

## **Pakistan statement at COASS**

**10<sup>th</sup> December, 2015.**

Chair, thank you for your report and an opportunity for transparency and exchange of views. We sincerely acknowledge your painstaking efforts for a consensus based decision before leaving for Nairobi - and also the constructive engagements that you have held in a most transparent and inclusive manner.

I must say:

We are disappointed with the fact that up till now we do not have any landing zone in the Export Competition pillar. WTO has a long standing agenda to reform export subsidies.

Chair, it is not advisable to create any linkage between one element of market access pillar with the full pillar of export competition.

Chair, Pakistan is one of those countries that have already eliminated exporting STEs, has zero commitment in the export subsidies schedule of commitment. 9.4 is used rarely, only when we have serious market failures and small farmers economic survival is at stake. Therefore we urge members

to resolve their differences in export competition pillar with a view to finding a solution.

Chair, In our view PSH is not ripe for MC-10, a dispassionate reading of Bali decisions shows that Ministers in Bali agreed to find a solution by MC-11, the general council decision again reiterated MC-11, and urged for the best endeavor and constructive engagement ---which has been there to the optimum—there is no obligation to find permanent solution by MC-10. Seeking a Permanent Mechanism for Food Security at Nairobi, in fact negates the Bali Ministerial Decision itself –

Chair,

The complexity of PSH requires deeper understanding of this policy tool and its impact on other countries food security. Several issues have already been raised on the unintended consequences. Pakistan has actively participated in the process and remained engaged for developing a permanent solution. In our view robust criteria/conditions need to be developed as prerequisites for using the interim solution. Such an approach would discourage increase in AMS type policies, article 20 of the AOA provides us the mandate to reform, the basis of DDA was also this reform agenda. Therefore, any solution to a complex issue such as food security does not lie in backtracking from DDA spirit and Uruguay commitments.

Chair we are not undermining the importance of stockholding for a country's food security policy, there are provisions in the Agreement to deal with this issue. We restate the fact that Public Stockholding Program for Food Security is at our heart. It is critically important to millions of poor farmers thriving on subsistence agriculture. In its current form, it will be a hard sell to our constituents; it has serious adverse unintended consequences impacting our economy.

Chair:

Addressing food security is a complex subject and requires much more than stockholding. The proposed permanent solution has elements that undermine our farmers' livelihoods—hence in our view it is not a solution; it is a problem. At present general consensus amongst our stakeholders is that market price support programs of one country have a negative effect on the food security of other countries. It works as a production incentive, not only inducing unsustainable production, but eliminating smaller exporters in third country markets. It is evident that country's global trade share plays a critical role here.

Chair, We need a robust Post-Nairobi dialogue keeping in view all perspectives of food security on the table.

In Post-Nairobi negotiations we propose that Members work towards developing comprehensive food security initiatives, while keeping in mind the inbuilt complexities of food security and its linkage with domestic and international trade.

Chair, in our view further work on safeguards and its impact on international trade can only be analyzed meaningfully if the interim solution is used by members. All elements such as transparency measures, monitoring, consultation, circumvention as mentioned in the interim solution remain relevant for any permanent solution as well.

Special safeguard mechanism is one element of the total market access pillar; therefore solution has to be developed in the context of full pillar. New proposals on the eve of ministerial have created a practical difficulty in finding any suitable solution.

Domestic support and market access pillar require serious conversation among members on the basis of current realities.

Pakistan is committed to finding reasonable solutions and progress in all pillars after Nairobi in the light of DDA principle of meaningful market access and development for all.

The current situation demands serious reflection and deeper understanding of the issues.

Chair, in the end let me say **Sustainability, has always been part of our rule book but it needs to become an overarching principle now.**

Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*