

**EVOLVING PARADIGM OF QUALITY STANDARDS IN
THE MULTILATERAL TRADING (WTO) SYSTEM:
CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR PAKISTAN**

Naeem Ullah Khan¹ and Muhammad Nadeem²

Abstract

WTO is a fact of life which poses many challenges and opportunities for developing countries in import and export sectors. WTO requires the compliance of certain quality standards to protect human life, environment and health. In post WTO time, segments of Pakistani economy especially industry, agriculture and services are progressively facing various difficulties. One of the real difficulties for low income nations towards gaining the sustainable development is the lack of capacity building to fulfill the requirements of the universal purchasers. Worldwide purchasers are progressively requesting compliance on quality, security, environment and social models. Consistence to universal and national standards advances productivity and competition through global trade secures customers' privileges of wellbeing and security and thus prompts the improvement of economy. Non fulfillment of these requirements results as loss of business. It can be safely concluded that every country needs to develop and adopt quality standards such as ISO 9000, ISO 14000, ISO 45000, and ISO 22000 which is best for its economic, social and environmental needs. Moreover, there should be active people's participation, close public-private NGOs partnership and there should be stress on training all the key factors involved in quality management and product standards. In the light of SPS and TBT Agreements Pakistan is required to upgrade its legal and scientific mechanism to enhance its quality of goods relating to agricultural, dairy, fisheries, and meat products. In case of non compliance Pakistan may be looser in the global regime of multilateral trading (WTO) system.

Key Words: WTO, TBT, SPS, ISO

¹ Assistant Professor University Law College, University of the Punjab, Lahore Pakistan. Email: naeemullahkhan786@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor Law College, University of Peshawar, Email: mnf@uop.edu.pk

Introduction

The WTO is viewed so differently by different people that one wonders if one is hearing about the same organization. Those who look upon it from a positive perspective regard it as an institution conferring a lot of benefits on its members. They see it as a consensus driven organization designed to achieve gains for both the developed and developing countries. Advantages of its membership are widely recognized, among other things, explaining eagerness of the non-member countries such as Saudi Arabia, Russian Federation and Iran to join the organization as well as the heavy price paid by China to become its member. In this context, it would be pertinent to refer to the observations of the high level consultative board “the number of the WTO members has now increased to nearly 164. That enormous increase in membership demonstrates what the world community really thinks of the value of the institution and is the most eloquent riposte to its detractors”.

On the contrary, the WTO detractors regard it as an exploitative and undemocratic organization, which is beneficial only for developed but not developing countries. The negative image of the organization is quite wide spread in the third world countries even among the intelligentsia, businessman, journalists, and otherwise well informed sections of society. While respecting differences of perceptions about the WTO it would be appropriate to emphasize that positive or negative views should be based on adequate information about the institution as well as about the prevailing economic order and commercial landscape of the contemporary world. Equally important would be to realize that many existing undesirable features of the international trade regime are not “because” of the WTO but in spite of the WTO. Finally, it would be in order to recognize that the WTO, good or bad is reality and cannot be wished away¹ (I. Haque, 2005, at p.5). The WTO is a reality of life; no one can claim that the WTO is a curse or blessing for Pakistan. There are both positive and negative impacts of the WTO. There are many challenges and opportunities under this multilateral trading (WTO) system for the member countries. There is a possibility to convert challenges into opportunities; much depends on policies and actions-not by the Government alone but also on responses of the private sector. The eminent scholar (I. Haque, 2005 at p.12) referred the obligations under the WTO regime in these words:

“No one can claim that WTO is an unmixed blessing for Pakistan. There are both positive and negative implications of the Pakistan’s membership of the WTO. We face many challenges and threats under the WTO regime. Equally important is the fact that a variety of opportunities are available to us which can lead to increase in international trade and economic growth. There is also ever present possibility to convert threats into opportunities. Much depends on our policies and action-not by the government alone but also on responses of the private sector. The WTO obligations among other things have placed new demands on the capacity and skills of both public and private sector. This is a critical issue and our failure to measure up to these demands would make challenges more daunting and opportunities elusive”.

In this paper we examine different issues like standards, technical regulations and health measures. These issues have got important place in in Pakistan. The Agreements i.e. “Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT)” and “Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS)” specifically address these problems. “SPS Agreement” protects human, animal or plant life or health from certain specified risks; and “TBT Agreement” covers the areas of technical regulations which is very important area and also area of standards² (J.H. Jackson, et al. 2002, at p.575) relating to Packing, Labeling, and Marketing etc. Moreover, the paper examines the challenges and opportunities for Pakistan in the import and export activities, and possible solutions to convert challenges into opportunities which lead towards the economic growth and development.

Literature Review

In the globalized world pursuing the origination of the WTO, Poses the certain challenges in the respect of quality standards in international markets for the developing world. Because in developing world main challenge is the national capacity to comply with conditions of SPS Agreement and TBT Agreement, which is fundamental requirement to reach the developed countries markets, in this contextual perspective WTO has adopted “Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT)” and “Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS)”, To face these challenges and convert into opportunities. To become an

active participant in global trade the institutional infrastructure of developing nations related to testing and quality insurance must be developed, standards and methods. WTO is a tidal wave that can never be stopped, it is only institution which can manage the challenges of globalization and convert the economic constraints in the prosperity of a country, heavily depends upon the pro-active actions of the developing countries in particular Pakistan. Those boats will be floated which are prepared [countries which have maintained the quality standards] for global challenges and those boats will be drowned which have not been ready to cope the challenges under global trade regime. “The TBT Agreement” deals with the conformity assessment procedures challenge and also to standards and technical regulations. “The SPS Agreement” applies to measures relating to health of human, animal and plant. Both Agreements the “TBT and SPS” are distinct in nature and also differ in scope, so, it will be weird to keep both of these Agreements in same group³ (S.Lester and B. Mercurio et al. 2010, at p.558). However, they have a shared origin which is “Tokyo Round Standards Code” and they have similarity regarding substance of their rules. We first examine the key provisions of each of these agreements, as well as their elaboration through the case law. We then briefly discuss the main purpose and objectives of both Agreements, how they fall within the WTO system, and the manner in which they constrain domestic policy-making

The Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS):

As already discussed that scope of “SPS Agreement” is covering measures which protects health of animal, human and plants, More specifically, Annex A of the Agreement defines Sanitary and Phytosanitary measures as any measure applied:

- a) “To protect animal or plant life or health within the territory of the Member from risks arising from the entry, establishment or spread of pests, diseases, disease-carrying organisms or disease-causing organisms
- b) To protect human or animal life or health within the territory of the Member from risks arising from additives, contaminants, toxins or disease-causing organisms in foods, beverages or feedstuffs
- c) To protect human or animal life or health within the territory of the Member from risks arising from diseases carried by

- animals, plants or products thereof, or from the entry, establishment or spread of pests
- d) To prevent or limit other damage within the territory of the Member from the entry, establishment or spread of pests.”

Annex A sets out some risks related to animal, human or plant life or health, and therefore take measures to prevent. Only the “SPS Agreement” covers the measures that are taken for these purposes. Thus, to answer the question that a measure is falling within the area covered by the Agreement or not there will need to be an inquiry for this purpose, and it has proved to be a difficult issue. In WTO dispute settlement body, measures taken to restrict salmon imports based on a fear that domestic salmon will be infected with diseases found in foreign salmon and measures that restrict apple imports based on a fear that domestic apples will be infected with diseases found in foreign apples and measures that restrict sales of meat treated with hormones and products that are made with or contain genetically modified organisms, were challenged as SPS Measures. Scope of SPS Agreement enlightened further by Article 1.1 of the Agreement, specifying that “this Agreement applies to all Sanitary and Phytosanitary measures which may, directly or indirectly, affect international trade”. In practice, this provision might not provide much limitation on the scope, though many SPS measures take the form of import bans or restrictions, which clearly affect trade. Other such measures are more general bans or restrictions that apply to all products.

An Overview of the SPS Agreement Provisions:

Generally “The SPS Agreement” protects health and life of animal, human and plants. “The SPS Agreement” does not build up or manage a specific Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measure all things considered. Rather, the Agreement builds up various general necessities and techniques to guarantee that a measure is in actuality expected to secure against the hazard declared, as opposed to serve as camouflaged trade barrier.

The S&P Agreement expressly perceives that nations have legitimate requirement for directions to ensure animal, human and plant life and health (incorporates sustenance security controls).The “SPS Agreement” provides safeguard to the capacity of governments, while protecting

against the utilization of unjustified S&P Measures as an approach to secure local industry. The Agreement puts up methods and prerogatives which will recognize legitimate measures, the Agreement additionally will encourage harmonizing the measures to the WTO members. In the meantime, the Agreement shields the capacity of governments to secure health and life of animal, human, and plants⁴. One of the eminent scholars on international trade law explained the S&P Measures in these words (R.Bhala, 2001, at p.1665 and 1667):

“A testing, inspection, certification, or approval procedure; a relevant statistical method; a sampling procedure; a method of risk assessment; a packaging and labeling requirement directly related to food safety and a quarantine treatment, such as a relevant requirement associated with the transportation of animals or plants or with material necessary for their survival during transportation. Accordingly, whether a measure is Sanitary or Phytosanitary is determined by the intent of the measure. If it is not intended to protect against one of the enumerated risks, the measure is not a sanitary or a phytosanitary measure. A strict requirement for nondiscriminatory treatment is not possible for S&P Measures, since they frequently discriminate against imported goods or goods from a particular country because those goods pose a different risk of a plant or animal pests or disease. Under the S&P Agreement, discrimination is allowed as long as it is not arbitrary or unjustifiable”

As quoted in the SPS Agreement:

“.....No Member should be prevented from adopting or enforcing measures necessary to protect human, animal or plant life or health, subject to the requirement that these measures are not applied in a manner which would constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination between Members where the same conditions prevail or a disguised restriction on international trade.....; to improve the human health, animal health and phytosanitary situation in all Members”.

Harmonization

Article 3 of the SPS Agreement is entitled Harmonization. Article 3.1 of the Agreement states that “members shall base their Sanitary or Phytosanitary Measures on international standards, guidelines or

recommendations, where they exist except as otherwise provided for in this Agreement” (S.Lester and B. Mercurio et al. 2010, at p.561). These measures should not be inconsistent with the relevant guidelines, recommendations and international standards. Moreover, there is scientific justification behind these standards⁵ (S.R.Myneni-2006, at p.434). The goal of these provisions is to advance the harmonization of domestic regulations around international rules i.e. “Codex Alimentarius Commission, Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP), International Office of Epizootics, International Plant Protection Convention”. Thus, international quality standards, recommendations and guidelines act as a basic quality control standard for the protection that is to be followed.

In EC-Hormone’s case it was explained that under Article 3.1, the term ‘based on’ is a looser standard than ‘conform to’ (as panel in that case had found), which is found in Article 3.2. In this regard, it said that ‘a thing is commonly said to be “based on” another thing when the former “stands” or is “founded” or “build” upon or “is supported by” the latter. The appellate body held further that some general guidance on the relationship of the provisions of Article 3. It over ruled the panel’s characterization of Article 3.3 as an exception to Article 3.1, instead concluding that Article 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 apply together, each addressing a separate situation.

Equivalence

Article 4 provides for mutual recognition of other members’ laws in certain circumstances. Article 4.1 of the Agreement states that:

“Members shall accept the sanitary or phytosanitary measures of other Members as equivalent, even if these measures differ from their own or from those used by other Members trading in the same product, if the exporting Member objectively demonstrates to the importing Member that its measures achieve the importing Member’s appropriate level of sanitary or phytosanitary protection. For this purpose, reasonable access shall be given, upon request, to the importing Member for inspection, testing and other relevant procedures”

In essence, this approach tries to achieve goals that are similar to harmonization and helps integrate the markets by reducing burdens caused by different regulatory system.

Legal Implications of the SPS Measures and Pakistan

To avoid the trade sanctions and enhance its exports of agriculture and food products there is a tragic need to upgrade a hygienic food production, and preparing ought to be utilized to guarantee food security as indicated by the international standards. In the Past era (2005) EU, Japan, Iran, Turkey, Sri Lanka and Most of the Middle East countries banned various products of Pakistan such as mangoes, meat, fish; onion etc⁶. (DAWN, March 31, 2005). It is pertinent to mention here that there are More than 300 codes relevant to quality standards, recommendations and guidelines are relevant for food and safety. Pakistan has to meet these standards otherwise Pakistan would not be able to export its agricultural and food items in the rest of the world. Pakistan will have to tackle and resolve this issue on emergency basis. In year 2008 it was reported that Pakistan is also facing problems with export of mangoes to Japan export of rice to Russia, Iran raised objections over import of *kinnow* from Pakistan. The EU banned export of seafood from Pakistan. Moreover, 77 consignments of agriculture items were thrown away by EU within a short period of five years. The exclusive reason for the forfeiture was non-compliance by Pakistan of food safety regulations under SPS Measures. (AAJ NEWS, 28 April, 2008)

Legal Framework

“The Pakistan Animal Quarantine (Import and Export of Animal and Animal Products) Ordinance, 1978 (XLIX of 1979)”	“To regulate the import, export and quarantine of animals and animal Products in order to prevent the introduction or spread of diseases and to provide for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto”;
“The Pakistan Plant Quarantine Act, 1976 (LXXV of 1976)”	“An act to give effect in Pakistan to the International Plant Protection Convention, 1951. The Federal Government may, by notification in the official Gazette, prohibit, restrict or otherwise regulate, subject to such conditions as it may think fit to impose, import or any article or class of articles likely to cause infection to any crop or plant, or of any pest generally or any class of pests”.
“The Seed Act, 1976 (XXIX of 1976)”	“An Act to provide for controlling and regulating the quality of seeds of various varieties of Crop. it is expedient to provide for controlling and regulating the quality of seeds of various varieties of crops and for matters connected therewith”

“The Pakistan Fish Inspection and Quality Control Act, 1997 (XXXV of 1997)”

“Aim of this Act is to regulate the quality and promote the export of fish and fishery products from Pakistan. Matters dealt with by the Act include: Registration of fish processing plants, Registration of fish exporters, Constitution and functions of Inspection Committee, Inspection of fish processing plants, Fish export, Handling of fish and fishery products, Quality evaluation of fish and fishery products, Powers, duties and functions of Fishery Officer, Seizure and disposal, Power to make rules”.

In order to make optimum use of opportunities offered by the progressive liberalization of trade our agriculture and food industries and The Government should take a number of additional initiatives to resolve the following problems/issues in order to enhance its export in the world markets

- a) Food Safety / Quality Standards issue
- b) Rejections of agro based export consignments issue
- c) Issue of Ban on exports
- d) Issue of Management Capacity
- e) Out dated legislation issue.
- f) Substandard products are consigned to markets due to a systematic failure.
- g) Poor SPS inspection and quality certification system.

The TBT Agreement

The TBT agreement in the WTO regime ensures the technical regulations, standards. Labeling, packing, arrangements and certification procedure, do not create unnecessary hurdles in the promotion of international trade and this agreement contained certain parameters regarding the technical regulations. Every member country is required to meet those parameters as provided in the TBT Agreement i.e. “Technical Regulations”, “Standards” and “Conformity Assessment Procedures”, explained as below:

a) Technical Regulations

Technical Regulations may be defined in these words:

“A Document which sets down attributes of the product, production techniques or their related procedures, including the material managerial arrangements and their consistency is compulsory, it might likewise incorporate or bargain only with symbols, marking, packaging, labeling terminology, prerequisites as they apply to a product, process or production strategy”

b) **Standards**

There is no concrete definition regarding standards however, in the light of SPS agreement standards may be expressed in these words::

“Document affirmed by a perceived body, that gives, for basic and rehased utilize, rules or attributes for products or related procedures and production strategies, with which consistence is not required. It might likewise incorporate or bargain only with terminology, symbols, packaging, marking or labeling prerequisites as they apply to an item, process or production technique”.

c) **Conformity Assessment Procedure**

“Any system utilized, specifically or indirectly, to verify that important necessities in specialized directions or measures or satisfied”.

These definitions are written in fairly dense ‘legalese’ to explain the terms in plain English, see following.

A technical regulation is basically regulating different aspects of products i.e. the physical characteristics, production process or labeling. The following examples are instructive: a measure that requires that products not manufactured in a way that harms the environment surrounding the factory. Or a measure that requires a level indicating whether toys contain parts that could harm young children, Note that while the definition refers to ‘document’ which could be interpreted narrowly, in practice the provision has been presumed to cover laws and other measures generally. A standard does basically the same things which technical regulation is doing. The main difference is that standards are not mandatory but technical regulations are mandatory, their impact is felt more greatly. In that sense, technical regulations are more important than standards, and the rules for technical regulations in the Agreement of Technical Barrier to Trade are more detailed and strict. The key provisions relating to technical regulations are in Article 2, which is entitled that how technical regulations are to be prepared, adopt and applied by the Central Government.

Preamble TBT Agreement provides that:

“..... No country should be prevented from taking measures necessary to ensure the quality of its export, or for the protection of human, animal or plant life or health, of the

environment, or for the prevention of deceptive practices, at the levels it considers appropriate, subject to the requirement that they are not applied in a manner which would constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination between countries where the same conditions prevail or a disguised restriction on international trade, and are otherwise in accordance with the provisions of this agreement."

The TBT Committee embraced a decision containing principles it considered critical for international standards improvement, in particular concerning transparency, openness, impartiality and consensus, significance and effectiveness, coherence and advancement measurement. The Committee noticed that international standardization was a region where developing nation support was still restricted and compelled. (Second Triennial Review on TBT, 2000) The Committee empowers the full use of the above standards and underlines that more extensive partner contribution guarantees an open and straightforward process in the improvement of international standards. It perceives progress made in developing nation however takes note of that difficulties still exist, both financially and technically. (Fifth Triennial Review on TBT, 2009)

Case Law Development on SPS and TBT⁷

Case Title	Agreements	Issue	Decision of Panel/ Appellate Body
US-GASOLINE (DS2) ⁸	GATT Art III and XX	"The Gasoline Rule under the US Clean Air Act that set out the rules for establishing baseline figures for gasoline sold on the US market, with the purpose of regulating the composition and emission effects of gasoline to prevent air pollution".	"The Panel found that the measure treated imported gasoline less favorably than domestic gasoline in violation of Art. III. The Appellate Body modified the Panel's reasoning and found that the measure was related to the conservation of exhaustible natural resources and thus fell within the scope of Art. XX. However, the measure was still not justified by Art. XX because the discriminatory aspect of the measure constituted unjustifiable discrimination and a disguised restriction on international trade"
AUSTRALIA – SALMON1 (DS18) ⁹	"SPS Arts. 5.1, 5.5 and 5.6"	"Australia's import prohibition of certain salmon from Canada. Fresh, chilled or frozen	"The Appellate Body upheld the Panel's finding that the import prohibition violated Art. 5.5 (and, by implication Art. 2.3) as arbitrary or unjustifiable levels of protection were applied to several different yet

EC – HORMONE S (DS26, 48) ¹⁰	“SPS Arts. 3 and 5”	ocean-caught Canadian salmon and certain other Canadian salmon”	comparable situations so as to result in discrimination or a disguised restriction (i.e. more strict restriction) on imports of salmon, compared to imports of other fish and fish products such as herring and finfish”.
JAPAN – AGRICULT URAL PRODUCTS II (DS76) ¹¹	“SPS Arts. 2.2, 5.7, 5.6 and 5.1”	“EC prohibition on the placing on the market and the importation of meat and meat products treated with certain hormones”	“The Appellate Body held that while a panel is prohibited from addressing legal claims not within its terms of reference, a panel is permitted to examine any legal argument submitted by a party or to develop its own legal reasoning”.
EC – ASBESTOS I (DS135) ¹²	“TBT Annex 1.1 GATT Arts. III:4, XX and XXIII:1(b) ”	“Varietal testing requirement under which the import of certain plants was prohibited because of the possibility of their becoming potential hosts of codling moth”.	“The Appellate Body upheld the Panel's finding that Japan's varietal testing requirement was maintained without sufficient scientific evidence in violation of Art. 2.2”
EC – Trademarks and Geographical Indications (DS174, 290) ¹³	“TBT Annex 1.1 and 1.3”	“France's ban on asbestos (Decree No. 96-1133). • Imported asbestos (and products containing asbestos) vs certain domestic substitutes such as PVA, cellulose and glass (PCG) fibers (and products containing such substitutes)”	“The Appellate Body, having rejected the Panel's approach of separating the measure into the ban and the exceptions, reversed the Panel and concluded that the ban as an “integrated whole” was a “technical regulation” as defined in Annex 1.1 and thus covered by the TBT Agreement”
EC – SARDINES ¹⁴	“TBT Annex 1.1 and Art. 2.4”	“Agricultural products and foodstuffs affected by the EC Regulation”.	“The Panel found that these inspection structures did not constitute a technical regulation within the meaning of the TBT Agreement”.
AUSTRALI A – APPLES I (DS367) ¹⁵	“SPS Arts. 2.2,	“EC Regulation establishing common marketing standards for preserved sardines,	“The Appellate Body upheld the Panel's finding that the EC Regulation was a technical regulation within the meaning of Annex 1.1 as it fulfilled the three criteria laid down in the Appellate Body report in EC – Asbestos: (i) the document applied to an identifiable product or group of products; (ii) it lays down one or more product characteristics; and (iii) compliance with the product characteristics was mandatory”

US – TUNA II (MEXICO) (DS381) ¹⁶	2.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.5, 5.6, 8, and Annexes A(1) and C(1)(a)”	including a specification that only products prepared from <i>Sardinapichardus</i> could be marketed/labelled as preserved sardines”.	“The Panel found that specific measures regarding each of the three pests at issue, as well as the general measures relating to these three pests, were inconsistent with Arts. 5.1 and 5.2, and that, by implication, these measures were also inconsistent with Art. 2.2 of the SPS Agreement. Australia appealed these findings only in regard to two of the three pests (fire blight and ALCM). The Appellate Body upheld the Panel’s above findings regarding the two pests and the general measures relating to these two pests”.
US – COOL (DS384, 386) ¹⁷	“TBT Annex 1.1, Arts. 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4”	“Certain Australian measures restricting the importation of New Zealand apples based on concerns about the risk of entry, establishment and spread of the fire blight bacterium”	“The Appellate Body found that the US measure establishes a single and legally mandated set of requirements for making any statement with respect to the broad subject of ‘dolphin-safety of tuna products in the United States. Thus, it upheld the Panel’s ruling characterizing the measure at issue as a technical regulation within the meaning of TBT Annex 1”
US – CLOVE CIGARETTES (DS406) ¹⁸	“TBT Arts. 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 12.1 and 12.3”	“Dolphin-safe labeling standards and Section 216.92 Dolphin-safe requirements for tuna harvested in the ETP [Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean] by large purse seine vessels”	“The Appellate Body reversed the Panel’s finding that the COOL measure violated Art. 2.2 Because it did not fulfill the objective of providing consumer information on origin. The Appellate Body found that Art. 2.2 does not impose a minimum threshold level at which the measure must fulfill its legitimate objective; rather, it is the degree of the fulfillment that needs to be assessed against any reasonably available less trade-restrictive alternative measures”
EC – SEAL PRODUCTS (DS400, 401) ¹⁹	“TBT Arts. 2.1 and 2.12”	“Imported cattle and hogs used in the production of beef and pork in the United States”.	“The Appellate Body upheld, although for different reasons, the Panel’s finding that, by banning clove cigarettes while exempting menthol cigarettes from the ban, favoring the domestic menthol cigarettes and according less favorable treatment to imported clove cigarettes.”
		“a tobacco control measure adopted by	

the United States. Clove cigarettes from Indonesia”.	“The Appellate Body reversed the Panel’s intermediate finding that the EU Seal Regime lays down “product characteristics”, and consequently reversed the Panel’s finding that the EU Seal Regime was a technical regulation within the meaning of TBT Annex 1.1”
“Regulations of the European Union (EU Seal Regime) generally prohibiting the importation and placing on the market of seal products, with certain exceptions, including for seal products derived from hunts conducted by Inuit or indigenous communities (IC exception) and hunts conducted for marine resource management purposes (MRM exception)”	

International Standards and WTO

We all have needs, wants, requirements, and expectations. Needs are essential for life, to maintain certain standards, or essentials for products and services, to full fill the purpose for which they have been acquired. According to the Maslow (Maslow, Abraham H. 1954)

“Man is a wanting being; there is always some need he wants to satisfy. Once this is accomplished, that particular need no longer motivates him and he turns to another, again seeking the satisfaction. Everyone has basic psychological needs that are necessary to sustain life. (Food, Water, Clothing, Shelter). Maslow’s showed that once the psychological needs are fulfilled, the need for safety emerges. After safety, comes social needs followed by the need for esteem and finally the need for self actualization are the need to realize ones full potential. Satisfaction of psychological need is usually associated with money- not money itself but what it can buy”²⁰.

A document which gives detailed guidelines, characteristics, requirements and specifications that can be used consistently to ensure that materials, products, processes and services are fit for their purpose is said to be a standard. ISO International Standards ensure that products and services are safe, reliable and of good quality. For business, they are strategic tools that reduce costs by minimizing waste and errors, and

increasing productivity. They help companies to access new markets, level the playing field for developing countries and facilitate free and fair global trade. The WTO recognized the standards in international trade to protect human life, environment and health. (See Table which relates with the international standards).

Recognized and Applicable International Standards:

Quality Management Standards	ISO 9000	“The ISO 9000 series addresses various aspects of quality management and contains some of ISO’s best known standards. The standards provide guidance and tools for companies and organizations who want to ensure that their products and services consistently meet customer’s requirements, and that quality is consistently improved”.
Environmental Management Systems	ISO 14000	“The ISO 14000 family of standards provides practical tools for companies and organizations of all kinds looking to manage their environmental issues.ISO 14001:2015 and its supporting standards such as ISO 14006:2011 focus on environmental systems to maintain in different areas. The other standards in the family focus on specific approaches such as audits, communications, labeling and life cycle analysis, as well as environmental challenges such as climate change”.
Health &Safety Standards	ISO 45000	“ISO is developing a new standard, ISO 45000 that will help organizations reduce this burden by providing a framework to improve employee safety, reduce workplace risks and create better, safer working conditions, all over the world. Originally, it was OHSAS 18000”.
Food Safety Management	ISO 22000	“The ISO 22000 family of International Standards addresses food safety management. The consequences of unsafe food can be serious and ISO’s food safety management standards help organizations identify and control food safety hazards. As many of today’s food products repeatedly cross national boundaries, International Standards are needed to ensure the safety of the global food supply chain”.

Conclusion:

To conclude, it can be said that the importance and role of WTO cannot be denied. Economies like Pakistan should focus more on their quality standards in order to make strict compliance with the implications of WTO policies. For that matter, private sector should be involved to upgrade quality standards of the goods for export. Packaging of the

major export items of Pakistan should be focused and improved. Capacity building and training workshops for farmers²¹ are also a way out which can lead towards improved crops for export purposes and enhance multi-lateral trade ties with the rest of the world. Also, this is the dire need of time for overall betterment of human race, environment and security.

Notes and References

-
- ¹ An overview of the WTO and Implications of its Membership for Pakistan- (Inaam-ul-Haque), at p.5
- ² Legal Problems of International Economic Relations- J.H.Jackson, et al. west publishing co. U.S.A 2002, at p.575
- ³ World Trade Law- Simon Lester and Bryan Mercurio-First Indian Reprint,2010, universal law publishing co.pvt.ltd, New Delhi, India, at p.558
- ⁴ International Trade Law: Theory and Practice- R. Bhala- second Edition-2001, Lexis Publishing USA, at p.1665
- ⁵ International Economic Law, S.R.Myneni, 2006, Allahabad Law Agency Haryana, at p.434
- ⁶ Pakistan yet to meet food safety standards- DAWN NEWSPAPER, 31 March, 2005
- ⁷ https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/dispu_settl_1995_2014_e.pdf
- ⁸ United States – Standards for Reformulated and Conventional Gasoline, 20th May, 1996
- ⁹ Australia – Measures Affecting Importation of Salmon, 6th Nov, 1998
- ¹⁰ 1 European Communities – Measures Concerning Meat and Meat Products, 13th February, 1998
- ¹¹ Japan – Measures Affecting Agricultural Products, 19th March, 1999
- ¹² European Communities – Measures Affecting Asbestos and Asbestos-Containing Products, 05 April, 2001
- ¹³ European Communities – Protection of Trademarks and Geographical Indications for Agricultural Products and Foodstuffs, 20th April, 2005
- ¹⁴ European Communities – Trade Description of Sardines, 23rd October, 2002
- ¹⁵ Australia – Measures Affecting the Importation of Apples from New Zealand, 17th December, 2010
- ¹⁶ United States – Measures Concerning the Importation, Marketing and Sale of Tuna and Tuna Products, 13th June, 2012
- ¹⁷ United States — Certain Country of Origin Labeling (COOL) Requirements, 23rd July, 2012
- ¹⁸ United States – Measures Affecting the Production and Sale of Clove Cigarettes, 24th April, 2012
- ¹⁹ European Communities — Measures Prohibiting the Importation and Marketing of Seal Products, 18th June, 2014
- ²⁰ ISO 9000 Quality System Handbook- David Hoyle (4th Edition 2002, at p.19)
- ²¹ Impacts of the training and visit extension system on farmers' knowledge and adoption of technology: Evidence from Pakistan by Sayyed Sajidin Hussain, Darek Byerlee, Paul W. Heisey