

Criticism of Pakistan's paper on SP's

A small group of G33 countries that included Barbados, Bolivia, Cuba, India, the Philippines, Jamaica, Kenya, Nigeria, South Korea, Venezuela and Zimbabwe made critical interventions on various points which are summarized as follows:

- i. The exclusion indicators indicated in the paper by Pakistan are based on the trade criteria. The net effect of injury to vulnerable farmers in a country is the same, whether imports are sourced from developing or developed countries.
- ii. The negative indicators a priori exclude specific agricultural products from being designated as SPs which is incompatible with the principle of "self-designation".
- iii. The negative indicator relating to bilateral and regional trade agreements is not tenable. The sensitivities in the multilateral arena are different and it is unreasonable to expect bi-lateral concessions to be mirrored in a multilateral setting.
- iv. The set of ten indicators by Pakistan appear to be focusing on its own specific needs and do not take into account the diverse situations prevailing in a number of developing countries.
- v. The G-33 proposal requires compliance with any one indicator sufficient to designate a product as SP. However, in the Pakistan proposal it becomes implicit that all or more than one indicator must be met simultaneously by a product in order to be designated as a Special Product.
- vi. The proposal has a provision for a penalty for designating larger number of SPs. In effect, it amounts to penalizing a country which has a large number of poor farmers producing diverse agriculture products at a subsistence level and thus needs larger number of Special Products.
- vii. There should be no linkage of SPs with the formula for tariff reduction.
- viii. The concept of tariff capping has no place in the discussion on SPs. .
- ix. There is no economic justification for the proposed ineligibility of SPs for SSM treatment. The SSM is designed to enable developing countries to cope with emergency situations arising from import surges and price volatility.
- x. Potential negative implications of SPs for exporting developing countries are exaggerated. South-South trade has been growing at a fast pace.