishery and livestock enterprises (ID 509) - Concerns of Peru

5.151. Peru reiterated its concern regarding Panama's renewal procedures for Peruvian fish establishments, noting that despite ongoing exchanges and clarifications, uncertainty remained over the conditions, criteria, and procedures that would apply to establishments whose authorizations would expire in July 2026. Peru highlighted the lack of information on the technical and legal basis for validity periods and renewals, expressed concern about potential regulatory changes affecting market access, recalled obligations under Article 8 and Annex C(1)(c) of the SPS Agreement to avoid undue delays and unnecessary requirements, and called on Panama to activate the institutional

mechanisms foreseen under the bilateral Free Trade Agreement, including convening the SPS committee established under Article 6.11 of that agreement.

5.152. The European Union supported concerns, noting that since 2019 Panama had delayed or blocked market access requests and updates to authorized establishment lists, and recalled that despite a 2022 bilateral understanding and subsequent commitments in 2025 to accelerate procedures, many establishments remained unlisted, not renewed, or removed without justification. The European Union therefore urged Panama to ensure transparent, predictable, and timely approval and listing procedures in line with international standards and Article 147 of the EU–Central America Association Agreement.

5.153. Costa Rica reiterated its support for concerns regarding Panama's measures, stating that certain SPS actions did not appear to be based on scientific evidence or adequate risk assessment, had restricted access to the Panamanian market for agricultural products, and raised issues of non-compliance with obligations under the SPS Agreement.

5.154. Panama reiterated that applications for the authorization and renewal of establishments from Peru were being examined in line with national regulatory procedures and WTO SPS obligations, noting ongoing bilateral technical exchanges and progress, including the authorization of ten Peruvian establishments and a newly approved facility until 2029. It emphasized its commitment to transparency, continued dialogue, and follow-up on pending dossiers, and indicated that Members' comments would be transmitted to the relevant authorities while further updates would be provided to the Committee.

### 5.2.28 Russian Federation - Procedures for authorizing units eligible for export of fish and fish products to Eurasian Customs Union (ID 508) - Concerns of India

5.155. India expressed appreciation for the progress made in facilitating market access for fish and seafood products, noting that 38 establishments could be added to the register of exporters of the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) in 2025 and two more in 2026. However, India further noted that 54 establishments were still pending and regretted that the listing process continued to rely primarily on establishment-specific inspections. India reiterated its readiness to facilitate an audit of its official control system and considered that a systems-based approach could enhance efficiency while maintaining the necessary sanitary safeguards. India sought clarity regarding the expected timelines for completing the pending approvals and looked forward to continued technical engagement with the Russian Federation.

5.156. The Russian Federation referred to its previous statement at the 94th Committee meeting and reported progress, noting the expansion of authorized activities for 23 Indian fish and seafood establishments, the addition of 40 new establishments (including 37 for shrimp exports), and the lifting of restrictions on one facility. The Russian Federation requested that India refrain from raising this concern in future Committee meetings.

### 5.2.29 EU delays in the renewal of authorizations for fishery enterprises and fish products (ID 579) - Concerns of the Russian Federation

5.157. The Russian Federation reiterated its concern about the EU decision to stop processing technical updates for Russian fish establishments in the EU TRACES-NT (Trade Control and Expert System New Technology), noting that the lack of engagement since 2022 on updating information for previously listed and authorized enterprises had effectively blocked Russian fish exports to the EU market. It considered the EU delays in renewing authorizations for fishery establishments and products to constitute an unjustified and discriminatory restriction on trade. The Russian Federation urged the European Union to comply with its WTO obligations by ensuring that SPS measures be based on risk assessments related to human, animal and plant health and not hinder trade through technical barriers inconsistent with Article 5 of the SPS Agreement. Finally, the Russian Federation added that the lack of substantive answer demonstrated a low level of transparency and called upon the European Union to comply with its WTO obligations.

### 5.2.30 The Russian Federation's delays in lifting the suspension on imports of fishery products (ID 627) - Concerns of Thailand

5.158. Thailand raised concerns about delays by the Russian Federation in lifting suspensions on imports from six Thai fish establishments, noting that requested documentation and corrective actions had been submitted and that on-site inspections by EAEU experts had been agreed but not yet scheduled. It recalled obligations under Article 8 and Annex C of the SPS Agreement regarding timely procedures and transparency and urged the Russian Federation to promptly confirm inspections to enable resumption of trade.

5.159. The Russian Federation noted that temporary restrictions remained in place on seven Thai fish processing establishments due to detected violations, indicating that lifting restrictions would depend on inspections by EAEU experts and confirmation of corrective measures. The Russian Federation added that documentation from five establishments was under review while information from one remained outstanding, highlighted that no inspections were currently planned for 2026, and underscored readiness to continue bilateral cooperation with Thailand.

### 5.2.31 Mexico's undue delays in the clearance of frozen shrimp (ID 577) - Concerns of Ecuador

5.160. Ecuador reiterated concern about the lack of publication of sanitary requirements needed to reopen the Mexican market for frozen shrimp, noting that despite submitting all requested technical information since the 2015 suspension and agreeing in 2020 to proposed requirements by Mexico's National Service for Agri-food Health, Safety and Quality (SENASICA), Mexico had not issued a final response or completed the process. Ecuador considered these delays inconsistent with transparency and procedural obligations under the SPS Agreement and urged Mexico to publish the requirements and advance market reopening.

5.161. Mexico took note of the intervention of Ecuador and informed the Committee that relevant information would be transmitted to its competent authorities.

### 5.2.32 Mexico's undue delay in reauthorizing shrimp imports (ID 614) - Concerns of Peru

5.162. Peru reiterated its concern about Mexico's continued delays in reopening imports of Peruvian shrimp, noting that exports had been suspended for two years despite Peru having provided all requested technical information and having received no further requests or specific observations. Peru highlighted that a proposed bilateral technical meeting had been declined without alternative dates being offered and noted that the lack of transparency regarding the status of the evaluation was causing significant harm to Peruvian exporters and the aquaculture sector. Peru called for renewed technical dialogue and an early meeting of the SPS committee established under Article 7.10 of their bilateral trade agreement to advance a resolution.

5.163. Mexico stated that SENASICA had requested additional information from Peru regarding the registration system of white shrimp producers and processors but had not received a response. Mexico reiterated its willingness to continue technical collaboration while maintaining its position.

### 5.2.33 Thailand's ban on imports of aquaculture shrimp (ID 607) - Concerns of India

5.164. India reiterated its concerns regarding Thailand's requirement to test shrimp imports for seven WOAH-listed pathogens. India noted that this requirement exceeded what was scientifically justified, noting that four of the listed pathogens had never been reported in India. India stated that the current measures were more trade-restrictive than necessary and lacked scientific transparency, raising concerns under the SPS Agreement and the recommendations of the WOAH Aquatic Animal Health Code. India emphasized that highly processed and cooked shrimp products posed no disease risk and were recognized as safe by WOAH. India encouraged consideration of market access for such products and expressed its willingness to engage bilaterally towards a mutually agreeable resolution.

5.165. Thailand stated that its import requirements for marine shrimp, established in 2010, required health certification for freedom from seven aquatic diseases based on risk assessment and WOAH recommendations, noting that imports of white-leg shrimp from India had resumed in 2022 following

discussions but that other products would require a formal market access request with supporting technical information. It clarified that certain diseases present domestically were under official control programmes requiring equivalent measures in imports consistent with Section 5.1.2.2 of the WOAH Aquatic Animal Health Code and that supporting evidence requested from India for other diseases had not yet been provided. Thailand reiterated its readiness for technical consultations while noting a lack of response to its invitations.

### 5.2.34 Indonesia's pathogen-free certificate and testing requirement for frozen shrimp (ID 615) - Concerns of India

5.166. Acknowledging the technical explanations received on notification G/SPS/N/IDN/156, India requested Indonesia to share specific risk assessments, surveillance data, or scientific references justifying the inclusion of each of the listed diseases in the proposed veterinary health certification requirements. Reaffirming its commitment to continued engagement with Indonesia, India (i) proposed to explore a mutual recognition mechanism for veterinary certification, consistent with Article 4 of the SPS Agreement; (ii) suggested undertaking a joint technical review of the proposed certificate templates to ensure alignment with WOAH standards and minimize administrative burdens, redundant testing requirements, and related costs for exporters; and (iii) requested exemption from certification requirements for diseases that had never been reported in India.

5.167. Indonesia emphasized that its aquatic animal health measures were consistent with Articles 2 and 5 of the SPS Agreement, noting that they were based on scientific risk assessments tailored to its national and archipelagic context. It explained that health certification requirements, as notified in G/SPS/N/IDN/154, were applied non-discriminatorily and aligned with WOAH Aquatic Animal Health Code standards, and clarified that measures were proportionate to risk categories, while indicating willingness to assess India's supporting evidence, continue technical exchanges, and explore equivalence arrangements under Article 4 of the SPS Agreement.

### 5.2.35 Delays in Thailand's approval procedures for animal products (ID 527) - Concerns of the Russian Federation

5.168. The Russian Federation reiterated concerns about delays in Thailand's approval procedures for Russian livestock products, noting that despite cooperation since 2019, multiple inspections, and submission of all requested information, market access had not yet been granted. The Russian Federation recalled discussions in 2025 on possible mutual attestation and pending feedback on feed certificates, highlighting its favourable WOAH animal health statuses. The Russian Federation urged Thailand to comply with Article 8 and Annex C of the SPS Agreement by completing procedures without undue delay while expressing readiness for continued bilateral cooperation.

5.169. Thailand stated that it was drafting import requirements for beef from the Russian Federation in line with the Animal Epidemics Act and the WOAH Terrestrial Animal Health Code, while noting that market access for pork and poultry would be considered once relevant WOAH disease-free status was obtained. Thailand added that revised health certificates for feed and feed additives were under review and indicated openness to continued technical discussions.

### 5.2.36 Costa Rica's undue delay and lack of response in approval procedures for products of animal origin (ID 628) - Concerns of Brazil

5.170. Brazil welcomed Costa Rica's engagement and progress in evaluating requests for fisheries, aquaculture, honey, and animal-origin products, viewed these developments positively, and emphasized the importance of continued technical cooperation and communication. Brazil requested further information on next steps and timelines to enhance predictability, as well as updates on other pending market access requests, while reaffirming its commitment to constructive engagement to advance outstanding issues.

5.171. Costa Rica stated that, following bilateral discussions in August 2025, it had prioritized agreed areas for progress, reporting that market access was open for bovine genetic material and under assessment for porcine genetic material, and that technical evaluations had advanced for animal-origin meals, fisheries products, and honey, including inspections and document reviews.

Costa Rica indicated that updates had been regularly communicated to Brazil and reaffirmed its commitment to advancing pending processes without delay to strengthen bilateral trade.

### 5.2.37 Chinese Taipei's import restrictions on poultry and beef (ID 521) - Concerns of Brazil

5.172. Brazil raised concerns about prolonged approval procedures by Chinese Taipei for poultry and beef imports, noting that despite extensive information submissions since 2016 (for poultry) and 2019 (for beef), processes remained at the documentary stage without progress toward audits or approval. Brazil highlighted continued requests for additional information, emphasized that atypical BSE should not justify restrictions under WOAH standards, and requested a clear roadmap, timelines, agreement on sanitary requirements and certification, and scheduling of on-site audits, while stressing the need for science-based, transparent, and predictable SPS procedures.

5.173. Chinese Taipei indicated that it had provided Brazil with detailed updates following the 90th Committee meeting on the status of its poultry and beef market access applications, including requests for supplementary information and explanations for delays linked to disease status, notably highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) and Newcastle disease outbreaks. Several submissions from Brazil remained incomplete or pending, which had delayed the review process. Chinese Taipei explained that documentation review must be completed before on-site audits could be arranged, added that its measures were science-based, transparent, and consistent with SPS Agreement obligations, and expressed willingness to continue technical engagement.

### 5.2.38 The Dominican Republic's undue delays in the authorization process for exports of animal products from Costa Rica (ID 581) - Concerns of Costa Rica

5.174. Costa Rica reiterated concerns about prolonged delays exceeding four years in the Dominican Republic's approval process for animal-origin products, noting the lack of transparency regarding administrative issues cited by the Dominican Republic's General Directorate of Livestock and the lack of updates on pending applications and renewals for previously approved establishments. The situation had effectively closed the market and created uncertainty for 22 establishments and new applicants. Costa Rica urged the Dominican Republic to complete approval and renewal procedures without unjustified delay in line with the SPS Agreement.

5.175. The Dominican Republic reiterated its engagement to modernize its SPS framework at the national level and noted that this was an ongoing process. The Dominican Republic was available to continue cooperating with its Costa Rican counterparts with a constructive spirit.

### 5.2.39 General import restrictions due to BSE (ID 193) - Concerns of European Union

5.176. Reiterating this concern for the 56th time, the European Union reported that some Members continued to maintain import bans and had accumulated unacceptable delays in their approval procedures to lift BSE restrictions. In the European Union's view, the delays by some Members, including China, Indonesia, South Africa, and Chinese Taipei, were at odds with Article 8 of the SPS Agreement and Annex C thereto. The European Union urged Members to comply with their obligations under the SPS Agreement and apply international standards, lift the remaining BSE-related restrictions for all EU member States, finalize the risk assessment of pending market access requests, and complete administrative steps to allow market access without further delay. The European Union reiterated its openness to working constructively with Members.

5.177. Chinese Taipei explained that its import approval procedures for beef, applied under its Regulations for Systematic Inspection of Imported Food, were based on international standards and required steps such as questionnaires, risk assessment, and on-site audits, noting that timelines depended on the completeness of information provided by applicants. Chinese Taipei highlighted recent approvals of imports from some EU member States and reaffirmed its openness to continue cooperation and technical engagement with the European Union.

5.178. China stated that, following risk assessments, it had lifted BSE-related import restrictions on certain EU bovine products, including boneless veal from the Netherlands and boneless beef from several EU member States, and indicated its willingness to continue technical exchanges with the European Union on BSE prevention and control.

### 5.2.40 EU recognition of Mexico as a country with WOAH negligible BSE risk (ID 543) - Concerns of Mexico

5.179. Mexico stated that since 2017 it had requested inclusion as a negligible BSE risk country under Decision 2007/453/EC and had repeatedly sought recognition from the European Union without receiving a legal, technical, or scientific justification for the delay. The European Commission had indicated that a formal request needed to be submitted under Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 to proceed with amending Decision 2007/453/EC. Mexico would submit this request for evaluation.

5.180. The European Union had taken note of Mexico's official BSE status according to WOAH and was considering Mexico's request. The European Union indicated that it had responded to Mexico's communications and the issue was under bilateral discussion within the framework of the EU-Mexico SPS committee. The European Union reiterated that Mexico would have to submit technical information based on the procedure laid down in Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 999/2001. The European Union looked forward to continuing the technical discussions with Mexico.

### 5.2.41 Türkiye's prohibition on the importation of live cattle (ID 604) - Concerns of the United States

5.181. The United States stated that Türkiye had not provided scientific justification for its H5N1-related ban since May 2024 despite repeated requests, and had not engaged in technical discussions or bilateral cooperation. It urged Türkiye to reconvene its scientific committee to review and remove mitigation measures, noting that US exports focused on non-lactating dairy heifers and beef cattle, and highlighted domestic measures taken by the US Department of Agriculture (USDA), including enhanced surveillance, mandatory testing, biosecurity support, and a national monitoring programme.

5.182. Türkiye indicated that it had temporarily suspended imports of live cattle from the United States following notifications of HPAI cases in cattle and other mammals and based on WOAH information showing the disease remained ongoing, noting that the measure could be reviewed in light of evolving scientific evidence and future decisions by its National Disease Crisis Center.

5.183. The United States acknowledged the response from Türkiye and encouraged it to look at the right standards. The United States submitted its statement in document G/SPS/GEN/2431.

### 5.2.42 Canada's restrictions on Brazilian pork from internationally recognized FMD free zones without vaccination (ID 568) - Concerns of Brazil

5.184. Brazil stated that it remained engaged with Canada but reiterated concern about delays in initiating evaluation of Brazilian swine disease-free zones, noting that WOAH recognized Brazil as free from foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) without vaccination and that it had longstanding freedom from ASF and controlled classical swine fever zones. It recalled obligations under Article 8 and Annex C of the SPS Agreement to avoid undue delays and requested Canada to begin the evaluation process and provide a timeline.

5.185. Canada explained that its Health of Animals Act and Regulations mandated a comprehensive animal disease status evaluation of Brazil to grant enhanced access to Brazilian pork and beef. This would involve scientific risk assessment and on-site evaluation, which required a significant amount of resources. Canadian and Brazilian officials had met in October 2025 and agreed on a clear path forward to address Brazil's various market access requests. Reiterating its commitment to its WTO SPS obligations, Canada encouraged Brazil to withdraw their STC and continue to engage through the established bilateral process.

### 5.2.43 Japan - Restrictions related to FMD (ID 332) - Concerns of Argentina

5.186. Argentina welcomed recent progress in negotiations on market access for beef from its entire territory, noting that Japan's Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries had advanced the sanitary approval process to stage 11 of 12 for beef from zones free of FMD with vaccination, and expressed expectation that the process would be completed in the coming months.

5.187. Japan noted that its market had opened to beef from Argentina's Patagonian region in 2018, following an earlier request in 2017 to allow imports of boneless fresh beef from other regions. Japan explained that it applied its standard approval procedure, in place since 2008, to ensure scientific integrity in evaluating such requests. As Japan was FMD-free without vaccination, imports from regions maintaining FMD-free status through vaccination required detailed technical discussions between both countries' competent authorities. Consultations on the animal health requirements were ongoing, following the completion of the risk assessment for beef imports from regions outside Patagonia in February 2026. Japan reaffirmed its commitment to advancing the process through mutual bilateral collaboration.

### 5.2.44 South Africa's import restrictions on poultry due to highly pathogenic avian influenza (ID 431) - Concerns of the European Union

5.188. The European Union reiterated serious concerns that South Africa maintained countrywide bans on poultry imports from EU member States affected by HPAI, despite restoration of disease-free status in line with WOAH standards, regretting that the measures lacked scientific justification and disregarded WOAH regionalization principles (Articles 4.3.1–4.3.4 of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code). The European Union highlighted limited progress despite technical engagement and prior commitments, noted delays in recognizing disease-free status, and urged South Africa to accept EU regionalization, resume trade from HPAI-free areas, and respond to proposed streamlined procedures for reopening markets.

5.189. South Africa reiterated that it applied WOAH-aligned approaches, including zoning, compartmentalization, and safe commodities, in accordance with the Terrestrial Animal Health Code, and noted ongoing technical exchanges with the European Union. It indicated that while information had been shared, the European Union had submitted a proposal rather than the requested data, which it considered not aligned with a cooperative approach.

### 5.2.45 China's import restrictions due to highly pathogenic avian influenza (ID 406) - Concerns of the European Union

5.190. The European Union reiterated longstanding concerns that China maintained countrywide bans on poultry imports from EU member States affected by HPAI despite EU disease control measures consistent with WOAH regionalization principles, noting that non-recognition of EU-wide regionalization continued to restrict trade. The European Union urged China to comply with SPS Agreement obligations and WOAH standards by allowing imports from disease-free areas.

5.191. China highlighted that it welcomed imports of safe poultry products from the European Union but noted that ongoing HPAI outbreaks in several EU member States had necessitated measures based on scientific principles and risk assessment to protect animal and public health. It indicated that China had lifted restrictions for some countries and concluded regionalization agreements with others, and expressed willingness to continue technical exchanges with the EU on disease control and surveillance.

### 5.2.46 Japan's approval procedures for poultry products (ID 556) - Concerns of the Russian Federation

5.192. The Russian Federation reiterated concerns about delays in Japan's approval procedures for poultry imports, noting that despite Japan's recognition of regionalization and prior inspections, the process for agreeing on veterinary certificates and requirements had remained unresolved due to prolonged technical revisions and lack of response to consultation proposals. It urged Japan to expedite certification approvals to avoid undue delay under SPS obligations and reaffirmed readiness for bilateral cooperation. Finally, the Russian Federation added that the lack of substantive answer demonstrated a low level of transparency, and called upon Japan to comply with its WTO obligations.

### 5.2.47 China's import restrictions due to African swine fever (ID 392) - Concerns of the European Union

5.193. The European Union reiterated longstanding concerns that China maintained countrywide bans on pork imports from EU member States affected by ASF despite EU measures consistent with WOAH regionalization principles, noting that non-recognition of EU-wide regionalization continued

to restrict trade. The European Union urged China to comply with SPS Agreement obligations and WOAH standards by allowing imports from disease-free areas.

5.194. China noted the EU concerns regarding ASF measures and emphasized that its import restrictions were based on scientific evidence and risk assessment, while recognizing WOAH regionalization principles as important references. It indicated that risk assessments had led to lifting restrictions on certain EU member States, such as Belgium, and to cooperation agreements with Finland and Germany. China expressed willingness to strengthen technical exchanges and cooperation with the European Union on ASF prevention and control.

### 5.2.48 Peru's non-application of regionalization for African swine fever (ID 544) - Concerns of the European Union

5.195. The European Union reiterated serious concerns that Peru maintained countrywide bans on pork and pork products from EU member States affected by ASF, including those that had regained disease-free status, and noted that this approach failed to apply WOAH regionalization principles, particularly Article 15.1.23 of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code. The European Union noted that imports of safe products remained restricted despite a harmonized certificate agreed in November 2025, emphasized that EU disease-free zones operated under WOAH standards, and urged Peru to comply with obligations under the SPS Agreement, WOAH standards, and the bilateral trade agreement by allowing imports from disease-free areas without additional restrictions.

5.196. Peru thanked the European Union for its comments and reaffirmed its commitment to the SPS Agreement and their bilateral trade agreement, noting that, during a high-level meeting on 3 June 2026, it had proposed developing a roadmap with concrete actions and timelines to advance issues of mutual interest. Peru stressed the importance of continued technical dialogue between the respective sanitary authorities, based on scientific evidence and transparency, and reiterated its willingness to continue exchanging technical information in a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect.

### 5.2.49 Mexico's import restrictions due to African swine fever (ID 563) - Concerns of the European Union

5.197. The European Union reiterated concerns that Mexico failed to apply the regionalization principle to pork imports, maintaining nationwide ASF-related restrictions on EU member States despite the SPS Agreement, WOAH standards, and the 2017 bilateral health certificate. It noted that Mexico's measures were not sufficiently science-based or proportionate under Article 2 of the SPS Agreement, called for legislative revisions and acceptance of trade from disease-free zones and safe commodities such as collagen and gelatine in line with Article 15.1.23 of the WOAH Terrestrial Animal Health Code, and highlighted that alignment would also be required under the modernized EU-Mexico trade agreement.

5.198. Mexico indicated that its measures could be interpreted as applying regionalization in line with WOAH principles by restricting only affected areas rather than the entire European Union. Mexico reported that SENASICA was working on a regionalization framework to allow exports from ASF-free zones with appropriate guarantees, and reiterated its willingness to strengthen bilateral cooperation and continue dialogue.

### 5.2.50 Colombia's import restrictions due to African swine fever (ID 580) - Concerns of the European Union

5.199. The European Union reiterated concerns that Colombia maintained countrywide bans on pork imports from EU member States affected by ASF, noting lack of progress despite repeated requests, and stated that the measures ignored WOAH-compliant regionalization principles. The European Union urged Colombia to apply regionalization and allow trade from disease-free areas.

5.200. Colombia reiterated its commitment to technical dialogue but indicated that its measures on pork imports responded to the need to prevent the introduction of ASF, an exotic disease with serious risks, and applied to products not meeting conditions of the WOAH Terrestrial Animal Health Code while excluding commodities considered safe. It acknowledged the relevance of Article 6 of the

SPS Agreement and WOAH standards on regionalization but stressed that any adaptation of measures required a technical assessment based on sufficient evidence, and confirmed ongoing review of EU information in line with Andean Decision 879 and SPS obligations.

### 5.2.51 Ecuador - Non-application of regionalization for African swine fever (ID 609) - Concerns of the European Union

5.201. The European Union reiterated concerns that Ecuador maintained import restrictions on pork from EU member States affected by ASF, noting lack of progress despite repeated requests and arguing that the measures failed to apply WOAH regionalization principles. The European Union emphasized that EU disease-free zones and safe commodities complied with international standards, and urged Ecuador to allow imports from disease-free areas in line with the SPS Agreement and WOAH guidelines.

5.202. Ecuador recognized the importance of regionalization but emphasized that ASF remained an exotic disease posing high risks, justifying precautionary measures to protect animal health and food security in line with Articles 2 and 5 of the SPS Agreement and the WOAH Terrestrial Animal Health Code. Any recognition of disease-free zones required a risk analysis under Andean Decision 880. Ecuador invited the European Union to follow the established procedure under Article 6 of the SPS Agreement to initiate technical assessment, while reaffirming commitment to dialogue and science-based trade.

### 5.2.52 China's import restrictions on animal products in relation to bluetongue disease (ID 593) - Concerns of the European Union

5.203. The European Union reiterated strong concerns that China maintained import restrictions on animal products from several EU member States due to bluetongue disease, arguing that these measures were inconsistent with Article 8.3.2 of the WOAH Terrestrial Animal Health Code, which identified safe commodities that should not be restricted. The European Union urged China to lift the measures promptly.

5.204. China noted the European Union's concerns regarding bluetongue-related restrictions and emphasized that its measures on imports of ruminants and related products were based on scientific evidence and risk assessment, indicating that certain products such as embryos and semen could be imported subject to quarantine requirements. China reported ongoing technical consultations with EU member States and stated that it would continue monitoring outbreaks and maintaining communication.

### 5.2.53 South Africa's delays in granting SPS access for poultry, beef, pork, fish and seafood (ID 564) - Concerns of the Russian Federation

5.205. The Russian Federation reiterated concerns about the lack of progress in South Africa's approval procedures for imports of Russian poultry, beef, and pork, requesting expedited consideration of submitted risk assessment questionnaires and feedback on responses provided, including those on BSE submitted in 2018. The Russian Federation highlighted its recognized WOAH animal health statuses, welcomed South Africa's approval of certificates for fish products, and reaffirmed readiness to continue bilateral cooperation.

5.206. South Africa acknowledged the Russian Federation's interest and noted that it had evaluated the submitted information and communicated identified shortcomings to the Russian authorities on 13 May 2026, indicating that it was still awaiting further feedback to proceed.

### 5.2.54 Bolivia's import restrictions on agricultural and fisheries products (ID 530) - Concerns of Peru

5.207. Peru expressed deep concern that Bolivia had continued to block imports of fresh/chilled whole trout since 2017 despite the existence of an agreed sanitary certificate approved nine years earlier, noting that Peru had implemented measures to ensure product safety and engaged in repeated bilateral technical discussions without achieving market access. Peru called on Bolivia to resume technical engagement and establish a working mechanism to resolve the issue, emphasizing

that such dialogue would be consistent with the transparency, cooperation, and trade-facilitation objectives of the SPS Agreement.

### 5.2.55 Australia's undue delays in opening its pork market (ID 610) - Concerns of Brazil

5.208. Brazil highlighted ongoing constructive engagement with Australia but reiterated concern about the lack of progress in approving pork exports, noting that no import risk assessment had been initiated or timeline provided despite sustained exchanges. Brazil recalled obligations under Article 8 and Annex C of the SPS Agreement, pointed to inconsistency with WOAH recognition of Brazil as free from FMD without vaccination, and requested transmission of technical questionnaires and a clear timeline for audit and risk assessment while emphasizing expectations of equitable treatment.

5.209. Australia acknowledged Brazil's concerns and noted that the request for pig meat market access remained under consideration. Australia explained that a comprehensive risk assessment covering multiple diseases, including FMD and classical swine fever, is required despite WOAH recognition of Brazil's FMD-free status. Australia emphasized its ongoing good faith engagement with Brazil engagement, provision of information on its evaluation processes and commitment to WTO obligations as well as to scientific principles.

### 5.2.56 Thailand's sanitary requirements on wet blue leather imports (ID 539) - Concerns of Brazil

5.210. Brazil acknowledged Thailand's ongoing assessment of guarantees provided by Brazil regarding animal health safeguards and official oversight of processing establishments. Brazil emphasized that the intensive chemical treatment process used rendered the requirement for shipment-by-shipment sanitary certification unnecessary and disproportionate. Brazil requested a formal response to its August 2025 proposal, which included a practical alternative based on a list of authorized establishments maintained by its Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply, while reminding that domestic legislation could not exempt Members from their obligations under the SPS Agreement. Brazil remained committed to bilateral discussions.

5.211. Thailand shared its appreciation for the constructive engagement and Brazil's proposal intended to serve as an equivalent to health certificate requirements and indicated that it required additional time for a thorough review of the proposal, considering technical aspects, such as ensuring quality and safety control for imported products, and legal aspects regarding its equivalence to current health certificate requirements. Thailand committed to communicate the outcome of this review directly to Brazil and encouraged Brazil to submit relevant scientific evidence to support the proposal. Thailand believed its measure aligned with WOAH recommendations and Article 3 of the SPS Agreement and expressed its commitment to maintaining open dialogue and continuing technical discussions with Brazil.

### 5.2.57 Thailand's unjustified suspension of Brazilian exports of beef and edible offal (ID 597) - Concerns of Brazil

5.212. Brazil emphasized continued engagement with Thailand but reiterated concern about the prolonged suspension of imports of Brazilian beef and beef offal since September 2024, noting a lack of progress despite multiple interventions. The measure had been imposed based on a preliminary audit without identified sanitary risk or prior technical clarification. Brazil stressed that no risk assessment or scientific justification had been provided, raising concerns under Articles 4 and 5 of the SPS Agreement, and urged Thailand to complete its review and lift the suspension without further delay.

5.213. Argentina supported Brazil's concern regarding Thailand's measures, noting that similar restrictions had prevented Argentina from exporting beef and bovine offal to Thailand (see STC ID 611).

5.214. Thailand indicated that the Department of Livestock Development was conducting a technical review of Brazil's corrective action plan, focusing on traceability and production control systems, and would communicate the outcome once completed. The temporary suspension was applied in a non-

discriminatory manner under its sanitary regulations to ensure disease prevention and traceability. Thailand reaffirmed readiness to continue bilateral technical discussions.

### 5.2.58 Viet Nam's undue delays in the authorization of beef imports (ID 575) - Concerns of Mexico

5.215. Mexico indicated that it had sought since 2015 to reopen exports of bovine meat to Viet Nam, noting that repeated requests for additional information and translation requirements had caused delays and limited progress. Mexico highlighted that despite proposing a technical working group to address outstanding issues, no substantive advancement had occurred, leaving export applications from seven establishments pending.

5.216. Viet Nam indicated that, since receiving Mexico's request in 2016, it had sent multiple communications requesting documentation for import risk analysis, but noted that incomplete, outdated, and untranslated submissions had delayed the process. An on-site audit of Mexico's beef production and control systems was being planned as the next step to advance the assessment.

### 5.2.59 Thailand - Suspension of beef and beef offal imports due to delays in inspection of previously approved establishments (ID 611) - Concerns of Argentina

5.217. Argentina informed Members that beef and beef offal import authorizations had been suspended since January 2025 for 11 Argentinian establishments. Argentina had responded fully to three questionnaires that had been sent by Thailand in 2015, 2018, and 2023 without having received any requests for clarification, and technical and high-level meetings had been held. Argentina further reported that the Thai competent authorities had not responded to numerous notes and requests for in-person inspections. Argentina reiterated its offer to organize a visit in September, and hoped for a prompt confirmation from Thailand.

5.218. Brazil reiterated its interest to receive updates on this STC as it related to another concern it had raised (STC ID 597) and implicated systemic and broader issues with Thai approval processes.

5.219. Thailand acknowledged receipt of the invitation letters to conduct an inspection visit to Argentina's bovine establishments and reported that its Department of Livestock Development was currently considering the proposal. However, Thailand noted that the competent authorities of both Thailand and Argentina needed to first reach a common understanding on the scope and objective of the on-site inspection as Thailand intended to conduct the inspection to renew the import approval of 11 establishments whereas Argentina's proposal included both previously approved establishments and new establishments. Thailand looked forward to continuing its engagement with Argentina through existing technical channels.

### 5.2.60 Guatemala - Delays in the authorization of imports of egg products (ID 618) - Concerns of Mexico

5.220. Reiterating its concerns, Mexico informed the Committee that, in 2024, Guatemala's Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food (MAGA) had conducted an on-site visit to the *Tipo Inspección Federal* (*TIF*) establishment No 499 with the aim of evaluating good manufacturing practices and measures implemented to ensure the absence of HPAI and Newcastle virus. The visit report had concluded non-compliance with WOAH standards. Subsequently, Mexico had submitted technical information proving there was no sanitary risk associated with the relevant products and had shared additional information upon Guatemala's request. While a virtual meeting had been held, MAGA had not responded to the information sent and had requested the scientific technical document supporting Mexico's self-declaration as a zone of velogenic Newcastle disease. In August 2025, a videoconference with MAGA had been requested, but Mexico was still waiting for the meeting to take place. Mexico concluded that an official letter would be sent to the authority to reiterate Mexico's interest in moving forward on this matter.

5.221. Guatemala recalled that an inspection of the FIT establishment No 499 had been carried out, which had shown a sanitary risk associated with HPAI and the velogenic Newcastle disease and non-compliance with WOAH standards. On several occasions, Guatemala had requested further technical and scientific information to support the certification of Mexico as a disease-free country, but evidence and had not been provided for a favourable technical ruling. As a result, Guatemala had

recommended that Mexico request a new inspection once corrective measures were implemented. Guatemala emphasized that its measures were based on scientific principles and a technical assessment, in line with the SPS Agreement and WOAH standards. In a letter of May 2026 referring to the inspection of the FIT establishment No 499, Mexico had requested the application of the national treatment principle. However, as Guatemala had responded in June 2026, the epidemiological conditions in the two countries were not equivalent as Guatemala had been historically free of HPAI and the Newcastle disease. Referring to Articles 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 5.1, and 5.7 of the SPS Agreement as well as Chapters 2.1, 5.3, 10.4, and 10.9 of the WOAH Terrestrial Animal Health Code, Guatemala reaffirmed that its measures were technically justified and consistent with the SPS Agreement. Expressing its willingness to continue bilateral dialogue, Guatemala reiterated its commitment to transparency and called on Mexico to request a new inspection.

### 5.2.61 China's import suspension of fresh fruits (ID 532) - Concerns of Chinese Taipei

5.222. Chinese Taipei reiterated its concern regarding China's suspension of imports of pineapples, wax apples, citrus, and mangoes, and requested China to provide regulations and quarantine requirements for sugar apples, pomelo orchards, and their packing facilities. Chinese Taipei appreciated the partial resumption of market access for sugar apples and pomelos but regretted that China did not consistently apply scientific standards to other orchards and packaging facilities. Noting its numerous requests for technical dialogue, Chinese Taipei regretted that it had not received a substantive response from China. Chinese Taipei further requested China to provide scientific identification and risk assessment reports, recalling that the scale insects at issue were widely distributed in China and could be managed with fumigation and other quarantine treatments to minimize trade barriers. Referring to Articles 2, 3, and 5 of the SPS Agreement, Chinese Taipei urged China to engage in a science-based dialogue and resume trade for a mutually beneficial solution.

5.223. China responded that, in 2021 and 2022, it had suspended the importation of pineapples, sugar apples, wax apples, and citrus from Chinese Taipei due to the repeated detection of quarantine pests such as *Planococcus minor*, which were classified as entry quarantine pests by China. They were not widespread in China and were under official control. China further explained that, since 2023, it had again detected the quarantine pests in mangoes exported from Chinese Taipei and it had therefore suspended these imports in August 2023. Based on a comprehensive assessment of correction measures taken by Chinese Taipei, China had resumed the importation of sugar apples in June 2023 and pomelo in September 2024 and had approved registration of export enterprises that met relevant requirements. China urged Chinese Taipei to further improve its plant quarantine regulatory system.

5.224. Reiterating that scale insects were widely distributed in China, Chinese Taipei asked for the relevant scientific evidence, the pest risk assessment (PRA) report, and official control measures report. Chinese Taipei expressed its readiness to engage in scientific discussions on this issue.

### 5.2.62 US import restrictions on apples and pears (ID 439) - Concerns of the European Union

5.225. The European Union reiterated its longstanding concern with US import restrictions on apples and pears, despite numerous exchanges and completed scientific groundwork ten years earlier. The US final notice had still not been published, without any scientific justification. The European Union indicated that, while the US market was open under a preclearance condition, this remained expensive, effectively closing the US market. The European Union urged the United States to honour its SPS obligations and publish the final notice promptly to allow imports of apples and pears under the agreed systems approach.

5.226. The United States noted it was working through its administrative procedures on the request for expanded market access and reminded the European Union of the existing import requirements. Referring to bilateral US-EU plant health meetings, the next one of which would be held in September 2026, the United States remained interested in maintaining discussions that would meaningfully enhance bilateral trade.

### 5.2.63 Morocco's import ban on ornamental plants (ID 548) - Concerns of the European Union

5.227. Reiterating its concerns, the European Union urged Morocco to provide further clarity and publish and notify the legal act defining how infected/surveillance/pest-free areas were defined by Morocco for Xylella fastidiosa in international trade. Providing transparency and legal clarity would contribute to a better understanding and more predicable trade and would help to provide information to exporting countries on the administrative zones considered by Morocco when setting the zones subject to an import ban. The European Union also asked Morocco to provide substantial responses, going beyond information already provided, to the questions raised by the four most affected EU member States in earlier official letters.

5.228. Morocco recalled its measures aimed at protecting Morrocco's phytosanitary resources, preserve its status as free from Xylella fastidiosa, and prevent any risk of its introduction and spread within its territory. Xylella fastidiosa was one of the most concerning pests internationally and presented a risk for several strategic agricultural sectors, such as the olive, citrus, vine, or almond sectors. In addition, the number of host plants for Xylella fastidiosa had been steadily increasing, which confirmed that the scientific understanding and risk mapping had not yet stabilized. Reaffirming its readiness to assess any new scientific information that would be provided, Morocco added that its measures were part of a preventive approach and, at this stage, technical information provided did not call for a review of the risk assessment.

### 5.2.64 US undue delays in opening its citrus market (ID 542) - Concerns of Brazil

5.229. Brazil reiterated its concerns regarding persistent delays in US approval procedures affecting Brazilian exports of Tahiti lime, an issue that had been under discussion for over two decades. Despite the publication of the PRA and the launch of a public consultation in 2022, no meaningful progress had been achieved. While the United States had provided explanations regarding administrative transitions, resource constraints, and competing priorities, no technical justification had been presented for the continued delay. Brazil noted a recent Foreign Agricultural Service report had acknowledged the economic and social importance of Tahiti lime production in Brazil and appreciated a technical meeting with the USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) in March 2026, although no concrete progress had been achieved since then. Brazil requested an updated assessment of the status of the market access process, including clarification regarding the remaining regulatory steps and the expected timeframe for their completion.

5.230. Argentina was closely monitoring the situation and regretted delays in moving forward US administrative procedures (see STC ID 569).

5.231. The United States responded that APHIS had made progress on this request. Following the completion of the PRA, there were still several steps required before the publication of the initial and final notices in the Federal Register, including the development and bilateral concurrences of risk mitigation measures.

### 5.2.65 US lengthy approval procedures for plant products (ID 596) - Concerns of the European Union

5.232. Acknowledging recent discussions on plant health and related progress on some of the pending market access applications, the European Union reiterated its concerns with complex, burdensome, and lengthy US approval procedures for importing plants and plant products. The European Union noted that the last two market openings obtained for a plant product dated back to September 2023 and they had gone through a 6-year and a 28-year procedure, respectively. The European Union regretted that overall limited progress had been made, with over a third of EU market access applications still at the administrative stage of drafting the initial notice, despite technical work being finalized some time ago, and some applications on hold with no indication as to when the next market opening would be granted. Only the first 6 of the 19 steps needed in the US application procedure were scientific in nature. The European Union invited the United States to expeditiously approve the many longstanding applications submitted by the EU member States and avoid unjustified delays.

5.233. Reiterating that the European Union exported hundreds of different types of plants and plant products to its market, the United States responded that it was actively working on requests from many EU member States. The United States underscored its robust and thorough process for evaluating market access and highlighted the need to balance interests from many trading partners with available resources while ensuring that domestic stakeholders had a voice. Noting the diversity in capacities and approaches of regulatory authorities across the EU member States, the United States recalled that numerous requests had been finalized or were in the process of being finalized in recent years. To conclude, the United States expressed appreciation for the ongoing technical engagement, including in the upcoming US-EU plant health bilateral meetings in September 2026.

### 5.2.66 US delays in the authorization of sweet citrus fruits (ID 569) - Concerns of Argentina

5.234. Argentina reiterated its concerns about the lack of progress towards opening the US market to its sweet citrus fruits. Since 2019, the process had been at a standstill in an unjustified way. Argentina was hopeful that the situation would change and requested again that the United States publish the PRA as soon as possible to open market access for Argentina's sweet citrus fruits. In Argentina's view, the undue delays were inconsistent with Articles 2.2, 5, and 8 of the SPS Agreement, as well as with Annex C thereto. Given the long delays that had occurred and considering this a priority, Argentina asked the United States for an estimated timeline to conclude the process for market access.

5.235. Brazil expressed interest in receiving updates on future developments as this issue linked to STC ID 542.

5.236. Acknowledging the continued bilateral engagement, the United States indicated that it was proceeding through its commodity import approval process and, following review and approval, a draft PRA would be released for stakeholder review for a minimum 30-day comment period. While it could not commit, at that time, to a timeline for completion of the commodity import approval process, the United States stated that it would communicate with Argentina as developments occur.

### 5.2.67 EU quarantine measures on certain pine trees and other products (ID 348) - Concerns of the Russian Federation

5.237. The Russian Federation reiterated its concern about the lack of progress in the review and approval of technical dossiers for exports of potatoes and coniferous trees. The technical dossiers had been submitted in 2020 and, despite requests for the European Commission to lift the ban and provide responses to the submitted materials, and confirmation of its readiness to electronically upload dossiers once approved, the dossiers were still under review. The Russian Federation urged the European Union to consider the technical dossiers without undue delay. The Russian Federation added that the lack of substantive answer from the European Union demonstrated a low level of transparency and called upon the European Union to comply with its WTO obligations.

### 5.2.68 Australia; Japan; Latvia; Lithuania; Poland; Romania; Slovak Republic; Slovenia; United States - Lack of communication on seeds and planting material (ID 631) - Concerns of the Russian Federation

5.238. The Russian Federation reiterated its concern about the lack of communication from several Members' competent authorities regarding requests from its Federal Service for Veterinary and Phytosanitary Surveillance asking for confirmation of the phytosanitary status of seeds and planting material intended for export. The Russian Federation noted that the imports of seed material were conducted at the request of foreign economic operators based on the results of an analysis of information received from the competent authority of the exporting country. The corresponding requirements were regulated by the Federal Law No 206-FZ of 21 July 2014 on plant quarantine and the Rules for the Control of Production Sites (including Processing), Shipment of Quarantine Products intended for import. The Russian Federation urged the competent authorities of relevant Members to respond promptly to its requests of confirmation of the phytosanitary status of seeds and planting material intended for export.

#### 5.2.69 India's import restrictions on Japanese cedar (ID 630) - Concerns of Japan

5.239. Japan reiterated its concern about the continued import restrictions imposed by India on Japanese cedar. Both countries had engaged in technical consultations based on scientific evidence and had reached an agreement on phytosanitary measures in June 2021. Japan regretted that India's domestic administrative procedures had remained suspended for five years without any scientific justification, hindering exports of Japanese cedar. Japan had repeatedly requested India to complete the administrative process, but India had not yet provided any rationale for the suspension. As the import restriction had been in place for an extended period without providing any scientific evidence and had caused an undue delay, Japan took the view that India did not fulfil the obligations of the SPS Agreement, and urged India to comply with its obligations, avoid undue delays, and immediately finalize the procedure required to lift the import ban.

5.240. Noting ongoing discussions, India reported that the issue had been discussed in a recent India–Japan joint working group meeting in March 2026. India reiterated its commitment to engage constructively and advance the process in a timely manner.

5.241. Japan added that the technical consultations on this matter had been concluded, and that the meeting of March 2026 had not been a meeting between phytosanitary authorities, but a diplomatic meeting, where Japan had repeatedly requested India to complete its administrative process. Japan urged India to immediately complete the procedure required to lift the import ban on Japanese cedar.

5.242. India noted Japan's concerns, which would be conveyed to the relevant authorities.

### 5.3 Information on resolution of issues

5.243. Under this agenda item, Burundi took the floor in relation to training and support activities and EU approaches to residues of pesticides and MOAH. Burundi noted that a meeting had been held in Brussels with delegates from African Members, which had led to recommendations to be implemented by 3 September 2026. Burundi enquired whether the European Union, prior to implementation, had taken into account small producers, who might be most adversely affected by these norms, and Members that used plant protection products accepted by international standards.

5.244. The European Union acknowledged the comments, noting they could have been discussed as part of the STCs, and invited Burundi to liaise with the European Union bilaterally through their embassy or national enquiry point.

5.245. The Chairperson announced the Secretariat's intention to contact Members who had outstanding STCs that had not been discussed in several years to find out if any of these concerns had been resolved. This exercise would be launched after the June 2026 Committee meeting.

## 6 OPERATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SPS AGREEMENT

### 6.1 Equivalence

#### 6.1.1 Information from Members

6.1. No Member provided any information under this agenda item.

### 6.2 Pest- and disease-free areas (regionalization)

#### 6.2.1 Information from Members

##### 6.2.1.1 Chinese Taipei - Freedom from African swine fever (ASF) (G/SPS/GEN/2408)

6.2. Chinese Taipei informed Members that it had regained ASF-free status through WOAH self-declaration in April 2026, following a single confirmed outbreak in October 2025 that had been rapidly contained through comprehensive control measures in line with the WOAH Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Article 15.1.7). It outlined a phased eradication and surveillance strategy and invited

Members, in accordance with Article 6 of the SPS Agreement, to update their measures and lift any restrictions based on the new disease-free status.

#### 6.2.1.2 Brazil - Experience in achieving foot-and-mouth disease free without vaccination status

6.3. Brazil informed Members that WOAH had recognized all Brazilian regions as free from FMD without vaccination in May 2025, highlighting this achievement as the result of long-term investments in veterinary services, surveillance, and disease control programmes. It emphasized that recognition of WOAH-official sanitary statuses supported SPS principles such as harmonization, regionalization, transparency, and predictability, warned that failure to take such recognitions into account could undermine confidence in trade and incentives for animal health investments, and encouraged Members to rely on international standards and officially recognized sanitary statuses when designing and implementing SPS measures.

#### 6.2.1.3 Argentina - Recovery of highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) freedom

6.4. Argentina reported that it had regained HPAI-free status following the closure of its last outbreak and submission of a self-declaration to WOAH in accordance with Article 10.4.6 of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code. Argentina noted that no further cases had occurred after completion of control measures, that exports had resumed to most markets, and urged trading partners to promptly recognize its updated status and restore trade in line with WOAH recommendations and the SPS Agreement, while emphasizing the importance of regionalization and compartmentalization principles.

#### 6.2.1.4 Ukraine - Report on HPAI status

6.5. Ukraine reported that it had remained free from HPAI since May 2021 and had submitted a WOAH self-declaration in June 2021 in accordance with Chapter 10.4 of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code, noting that most trading partners had since resumed imports and recognized its zoning arrangements. Ukraine emphasized that no outbreaks had occurred in commercial poultry establishments since 2021 and that subsequent detections in wild birds, duly reported through the World Animal Health Information System (WAHIS), should not affect its trade status under WOAH standards, and reaffirmed its commitment to implementing Article 6 of the SPS Agreement and the Committee guidelines in document G/SPS/48 to facilitate trade in poultry and poultry products.

#### 6.2.1.5 European Union - Hungary free from peste des petits ruminants (PPR) (G/SPS/GEN/2425)

6.6. The European Union reported that Hungary had experienced limited outbreaks of peste des petits ruminants in 2025 but had successfully contained and eradicated the disease through WOAH-aligned regionalization (zoning) measures and comprehensive control actions, leading to the restoration of its PPR-free status as recognized by WOAH from 24 October 2025. The European Union highlighted the effectiveness of EU measures under its Animal Health Law, supported by EFSA risk assessments, and invited Members, in line with Article 6 of the SPS Agreement, to acknowledge Hungary's disease-free status, as detailed in document G/SPS/GEN/2425.

#### 6.2.1.6 Chile - Freedom from HPAI (G/SPS/GEN/2427)

6.7. Chile reported, in accordance with Article 6 of the SPS Agreement, that it had regained country-wide HPAI-free status for poultry as of 24 June 2026, following implementation of WOAH-aligned surveillance and control measures. Chile highlighted the use of zoning and contingency plans to ensure safe trade continuity, referenced document G/SPS/GEN/2427, and emphasized the importance of regionalization and Committee guidance in document G/SPS/48.

### 6.2.2 Annual report in accordance with the Guidelines to Further the Practical Implementation of Article 6 in G/SPS/48 (G/SPS/GEN/2406)

6.8. The Secretariat referred to the guidelines in document G/SPS/48, and the requirement to prepare an annual report concerning requests for recognition of pest- or disease-free areas or areas of low pest or disease prevalence, determinations on whether to recognize such areas, and Members'

experiences in implementing Article 6, including the provision of relevant background information to other interested Members. The Secretariat noted that the report contained in G/SPS/GEN/2406 covered the period from 1 April 2025 until 31 March 2026. To take advantage of the ePing SPS&TBT Platform, the Secretariat had modified the reporting of notifications on regionalization, namely on trade facilitating measures.

### 6.3 Operation of transparency provisions

#### 6.3.1 Update on Transparency Working Group

6.9. The Chairperson recalled the recommendation adopted in the Sixth Review Report to create a Transparency Working Group.

6.10. Chile, on behalf of New Zealand and Chile as stewards of the Transparency Working Group, reported on the fifth meeting of the group, highlighting discussions on challenges and solutions related to SPS notification practices, including content clarity, use of documentation, and alignment with international standards, alongside emphasis on capacity building and domestic coordination. It noted the presentations and the outcomes of the Workshop on Transparency held on 22 and 23 June 2026 and relevant calls by Members to move towards concrete outputs through written proposals while ensuring inclusiveness. Chile further outlined next steps, including the circulation of a meeting summary and revised work plan, volunteers' engagement on priority topics, and preparation of written papers or proposals.

#### 6.3.2 Report on the Workshop on Transparency

6.11. The Chairperson reported that a Workshop on Transparency had been held, including dedicated training for government officials responsible for implementing SPS transparency obligations and practical discussions involving capital-based National Notification Authorities and National Enquiry Points. She highlighted exchanges of experiences and good practices on coordination, noting that these discussions could inform future work of the Transparency Working Group, and thanked participants and speakers for their active engagement and contributions.

6.12. Chile thanked the Secretariat for organizing the workshop and noted the importance of the topics discussed, particularly those that had been addressed though simulations, group work and practical exercises.

6.13. Brazil expressed its gratitude for an impressive opportunity to bring new ideas and share experiences to improve SPS transparency practices. Brazil further underlined the value of getting acquainted with the transparency practices followed by other Members and how this information would be beneficial once back home to consider improvements for national procedures and practices.

6.14. Burundi echoed previous statements in highlighting the value of the workshop for learning and networking and suggested that, in the future, such activities could extend beyond two days.

6.15. For further information, see the report of the Workshop circulated in G/SPS/R/120.

#### 6.3.3 Information from Members

6.16. No Member provided any information under this agenda item.

#### 6.3.4 Information from the Secretariat

6.17. The Secretariat provided an update on the STDF-funded project led by Kenya, Namibia, South Africa, Tanzania, and Uganda, launched in December 2025 to strengthen transparency and market access through capacity building and enhancements to the ePing SPS&TBT Platform. It reported that national workshops had been held in Tanzania, Namibia, and South Africa, with a next workshop planned in Kenya, and that outcomes would feed into a WTO-wide survey in 2026 to inform future improvements. The Secretariat also highlighted a new feature on the ePing SPS&TBT Platform – in testing phase – allowing users to contact their national enquiry points directly regarding notifications, noted ongoing outreach activities including virtual clinics and ePing walk-in sessions, and encouraged Members to participate in these initiatives.

6.18. Namibia expressed appreciation to the WTO Secretariat and the STDF secretariat and partner organizations for continued support through this STDF project. Namibia further commended the strong collaboration among beneficiary countries, noting that this partnership demonstrated the value of regional cooperation in strengthening SPS transparency practices and by supporting market access. Finally, Namibia highlighted how the project complemented Namibian ongoing efforts to strengthen its national SPS framework and concluded by recalling that continued capacity building was vital for Namibia and the other project partners, as well as for developing and LDC Members as a whole.

## 6.4 Control, inspection and approval procedures

### 6.4.1 Information from Members

6.19. Ukraine noted the need to increase both transparency and predictability of existing procedures for remote audits, as well as the recognition of relevant results. Ukraine was aware of a relevant thematic session that had taken place four years earlier, but highlighted that at the time of making its statement both technologies and international dynamics had changed, calling for renewed attention on this topic.

## 6.5 Special and differential treatment

### 6.5.1 Information from Members

6.20. In a statement that also related to agenda item 4 on cross-cutting issues, Namibia, on behalf of the G-90, welcomed the adoption of the MC14 S&DT Decision as a milestone marking significant progress for the multilateral trading system and reflecting a shared commitment to make S&DT more precise, effective, and operational. There had been vital cross-collaboration between the SPS and TBT Committees and the CTD-SS, and the September 2025 thematic session on S&DT had provided an invaluable opportunity for Members to share experiences as reflected in the moderator's report (G/SPS/GEN/2366). In light of the forward-looking mandate in the MC14 S&DT Decision for the SPS and TBT Committees to further their discussions on optimizing the implementation of the Agreements, Namibia recalled the G-90 recommendations in document JOB/TN/CTD/17, JOB/SPS/47, and JOB/TBT/602 to: (i) continue structured discussions on S&DT provisions of the SPS and TBT Agreements, including identifying practical improvements and organizing further thematic sessions, as appropriate; (ii) introduce concrete improvements to notifications and transparency, such as easing positive consideration of extension requests in the context of comment periods, promoting voluntary notifications of such extensions to the Committee, and enhancing the ePing SPS&TBT Platform; and (iii) optimize technical assistance and capacity building, including discussing leveraging innovative methods of financing. In this context, Namibia, on behalf of the G-90, proposed placing its communication as a standing agenda item in both the SPS and TBT Committees to further the discussions and requested the Secretariat's assistance in undertaking a factual stock-taking exercise and mapping of existing efforts and initiatives in these three areas it had outlined to provide a shared understanding of what had been done so far and avoid duplication.

6.21. Regretting that this had not been discussed earlier in the meeting under agenda item 4 on cross-cutting issues, the United States and the European Union expressed reservations about adding a standing agenda item, also given the existing standing agenda item on special and differential treatment (agenda item 6.5). While it welcomed the MC14 S&DT Decision, the European Union also expressed reservations about agreeing, at this point in time, on any proposals and looked forward to the discussions.

6.22. The Chairperson suggested that Members discuss among themselves how best to use existing agenda items to deal with suggestions and proposals put forward by the G-90.

## 6.6 Monitoring of the use of international standards

### 6.6.1 New issues

6.23. No Member provided any information under this agenda item.

### 6.6.2 Issues previously raised

#### 6.6.2.1 European Union - FMD restrictions not consistent with the WOAH international standard

6.24. The European Union highlighted inconsistencies in Members' application of WOAH standards on FMD, noting that despite clear provisions in the WOAH Terrestrial Animal Health Code on zoning and safe commodities (Articles 8.8.34–8.8.41), some Members continued to impose unnecessary restrictions. It emphasized that FMD risks could be effectively managed and that products such as UHT milk, heat-treated meat, and gelatine should not require FMD-related conditions, and urged Members to correctly apply WOAH standards to support safe and uninterrupted trade.

#### 6.6.2.2 European Union - ASF restrictions not consistent with the WOAH international standard

6.25. The European Union reported about the inconsistent application of WOAH standards on ASF, noting that despite clear guidance in the WOAH Terrestrial Animal Health Code on zoning and safe commodities, some Members continued to impose blanket bans. It emphasized that ASF risks could be effectively managed and that certain products, including long-cured meats, should not require ASF-related conditions, and encouraged Members to adopt science-based, proportionate measures to facilitate safe trade.

#### 6.6.2.3 European Union - HPAI restrictions not consistent with the WOAH international standard

6.26. The European Union noted that many Members maintained countrywide bans following avian influenza outbreaks, contrary to obligations under Article 6 and Annex C of the SPS Agreement, and that such measures were not scientifically justified where effective zoning, movement controls, and biosecurity measures were in place. It called for application of WOAH Terrestrial Animal Health Code provisions, including Articles 10.4.3 and 10.4.6, to recognize disease-free zones and allow trade from areas that had regained HPAI-free status.

### 6.6.3 Annual report in accordance with the Procedure to Monitor the Process of International Harmonization in G/SPS/11/Rev.1 (G/SPS/GEN/2407)

6.27. The Secretariat indicated that it had distributed the annual report in document G/SPS/GEN/2407. The current report included a new section on notifications and the use of relevant international standards. In accordance with the monitoring procedure, the Secretariat would bring these issues to the attention of the three standard-setting bodies.

## 6.7 Follow-up to the Sixth Review of the Operation and Implementation of the SPS Agreement

### 6.7.1 Report on the informal meeting

6.28. The Chairperson reported that Members had discussed the SPS mentoring system and implementation of remaining recommendations from the Sixth Review Report during the informal meeting held on 24 July 2026, noting that issues related to the Transparency Working Group had already been addressed separately and that the mentoring system would be discussed under a dedicated agenda item. She indicated that a draft summary of the informal meeting would be circulated for comments. The final version of the report is included in Annex A.

### 6.7.2 Information from Members

6.29. No Member provided any information under this agenda item.

# 7 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND COOPERATION

## 7.1 Information from the Secretariat

### 7.1.1 WTO SPS activities

7.1. The Secretariat reported on technical assistance and outreach activities delivered since the last Committee meeting. The Secretariat had delivered one national seminar on SPS and TBT in Timor-Leste in May and had organized the Thematic Workshop on Transparency in June (see the report of the Workshop circulated in G/SPS/R/120). The Secretariat had also delivered presentations upon invitation by other organizations, in person or virtually. Various of these outreach activities had been organized at the initiative of academic institutions. Other activities included a WTO workshop for francophone parliamentarians, an International Grains Council conference, and the technical congress of the Global Alliance of Pet Food Associations. The Secretariat further provided information about planned activities in 2026, namely, a course on Essentials for SPS Committee Participation, in French, scheduled to take place in a hybrid format in October-November, and a national workshop on the SPS Agreement in Brazil in December.

### 7.1.2 Update on mentoring system (G/SPS/GEN/2423)

7.2. The Chairperson reminded the Committee of the report prepared by the Secretariat in document G/SPS/GEN/2423, which summarized information on the pilot phase of the SPS mentoring system and feedback from participants to assist Members in evaluating the feasibility and value of continuing with the mentoring system. The report had been presented in the informal meeting earlier in the week. Members had expressed their support to extend the SPS mentoring system and had shared suggestions to improve the system. In light of these discussions in the informal meeting, the Chairperson suggested that the SPS mentoring system be extended for two years, with an update in June 2027.

7.3. The Secretariat indicated that it would revise the concept note on the SPS mentoring system in document G/SPS/GEN/2314/Rev.1 and launch a new call for mentees after the summer.

7.4. Namibia, Pakistan, Morocco, the United Kingdom, Canada, Burundi, Peru, and the European Union expressed strong support for extending the SPS mentoring system, and many of them shared positive results from their participation as mentee or mentor in the pilot phase of the programme. In terms of possible improvements, Namibia suggested that the programme should expand mentor availability and incorporate in-person meetings during Committee weeks. Pakistan suggested that provisions should be made for the replacement of mentees or mentors to ensure continuity of mentoring activities in instances of staff turnover. Institutional participation should be encouraged alongside individual participation for sustained implementation of mentoring outcomes, and opportunities for in person exchanges during Committee meetings be provided. Morocco noted that an experience-sharing visit between the mentor and mentee would facilitate networking, exchanges, and follow-up. In voicing its support, Canada noted that an extension of two years seemed appropriate and welcomed suggestions made to improve the system.

7.5. The Committee agreed to extend the mentoring system for two years, with a mid-term update in 2027.

### 7.1.3 STDF (G/SPS/GEN/2414)

7.6. The STDF Secretariat reported that demand for STDF support continued to rise sharply, with over 400 project applications received for the current round of grant consideration, resulting in greater competition for STDF grants. At its next working group meeting, the STDF had funds to cover two new projects alongside some project preparation grants. Information about its 27 ongoing projects, upcoming deadline for grant application (1 August 2026), funding details, and application modalities were available on its website.

7.7. The STDF Secretariat informed the Committee about a recent study on scaling and SPS financing examining how the partnership could better expand the reach and impact of its work and announced a study report on SPS financing to identify opportunities to mobilise more diverse sources of finance to consider persistent investment challenges. The SDTF also reminded Members

of its briefing note on remote audit and inspection for SPS compliance and ongoing in-country related work, and announced that its 2025 annual report, entitled "Accelerating safe trade: from innovation to scale", had been published, highlighting the strong investment case for SPS catalytical role.

7.8. The STDF Secretariat expressed its appreciation for the financial support from its donors, Australia, Canada, the European Commission, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United States, and highlighted that it had welcomed the United Kingdom as a new donor in 2026. It also reported a funding gap of approximately USD 1.9 million for the full implementation of its 2026 work plan and was actively seeking engagement of new funding partners. The next STDF Working Group meeting was on 30 June – 1 July 2026, to be chaired by FAO.

7.9. Making a statement in relation to agenda items 4, 6, and 7, Burkina Faso, on behalf of WAEMU members, looked forward to working on the implementation of the MC14 S&DT Decision. It welcomed the work of the Transparency Working Group and the SPS mentoring system pilot in 2025-2026 and encouraged the work to continue with the aim of strengthening transparency, simplifying access to information, promoting online tools, and extending the SPS mentoring system. Noting that WAEMU members continued to face challenges linked to SPS surveillance, risk management, laboratory infrastructure, certification systems, traceability, and effective participation in international standard setting activities, Burkina Faso welcomed the WTO technical assistance activities and the support provided by the STDF and encouraged partners to continue their efforts to assist African counties in strengthening their SPS systems.

## 7.2 Information from Members

### 7.2.1 European Union - SPS-related technical assistance provided by the European Union in 2024 and 2025 (G/SPS/GEN/1139/Add.8)

7.10. The European Union reported on SPS-related technical assistance provided by the European Union and its member States to developing and least developed countries in 2024-2025, as detailed in document G/SPS/GEN/1139/Add.8. The European Union explained that it had financed over 350 projects, with budgets ranging from EUR 1,600 to 25 million, and benefitting over 90 countries, groups of countries, regional and international organizations, and international standard setting bodies. Its assistance was geared towards capacity building, improving governance, and meeting international standards, and projects related to animal health, plant health and food safety, either in a complex format targeting several aspects for example to promote market access, or concentrating on targeted issues, such as the control of specific diseases and pests. The European Union invited Members interested in receiving SPS-related technical assistance to approach the EU delegation in their country or the relevant directorates of the EU Commission.

### 7.2.2 Australia - Cooperation within the Indo-Pacific

7.11. Reporting on SPS-related cooperation with Indo-Pacific partners, Australia informed Members that it continued to prioritize practical biosecurity cooperation through various efforts including longstanding technical working groups with New Zealand and renewed information sharing engagement as well as a biosecurity partnership with Indonesia. Australia also informed the Committee about an upcoming Quarantine Regulators Meeting in August on Biosecurity beyond borders. These meetings provided a unique platform for regulatory agencies to exchange best practices, advance innovation, and work towards more harmonized biosecurity measures facilitating trade. Australia further highlighted regional capacity building through broader initiatives, such as the Southeast Asia and Australian government-to-government programme to strengthen institutional linkages and regulatory capability across Southeast Asia.

## 8 CONCERNS WITH PRIVATE AND COMMERCIAL STANDARDS

8.1. No Member provided any information under this agenda item.

# 9 OBSERVERS

## 9.1 Information from observer organizations

### 9.1.1 WAEMU (G/SPS/GEN/2410)

9.1. WAEMU reported on SPS-related activities in 2021-2025, highlighting a new regulation, implementing regulations, and related training courses in the veterinary area, concerted actions in the area of plant health, implementation of regional programmes and contribution to the global initiative to eradicate the peste des petits ruminants by 2030, operationalization of a pesticide registration committee in West Africa, contribution to a regional initiative to prevent biotechnological risks and support to the set-up of a laboratory network and a regional reference GMO detection laboratory, progress in the area of veterinary drugs, and coordination and exchange of information within its veterinary committee and phytosanitary sub-committee. The WAEMU commission was planning to set up subregional perspectives by 2030, in line with 2025-2030 strategic plan. Future activities were thus organized around seven complementary axes to continue expanding harmonization and mutual recognition of SPS norms and certification procedures, strengthening animal health and actions against cross-border animal diseases, securing phytosanitary status and market access, consolidating pesticide management, reinforcing biosecurity, improving quality and security of veterinary drugs, and accelerating digitalization. WAEMU was committed to harmonizing SPS measures and strengthen capacity, and stood ready to deepen its exchanges with the Committee.

### 9.1.2 CAHFSA (G/SPS/GEN/2411)

9.2. The report of CAHFSA's activities is contained in document G/SPS/GEN/2411.

### 9.1.3 OIRSA (G/SPS/GEN/2412)

9.3. The report of OIRSA's activities is contained in document G/SPS/GEN/2412.

### 9.1.4 GSO (G/SPS/GEN/2413)

9.4. The report of GSO's activities is contained in document G/SPS/GEN/2413.

### 9.1.5 African Union (G/SPS/GEN/2415)

9.5. The report of the African Union's activities is contained in document G/SPS/GEN/2415.

### 9.1.6 ITC (G/SPS/GEN/2417)

9.6. The report of ITC's activities is contained in document G/SPS/GEN/2417.

### 9.1.7 IICA (G/SPS/GEN/2419)

9.7. IICA highlighted workstreams implemented with USDA support. IICA had provided support to Latin American and Caribbean countries to strengthen preparedness and response capacity for transboundary animal diseases through activities implemented under a New World Screwworm prevention control and eradication programme and an IICA-USDA ASF partnership. In addition, IICA was working with the SPS Secretariat on updating its manual of good practices for SPS Committee participation.

9.8. In reference to its ongoing collaboration with IICA on a handbook of good practices for SPS Committee participation, the Secretariat reported that it had reached out and would continue to reach out to some delegates to request feedback on the draft manual and invited interested Members to express their interest in reviewing the document.

9.9. Burkina Faso welcomed the reports of observers, in particular those of the African Union and WAEMU, and encouraged them to continue to share information in the Committee. Burkina Faso recalled harmonization of sanitary regulations and cooperation were key and noted that WAEMU had

engaged in several activities in this respect. WAEMU members reaffirmed their engagement in favour of a multilateral rules-based, transparent, inclusive, and predictable trade system and Burkina Faso reiterated its call to reinforce technical cooperation to the benefit of WAEMU members and the WAEMU commission.

### 9.2 Requests for observer status

9.10. The Chairperson informed the Committee that no new nor pending requests for observer status had been received.

## 10 OTHER BUSINESS

10.1. The European Union expressed its appreciation for the excellent chairmanship over the last year of Ms Maria Cosme, of France, and thanked the interim Chairperson, Ms Cecilia Risolo, of Argentina, for chairing the present Committee meeting.

## 11 DATE AND AGENDA OF NEXT MEETING

11.1. The Chairperson recalled that the next regular meeting of the Committee was scheduled for 4-6 November 2026. It would be preceded by two thematic sessions, a transparency working group meeting, and an informal meeting. The proposed calendar of Committee meetings for 2026 and 2027 had been circulated as document G/SPS/GEN/2300 and G/SPS/GEN/2404, respectively.

11.2. The Secretariat indicated that it would prepare a summary report of the meeting based on oral interventions, complemented by Members' ability to download statements via eAgenda.

11.3. The Chairperson informed the Committee that the Secretariat would circulate relevant upcoming deadlines by e-mail, namely:

a. for comments on the Chairperson's draft report of the informal Committee meeting: Monday, 6 July 2026;

b. for comments on the stewards' draft report of the Transparency Working Group meeting (to be circulated on 30 June): Tuesday, 7 July 2026;

c. for volunteers to express interest in working on topics identified by the SPS Transparency Working Group: Tuesday, 7 July 2026;

d. for written comments on the proposals and draft programmes for thematic sessions (G/SPS/GEN/2387/Rev.1 and G/SPS/GEN/2416; G/SPS/GEN/2389 and G/SPS/GEN/2426; and G/SPS/GEN/2381), and proposing speakers for the November thematic sessions: Friday, 24 July 2026;

e. for explanatory proposals on proposed topics for 2027 thematic sessions: Wednesday, 14 October 2026;

f. for new issues for consideration under the monitoring procedure and for agenda items for the June meeting: Wednesday, 14 October 2026; and

g. for the distribution of the annotated draft agenda: Friday, 16 October 2026.

## ANNEX A

## INFORMAL SESSION – 24 JUNE 2026

REPORT BY THE CHAIRPERSON

At the informal meeting held on 24 June 2026, the Committee discussed the follow-up to thematic sessions, upcoming thematic sessions and the follow-up to the Sixth Review.

## 1 THEMATIC SESSIONS

### 1.1 Follow-up to thematic sessions

1.1. I first recalled that the former Chairperson had proposed at the March meeting to systematically add an agenda item to facilitate follow-up discussions on thematic sessions, based on Members' feedback to improve the Committee's follow-up. The inclusion of this agenda item provided an opportunity to reflect on the discussions from previously held thematic sessions and to identify any potential follow-up work or actions for the Committee, as relevant. I reminded Members that some discussions had already taken place at the last informal meeting on the follow-up to the Thematic Session on Import Controls, including the presentation of a follow-up paper by the proponent (G/SPS/GEN/2392), as part of a joint reflection with other Members. I then invited Members to continue their discussions on any follow-up activities to previously held thematic sessions or to discuss more generally the follow-up approach to thematic sessions.

1.2. One Member sought confirmation that this agenda item was on a trial basis, and queried its inclusion in the June meeting in the absence of a thematic session. The Member further requested clarification on the length of the trial period beyond June, and expressed its view that follow-up reflections should preferably be concluded during the thematic session itself or if necessary, within the same week of the thematic session, and not in subsequent meetings.

1.3. In response, I concurred that there had been no thematic sessions held during the week, and as such there was no specific follow-up discussion for the Committee. I then proposed that the Committee include this agenda item for the November informal meeting to provide an opportunity to reflect and follow-up on the two scheduled thematic sessions. I invited the Committee's feedback, and one Member indicated its agreement with this approach. Based on the feedback, and in the absence of any objections, I indicated that the Committee would maintain the agenda item for the November informal meeting.

### 1.2 Upcoming thematic sessions

1.4. Further to the discussions at the March 2026 Committee meeting, I recalled that Members had agreed to hold two thematic sessions in November 2026 and one in March 2027. I invited the proponents and Members to further discuss the organization of these thematic sessions, noting that no Member had submitted comments on these proposals by the 10 April deadline.

1.5. We first discussed the two thematic sessions to be held in November 2026, starting with the proposal on **promoting transparency in sampling, testing, and analytic methods used to determine compliance with sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures** (G/SPS/GEN/2387/Rev.1) submitted by Argentina, Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, Ecuador, New Zealand and the United States. The United States introduced the draft programme (G/SPS/GEN/2416), highlighting the work of the co-sponsors in developing this document. The United States underscored the session's focus on private sector engagement and challenges faced, and also on best practices, especially in relation to Members' novel ways to facilitate trade. The United States invited Members to provide ideas/suggestions, propose speakers as early as possible, and overall engage in collaborative discussions. Several co-sponsors echoed the importance of increasing transparency in these methods and underscored the valuable opportunity to exchange good practices in facilitating trade, examine existing SPS disciplines and ISSB guidance, and explore links to the Committee's work on control, inspection and approval procedures. One co-sponsor further noted the burdensome nature of these methods for some Members, and

another co-sponsor encouraged Members to propose a diverse range of speakers, including from LDCs.

1.6. One Member, while recognizing the importance of the topic, noted that any technical matters should be discussed in the relevant ISSB fora. The Member further highlighted that discussions should be conducted in a balanced manner, taking into consideration exporting and importing Members' perspectives while respecting the importing Member's appropriate level of protection (ALOP), as highlighted in the discussions in the Working Group on Approval Procedures.

1.7. Secondly, Australia and Canada provided information on their proposal on **hitchhiker pests in international trade** (G/SPS/GEN/2389), drawing attention to the draft programme circulated in document G/SPS/GEN/2426. The co-sponsors underscored the importance of the topic and the opportunity to share experiences and best practices. Noting that these pests were transported with traded goods, Australia highlighted their invasive impact, wide range of pathways and overall growing challenge to trade, animal and plant health. Canada similarly underscored the pest's wide-ranging impact which was not restricted to traditional SPS actors and parts of the supply chain with which Members were accustomed to engaging. Canada also acknowledged the ongoing work in bodies such as the IPPC. The co-sponsors welcomed further suggestions and engagement with Members, including how Members could contribute to the session. Two Members welcomed the proposal and indicated their willingness to share their extensive experience to further enrich the session.

1.8. Thirdly, we discussed the thematic session to be held in March 2027. Saudi Arabia expressed appreciation for the positive feedback and comments received on its proposal on **artificial intelligence and emerging technologies in the SPS area** (G/SPS/GEN/2381). Saudi Arabia noted the fruitful discussions held since the last Committee meeting to identify possible areas of cooperation and further invited interested Members to convey their interest as soon as possible to facilitate early preparations. One Member expressed support for the thematic session and indicated its willingness to work with Saudi Arabia to further develop the proposal.

1.9. I then invited Members to submit written comments on the proposals and draft programmes for these thematic sessions, and also to propose speakers for the November thematic sessions by the deadline of **Friday, 24 July 2026**. Lastly, recognizing Members' appreciation for advance planning of thematic sessions, I invited Members to reflect on whether any other thematic sessions should be scheduled for 2027, and to submit explanatory proposals outlining their proposed topics for consideration ahead of the November meeting. I also indicated that we would revert to the discussion on thematic sessions in the formal meeting.

## 2 FOLLOW-UP TO THE SIXTH REVIEW OF THE OPERATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SPS AGREEMENT

2.1. The Secretariat drew Members' attention to the report of the pilot phase of the SPS mentoring system, circulated as G/SPS/GEN/2423. Participants in the pilot phase had shared the view that Members would benefit from the extension of the mentoring system. The Secretariat presented some of the challenges and success factors included in the report. In case the Committee decided to extend the mentoring system, the Secretariat presented a proposed way forward, and would circulate a revised concept note setting out the mentoring process, which would build on the experience in the pilot phase. While the Secretariat would manage the calls for participation of mentees and mentors, select and match participants, convene the initial meeting for each pair or group, and provide any additional support upon request, each relationship would decide on all their organizational aspects. The proposed way forward also included a more in-depth review and assessment of mentee applications, with interviews to candidates and sharing of information to Missions prior to selection. Members were invited to provide alternative approaches and comments to the proposed approach.

2.2. Several participants in the programme, as well as other Members not involved in the pilot phase expressed strong support for the extension of the mentoring system beyond the pilot phase.

2.3. Participants in the pilot phase praised this bridge building initiative, that allowed the sharing of experiences, best practices and technical expertise, and that promoted peer to peer learning to address specific needs. Participants also noted the need for realistic objectives. Some mentees and mentors indicated they would continue their relationship beyond the pilot phase, others reiterated

their interest in acting again as mentors and others expressed their availability to share lessons learned. One participant suggested to include the possibility to replace candidates unable to continue, to encourage institutional participation for knowledge retention and to consider in-person interactions for further effectiveness. Another Member saw value in the discussion on how to translate the results into institutional capacity to support implementation of the SPS Agreement.

2.4. Regarding the possible way forward, Members praised the objective and pragmatic approach proposed and the focus on the demand-driven nature of the programme. Some Members sought further clarification on the duration of the mentoring system after its extension. One of those Members pointed to the need to develop terms of reference, in addition to the revised concept note, should the mentoring system become permanent, and raised concerns about the sustainability of the Secretariat's resources and the availability of mentors. Another Member sought clarification on the opportunity to form groups rather than pairs, which was confirmed by the Secretariat as a possibility, depending on the applications received, should Members find it useful.

2.5. The Chairperson proposed for the Committee to consider extending the mentoring programme for two years, with the possibility of having a review in June 2027 to make adjustments or changes as necessary. No Member opposed the proposal, that would be put forward for adoption in the formal meeting.

2.6. The Chairperson also recalled that Members had been invited to provide their views on how to move forward with the implementation of other recommendations from the Sixth Review. Document JOB/SPS/46 provided an overview of the actions undertaken to implement those recommendations. The Chairperson recalled that, in March 2026, one Member had invited the Committee's views on how to make progress on the recommendation on MRLs, noting the numerous STCs being raised in the Committee, and had suggested revisiting trade facilitative approaches to setting MRLs.

2.7. No Member took the floor on this topic.

## 3 OTHER SPS ISSUES

3.1. I then provided an opportunity for Members to raise any other SPS issues. However, no Member took the floor.

3.2. The Secretariat expressed its appreciation to Members for their consistent efforts in uploading statements to eAgenda, and further encouraged Members to submit these oral interventions in advance of taking the floor. The Secretariat provided an overview of the three options available to Members when uploading oral interventions to eAgenda. The **first (default) option** made statements automatically available to all Members at the end of the submission period, without Members' further intervention. For this option, the Secretariat had access to the text as soon as uploaded, but Members could only access the text after Friday midnight. The **second option** made statements available to all Members immediately. Both the Secretariat and Members had access to the statement as soon as uploaded. Finally, with the **third option**, statements were only made available to the Secretariat and never to Members, even after the Friday midnight deadline. All three options made the statement immediately available to the Secretariat, including interpreters. Members could choose any of the three options when uploading their statements and could also change their preference, and edit the text of their uploaded statement at any time before the deadline.

3.3. The Secretariat also explained that only the oral intervention delivered in the meeting was interpreted and then recorded in the summary report, and that having access to a draft statement was useful even when statements were uploaded right before delivery, as the system was updated in real time. After the deadline, the system would not allow any further action and the Secretariat would not be in a position to upload statements submitted by e-mail. The Secretariat also reminded Members that it would not upload to eAgenda any statements sent via e-mail, unless specifically requested. Lastly, the Secretariat highlighted that once Members submitted their oral interventions via eAgenda, there was no need to send the oral intervention by e-mail also, as the Secretariat could immediately access the statements in eAgenda.

3.4. Before closing the meeting, I indicated that a factual summary of this meeting would be circulated for comments, and a final version would be included as an annex to the summary report of the June 2026 Committee meeting.