



JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD IMPORT AND EXPORT INSPECTION
AND CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS

Twentieth Session

Chiang Mai (Thailand), 18- 22 February 2013

ACTIVITIES OF OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS RELEVANT TO THE WORK OF CCFICS

ACTIVITIES OF THE WTO SPS COMMITTEE DURING 2011-2012

REPORT BY THE WTO SECRETARIAT¹

1. This report to the 20th Session of the Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (CCFICS) provides a summary of the activities and decisions of the WTO Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the "SPS Committee") since August 2011. It highlights the work that may be of most relevance to CCFICS.

2. Since the last report to the 19th Session of the CCFICS, the SPS Committee held one regular meeting in October 2011² and three regular meetings in 2012.³ The first meeting in 2013 is scheduled for 21-22 March. Ms Miriam Chaves, from Argentina, served as interim Chairperson at the March 2012 meeting. At the July 2012 meeting, Ms Maria Albarece of the Philippines was appointed Chairperson for the 2012-2013 period.

Specific trade concerns

3. The SPS Committee devotes a large portion of each regular meeting to the consideration of specific trade concerns (STCs). Any WTO Member can raise specific concerns about the food safety, plant or animal health requirements imposed by another WTO Member. Issues raised in this context are usually related to the notification of a new or changed measure, or based on the experience of exporters. Often other countries will share the same concerns. At the SPS Committee meetings, Members usually commit themselves to exchange information and hold bilateral consultations to resolve the identified concern.

4. A summary of the STCs raised in meetings of the SPS Committee is compiled on an annual basis by the WTO Secretariat.⁴ Altogether, 344 specific trade concerns were raised in the 18 years between 1995 and the end of 2012, of which 32% were related to food safety.

5. During the October meeting held in 2011 and the three meetings held in 2012, thirteen new STCs of relevance to Codex were raised in the SPS Committee:

- European Union's concerns regarding Malaysia's import restrictions on pork and pork products (STC # 323);
- India's concerns regarding China's requirement for registration and supervision of foreign enterprises (STC # 324);
- Ecuador's concerns regarding EU regulations on cadmium in cocoa beans (STC # 325);
- India's concerns regarding United States' default MRLs, limits of determination or limits of quantification on basmati rice (STC # 328);

¹ This report has been prepared under the WTO Secretariat's own responsibility and is without prejudice to the positions of WTO Members or to their rights or obligations under the WTO.

² The report of the October 2011 meeting is contained in G/SPS/R/64 plus addenda.

³ The report of the March 2012 meeting is contained in G/SPS/R/66, that of the July meeting in G/SPS/R/67 plus corrigenda, and that of the October meeting in G/SPS/R/69.

⁴ The latest version of this summary can be found in document G/SPS/GEN/204/Rev.12. This document is a public document available from <http://docsonline.wto.org>. Specific trade concerns can also be searched through the SPS Information Management System: <http://spsims.wto.org>.

- India's concerns regarding China's testing methods for food additives (STC # 329);
- United States' concerns regarding Indonesia's port closures (STC # 330);
- China's concerns regarding European Union's limits of aluminum in flour products (STC # 331);
- India's concerns regarding Chinese Taipei's MRLs for roasted and powdered coffee (STC # 334);
- India's concerns regarding European Union's modification of testing of residues of pesticides (STC # 335);
- European Union's concerns regarding Russia's import ban on live animals (October 2012 meeting);
- Australia's concerns regarding Turkey's requirements for importation of sheep meat (October 2012 meeting);
- India's concerns regarding Japan's restrictions on shrimp due to anti-oxidant residues (October 2012 meeting); and
- United States' concerns regarding Indonesia's permits on horticultural products (October 2012 meeting).

6. Fourteen issues relating to food safety that had been previously raised were discussed again during October 2011 to the end of 2012:

- China and United States' concerns regarding Japan's positive list system for pesticides, veterinary drugs and feed additives MRLs (STC # 212);
- Colombia, Ecuador and Peru's concerns regarding the application and modification of the EU Regulation on novel foods (STC # 238);
- United States' concerns regarding Chinese Taipei's MRLs for ractopamine in pork products (STC # 275);
- Peru's concerns regarding the application and modification of the EU Regulation on novel foods (STC # 238);
- Mexico's concerns regarding China's hygiene standard for distilled spirits and integrated alcoholic beverages (STC # 278);
- Brazil's concerns regarding Japan's pesticide MRLs (STC # 283);
- China and India's concerns regarding the US 2009 Food Safety Enhancement Act (STC # 299);
- United States' concerns regarding Turkey's restrictions on products derived from biotechnology (STC # 302);
- India's concerns regarding EU MRLs of pesticides (STC # 306);
- India's concerns regarding Japan's prohibition of certain food additives (STC # 307);
- United States' concerns regarding Viet Nam's ban on offals (STC # 314);
- Norway's concerns regarding Chinese quarantine and testing procedures for salmon (STC # 319);
- United States' concerns regarding the Philippines' restrictions on imported fresh meat (STC # 320); and
- China and Hong Kong, China's concerns regarding the EU Regulation on polyamide and melamine plastic kitchenware (STC # 322).

7. At the SPS Committee meeting in October 2012, the European Union reported that its concerns regarding Chinese Taipei's MRLs for roasted and powdered coffee (STC # 334) - originally raised by India - were resolved.

Equivalence

8. In July 2004, the SPS Committee completed its work on guidelines on the implementation of Article 4 of the SPS Agreement on equivalence in response to concerns raised by developing countries.⁵ The Decision on Equivalence adopted by the SPS Committee notes, *inter alia*, the work on recognition of equivalence undertaken in the Codex, the OIE and the IPPC, and requests the further elaboration of specific

⁵ G/SPS/19/Rev.2.

guidance by these organizations to ensure that such recognition is maintained. Equivalence remains a standing agenda item of the Committee.

9. The Codex representative has provided regular updates to the SPS Committee on Codex work in this regard, and in particular the work of the CCFICS.

Transparency

10. The legal obligation of WTO Members is to notify new or modified SPS measures when these deviate from the relevant international standards, including International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures. The recommendations of the SPS Committee from the 2008 revised recommended procedures for transparency⁶ now encourage the notification of all new or modified measures even when these conform to international standards. Although this recommendation does not change the legal obligations of WTO Members, it enhances transparency regarding the application of standards, guidelines, and recommendations adopted by Codex.

11. Since June 2011, SPS National Notification Authorities can complete and submit SPS notifications online through the SPS Notification Submission System (SPS NSS). The SPS NSS allows for more accurate and complete notifications, and a substantial reduction in the time required for the WTO to circulate them. Interested WTO Members should request login names and access passwords from the WTO Secretariat. As of January 2013, 37 Members had requested and been given access to the system, and 23 of these had officially submitted notifications via the SPS NSS.

12. From August to December 2011, 304 SPS notifications had been submitted to the WTO, with 206 of these identifying food safety as the objective of the measure being taken. Among all SPS notifications submitted during this period, 65 (62 regular and 3 emergency) identified a Codex standard as relevant, by either indicating the application of the standard or a deviation from it.

13. In 2012, a total of 867 notifications of new or proposed SPS measures were submitted by WTO Members, with 534 of these identifying food safety as the objective of the measure being taken. Among all of the SPS notifications in 2012, 188 (182 regular and 6 emergency) identified a Codex standard as relevant, by either indicating the application of the standard or a deviation from it.

Monitoring the Use of International Standards

14. The procedure adopted by the SPS Committee to monitor the use of international standards invites countries to identify specific trade problems they have experienced due to the use or non-use of relevant international standards, guidelines or recommendations.⁷ These problems, once considered by the SPS Committee, are drawn to the attention of the relevant standard-setting body.

15. The Committee has previously adopted thirteen annual reports on the monitoring procedure.⁸ These reports summarize several standards-related issues that the Committee has considered and the responses received from the relevant standard-setting organizations. The Fourteenth Annual Report was adopted by the Committee on 11 July 2012.⁹

16. Since the adoption of the Thirteenth Annual Report in July 2011, no new issue has been raised under this procedure. In March 2012, a number of WTO Members raised in a joint submission, which was supported by many other WTO Members, a horizontal concern regarding the number of SPS measures that were not based on international standards, guidelines and recommendations or that had inadequate scientific justification.¹⁰ These measures often unduly restricted trade and appeared to be associated with objectives not deemed as legitimate under international trade rules. Given these concerns and in order to fulfil the objectives of the SPS Agreement, the submission aimed at reaffirming: (i) the need for science-based international guidelines, standards and recommendations; (ii) the need to support and strengthen confidence in SPS international standard-setting bodies; and (iii) the need for sanitary and phytosanitary measures which resulted in a higher level of protection than would be achieved by measures based on the relevant international standards, guidelines and recommendations to be established on the basis of science.

17. At the July 2012 meeting of the Committee, Brazil briefly introduced a submission regarding the increase in demand for scientific advice to support food control systems.¹¹ Brazil's submission encouraged WTO Members to ensure that adequate resources were available for JECFA, JMPR and JEMRA to carry out

⁶ G/SPS/7/Rev.3.

⁷ G/SPS/11/Rev.1.

⁸ These were circulated as G/SPS/13, G/SPS/16, G/SPS/18, G/SPS/21, G/SPS/28, G/SPS/31, G/SPS/37, G/SPS/42, G/SPS/45, G/SPS/49, G/SPS/51, G/SPS/54 and G/SPS/56.

⁹ G/SPS/59.

¹⁰ G/SPS/GEN/1143/Rev.2.

¹¹ G/SPS/GEN/1165.

their functions, in particular making available international scientific advice, including risk assessments, which form the basis for international standards and also for some national regulations. Argentina, Belize, Canada, Chile, the European Union, and the United States all supported the communication and in particular the crucial role of the scientific advice bodies. Belize emphasized the limited scientific capability of developing countries. The European Union and Chile stressed the importance of ensuring adequate funding for these scientific advice bodies. The Codex representative explained that their funding came from FAO and WHO, and consisted of a mix of extra-budgetary funds and funds from the regular budgets of these organizations. The issue of funding for the scientific advice bodies had been discussed at the recent meeting of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

Review of the Operation and Implementation of the SPS Agreement

18. The SPS Committee is mandated to review the operation and implementation of the SPS Agreement every four years. The Second Review of the Agreement was completed in July 2005.¹² As agreed by the Committee in its Second Review, the Committee has been considering proposals to facilitate the use of *ad hoc* consultations and negotiations to resolve trade problems. WTO Members have different views regarding this mechanism, as reflected in the current working draft.¹³ At its October 2012 meeting, the Committee agreed on a new approach regarding work on a procedure for ad hoc consultations: inter-sessional work will be done via an electronic "working group" (open to all interested WTO Members), with more informal meetings on the margins of the March 2013 Committee meeting. Individual delegates agreed to serve as "stewards" to seek compromise texts on each of the five main issues of disaccord,¹⁴ working via electronic exchanges.

19. The SPS Committee completed the Third Review of the Operation and Implementation of the SPS Agreement in March 2010. At the October 2010 informal meeting, Members agreed to prioritize three issues for consideration under the work of the Committee arising from the Third Review: (i) cooperation between the SPS Committee and the Three Sisters; (ii) improving the procedure for monitoring the use of international standards; and (iii) control, inspection and approval procedures (Article 8 and Annex C). Members were invited to submit inputs on the identified priority issues.

20. Members have been encouraged to discuss their experiences with control, inspection and approval procedures. The European Union has presented its approach to SPS audits and inspections in third countries. Argentina has noted that it is currently reviewing on-site audit procedures at the national level, and that it is considering presenting the results of this work to the SPS Committee when available.

21. On cooperation between the SPS Committee and the Three Sisters, following a proposal submitted by Japan, the WTO Secretariat organized, on 17 October 2011, a Geneva-based workshop on coordination of SPS matters at the national and regional levels. The objective of the workshop was to bring together officials responsible for participation in and implementation of the SPS Agreement, Codex, IPPC and/or OIE for an in-depth discussion, at a technical level, on best practices in coordination at national and regional levels. The WTO Secretariat, in its brief report on the coordination workshop¹⁵, highlighted two specific recommendations resulting from it, namely a possibility to develop guidelines for good national coordination and/or a manual of good practices. Also, the SPS Committee formally agreed to a proposal from Canada and Japan to encourage the Three Sisters to undertake joint work on cross-cutting issues, such as, *inter alia*, certification, inspection, approval procedures and/or risk analysis.¹⁶

Technical Assistance

22. At each meeting the SPS Committee solicits information from its Members regarding their technical assistance needs and activities. The WTO Secretariat also reports on the activities it provides and the upcoming courses and workshops.

23. In March 2012, the WTO Secretariat presented a report entitled "SPS Technical Assistance and Training Activities" containing detailed information on all SPS-specific technical assistance activities undertaken by the WTO Secretariat from 1 September 1994 to 31 December 2011.¹⁷

24. The WTO Secretariat circulated a document with information on all the SPS activities for 2012, including the Geneva-based advanced course which aims to provide in-depth and hands-on training to

¹² G/SPS/36.

¹³ G/SPS/W/259/rev.4 and corrigendum.

¹⁴ (1) The mandatory/voluntary nature of the procedure; (2) issues of transparency/confidentiality; (3) the role of facilitator; (4) timeframes for the procedure; and (5) relationship with NAMA/other initiatives in the context of the Doha negotiations.

¹⁵ G/SPS/R/65.

¹⁶ G/SPS/58.

¹⁷ G/SPS/GEN/521/Rev.7.

government officials.¹⁸ Four regional workshops on the SPS Agreement were held in 2012. The Codex Secretariat, or experts on Codex matters, participated as resource persons in the regional workshops and in the advanced course. National seminars are provided upon request by WTO Members and acceding governments. Further information on SPS activities is available through <http://www.wto.org/sp/ta>.

Private standards

25. Since June 2005, the SPS Committee has discussed the issue of private and commercial standards on a number of occasions. The issue was initially raised by St. Vincent and the Grenadines with regard to EurepGAP (now GlobalGAP) requirements on pesticides used on bananas destined for sale in European markets.

26. On several occasions, informal information sessions have been held in the margins of the SPS Committee meetings. A number of international organizations working on the issue of private standards, including OECD and UNCTAD, as well as a number of private standardizing groups, including GlobalGAP, have provided information regarding commercial and private standards. WTO Members have raised a number of concerns regarding the trade, development and legal implications of private standards.

27. An ad hoc working group identified "Possible Actions for the SPS Committee Regarding SPS-Related Private Standards". At its March 2011 meeting, the Committee adopted five of the six actions put forward by the working group.¹⁹ These actions relate to defining the scope of the discussions on these private standards and promoting information exchange among various actors in this area, including the SPS Committee, the relevant international standard-setting organizations, WTO Members, entities involved in SPS-related private standards, and the WTO Secretariat.

28. At its subsequent meetings in 2012, WTO Members discussed mainly the development of a working definition of "SPS-related private standards" (implementation of action 1). At its October 2012 meeting, delegates accepted the Chair's request that they propose new ideas for a working definition, since discussions on the previous draft²⁰ had resulted in a lack of progress. A number of Members are of the view that this issue is not within the mandate of the SPS Committee, nonetheless several Members shared information on relevant developments and their interactions with the private standard-setting bodies. Belize reported that every single one of its agricultural export products is affected by SPS-related private standards.

Dispute Settlement

The WTO dispute settlement procedures

29. Any WTO Member may invoke the formal dispute resolution procedures of the WTO if it considers that a measure imposed by another WTO Member violates any of the WTO Agreements, including the SPS Agreement. If formal consultations on the problem are unsuccessful, a WTO Member may request that a panel be established to consider the complaint.²¹ A panel of three or five individuals considers written and oral arguments submitted by the parties to the dispute and issues its legal findings and recommendations in a written report. The parties to the dispute may appeal a panel's decision before the WTO's Appellate Body. The Appellate Body examines the legal findings of the panel, which it may uphold, modify or reverse. As with a panel report, the Appellate Body report is adopted automatically unless there is a consensus against adoption.

30. According to the SPS Agreement, when a dispute involves scientific or technical issues, the panel should seek advice from appropriate scientific and technical experts. Scientific experts have been consulted, with one exception, in all SPS-related disputes. The experts are usually selected from lists provided by the standard-setting organizations referenced in the SPS Agreement: the Codex, IPPC and OIE. The parties to the dispute are consulted in the selection of experts and on the information solicited from them.

SPS Disputes

31. As of end of 2012, more than 450 complaints had formally been raised under the WTO's dispute settlement procedures. Of these, 40 alleged violations of the SPS Agreement, and two disputes addressed the SPS Agreement, although it had not been claimed in the request for consultations.²² Nineteen SPS-related complaints, on 14 issues, have been referred to a panel.²³

¹⁸ G/SPS/GEN/997/Rev.2.

¹⁹ G/SPS/55.

²⁰ G/SPS/W/265/Rev.2.

²¹ A flow chart of the dispute resolution process can be consulted at (http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/disp2_e.htm).

²² WT/DS320 and WT/DS321.

²³ For summaries of all disputes that have cited the SPS Agreement please refer to: http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/dispu_agreements_index_e.htm?id=A19#selected_agreement

32. Three panel reports have concerned food safety regulations: (i) the EC ban on imports of meat treated with growth-promoting hormones, challenged by the United States and by Canada (*EC-Hormones*)²⁴; (ii) EC measures affecting the approval and marketing of biotech products, brought by the United States, Canada and Argentina (*EC – Approval and Marketing of Biotech Products*);²⁵ and (iii) US measures affecting imports of poultry from China (*US – Poultry*).²⁶

33. The dispute *US - Poultry* (China) was the first to address the question of equivalence (Article 4 of the SPS Agreement). In this case, China challenged the US legislation which restricted the ability of the US Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) to complete equivalence determinations on China's poultry inspection system; and without such determination no poultry products could be imported into the country. China challenged the US measure under various provisions of the SPS Agreement, while the United States argued that as the measure was equivalence-based, it was only subject to Article 4 of the SPS Agreement. The panel concluded that Article 4 (equivalence) of the SPS Agreement was not the only provision regulating the operation of equivalence regimes, and found the measure to be inconsistent with several provisions of the SPS Agreement. The panel report was not appealed, and it was adopted by the Dispute Settlement Body in October 2010.

Recent developments

34. On 6 March 2012, the United States requested consultations with India concerning measures that India imposes on the importation of various agricultural products from the United States because of concerns related to avian influenza.²⁷ Following bilateral consultations, on 11 May 2012 the United States requested the establishment of a panel to examine this matter. The composition of the panel has not yet been agreed.

35. On 3 July 2012, after Canada and Korea had notified the DSB that they had reached a mutually agreed solution in the dispute *Korea - Beef* (WT/DS391), the panel (established in 2009) circulated its report to the Members reporting that a solution had been reached. This case related to Korea's BSE-related restrictions on beef and beef products from Canada.

36. On 30 August and on 3 September 2012 Argentina requested consultations with the United States on two separate issues concerning: (i) certain measures affecting the importation of animals, meat and other animal products from Argentina; and (ii) certain measures affecting the importation of fresh lemons from the Northwest region of Argentina. On 17 December 2012, the DSB deferred the establishment of both panels, which had been requested by Argentina earlier that month.

37. The developments of these and other disputes can be followed at <http://www.wto.org/disputes>.

Other Relevant Activities - the Standards and Trade Development Facility

38. The Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) is a global programme in capacity building and technical co-operation established by the FAO, the OIE, the World Bank, the WHO and the WTO. Other organizations involved in SPS-related technical cooperation, donors contributing to the STDF and developing country experts participate actively in the Facility's work. The STDF is managed and housed by the WTO.²⁸

39. The STDF supports developing countries in building their capacity to implement international SPS standards, guidelines and recommendations as a means to improve their human, animal and plant health status and ability to gain and maintain access to markets. In doing so, it contributes to sustainable economic growth, poverty reduction, food security and environmental protection in developing countries. The STDF helps in increasing awareness, mobilizing additional resources, strengthening collaboration and identifying and disseminating good practice to enhance the effectiveness of SPS-related technical cooperation. The STDF also provides support and funding for the development and implementation of projects that promote compliance with international SPS requirements.

40. As part of its coordination function and its role as a centre of good practice, the STDF undertakes action-oriented research, produces tools and practical guidelines, and organizes thematic events of interest to SPS practitioners and the broader trade community. In 2012, a series of events were organized on various topics.

²⁴ The reports of the panel are contained in documents WT/DS26/R/USA and WT/DS48/R/CAN. The Appellate Body report is contained in document WT/DS/26/AB/R, WT/DS48/AB/R.

²⁵ The reports of the panel are contained in documents WT/DS291/R, WT/DS292/R, and WT/DS293/R. The panel reports were not appealed.

²⁶ The report of the panel is contained in document WT/DS392/R. The panel report was not appealed.

²⁷ India's avian influenza measures prohibit the importation of various agricultural products into India from those countries reporting OIE-notifiable avian influenza (both highly pathogenic notifiable avian influenza and low pathogenic notifiable avian influenza).

²⁸ More detailed information on the STDF and its activities, including projects and project preparation grants, is available on the STDF website (<http://www.standardsfacility.org>).

41. On 12-13 July 2012, the STDF organized a seminar on International Trade and Invasive Alien Species (IAS) in Geneva. The seminar, attended by 110 participants, was successful in raising awareness about the mutually supportive objectives of the WTO SPS Agreement and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and the contribution of effective SPS control systems to help protect against the entry of harmful species, including pests, diseases and other IAS.

42. The STDF facilitated the organization of a joint meeting with the African Union Commission (AUC) on regional SPS coordination and capacity building in Africa in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia on 28 September 2012. The meeting was attended by approximately 25 officials of the AUC and its technical agencies, SPS representatives of Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and relevant international organizations. Participants discussed the role and function of the AUC, its technical offices and the RECs in adding value to SPS coordination and capacity building initiatives at the continental, regional and national level.

43. The STDF continued its work on the application of Multi Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) to inform decision-making on SPS capacity building and resource allocation. The STDF facilitated the application of the MCDA tool in Viet Nam in September 2012 and organized a regional workshop for selected experts in food safety, animal and/or plant health and trade from Asian and Pacific countries in Bangkok, Thailand on 12-13 November 2012. The MCDA tool will be applied in other countries in 2013 and further enhanced based on the feedback received through its application.

44. The STDF also initiated a preparatory work on the linkages between SPS and trade facilitation. The purpose of this work, to be carried out in 2013, will be to enhance understanding among SPS practitioners and staff of customs authorities in developing countries about the role of SPS agencies in trade facilitation, and to identify key needs, opportunities and good practices to enhance the effective engagement of SPS agencies in collaborative border management.

45. The STDF, in close collaboration with FAO and WHO, also plans to commission a study in 2013 on the spill over effects of export-oriented SPS technical assistance on the domestic food safety situation. The aim will be to draw key lessons to improve the design and delivery of future trade related technical assistance programmes.

46. The STDF will organize a side-event during the Aid for Trade Global Review in 2013 to raise awareness on the role of public-private partnerships to overcome SPS challenges faced by developing countries along agri-food value chains.

47. In November 2012, the STDF launched the STDF Virtual Library which is a central repository accessible through the STDF website, and containing SPS-related electronic documentation, including SPS needs assessments, action plans, training materials, evaluations of projects funded by the STDF and other donors, research papers and articles from various publishers and sources.

48. As a financing mechanism, the STDF provides grant funding to public and private organizations in developing countries seeking to comply with international SPS standards in an effort to gain or maintain market access. Two types of grants are available through the STDF: project preparation grants and project grants.

49. Funds up to US\$50,000 are available for project preparation grants (PPGs), which can be used for any of the following purposes (or a combination thereof): (i) application of SPS-related capacity evaluation and prioritization tools; (ii) preparation of feasibility studies that precede project development to assess the potential impact and economic viability of proposals in terms of their expected costs and benefits; and/or (iii) preparation of project proposals that can be funded by the STDF or other donors. A total of 53 PPGs have been approved and funded by the STDF since its inception.

50. Project grant financing up to a maximum of US\$1,000,000 is available from the STDF. Favourable consideration is given to projects that focus on one or more of the following: (i) the identification, development and dissemination of good practice in SPS-related technical cooperation, including the development and application of innovative and replicable approaches; (ii) STDF work on cross-cutting topics of common interest; (iii) the use of regional approaches to address SPS constraints; and/or (iv) collaborative and interdisciplinary approaches focused on the interface / linkages between human, animal and plant health and trade, and benefiting from the involvement of two or more STDF partners or other relevant organizations. A total of 63 projects have been approved for STDF funding since its inception.