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[2]Status box

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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| [27]**Notes** | [28]2017-02 Edited |

[29]Title

[30]Focused revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) in relation to re-export (2015-011).

[31]Reasons for the revision of the standard

[32]ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) provides requirements for the content and format of phytosanitary certificates, as well as for the preparation and issuance of phytosanitary certificates by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs).

[33]In 2011, the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) adopted a revision of ISPM 12 that had, as its main objective, the provision of more detailed requirements for preparing and issuing phytosanitary certificates in re-export situations.

[34]However, upon adoption of the revised ISPM 12, the CPM requested that a definition be considered for “identity (of a consignment)”. In addition, after adoption, several contracting parties pointed out that the revised ISPM 12 contained some self-contradictory and unclear text on re-export issues.

[35]Therefore, a slight review of ISPM 12 is proposed to provide a clearer and comprehensive description of re-export issues, with a correct use of terminology and in particular, if necessary, of the terms “identity”, “phytosanitary security” and “integrity”.

[36]In May 2015, the Standards Committee (SC) decided that the proposed changes to ISPM 12 should be carried out through the regular Standard setting process and asked the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) to propose the revision of ISPM 12 as a topic at the 2015 call for topics, for a focused revision in relation to sections that would be affected by the terms.

[37]Scope

[38]The revision of ISPM 12 will be focused on sections affected by the terms “identity (of a consignment)”, “integrity (of a consignment)” and “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)”. It aims to provide some minor text changes so that the requirements for preparing and issuing phytosanitary certificates in re-export situations are clearly and unambiguously described, using correct terminology.

[39]Tasks

[40]The expert drafting group (EDG) should undertake the following tasks:

1. [41]Revise where necessary the text dealing with re-export situations (in particular sections 4 and 6) to ensure more clarity as regards the description of the considerations and requirements for preparing and issuing phytosanitary certificates for re-export or for export, while using correct terminology and retaining the intended meaning of ISPM 12. To this end, the EDG should:

* [42]consider the issues raised by the TPG and presented to the SC in May 2015
* [43]ensure the concepts referred to are clearly explained without using the terms “identity (of a consignment)”, which is currently not defined, and “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)” and “integrity (of a consignment)”, for which the current definitions are under revision
* [44]express in plain wording (and without referring to the three terms mentioned in the previous point) the precondition that all parts of a consignment for re-export are part of the consignment or consignments as originally certified in the country of origin and covered by the original phytosanitary certificate or certificates.

1. [45]Consider whether the use of single-word terms would improve comprehension of the revision of the standard and, if so, propose these terms and their recommended definitions to the SC and TPG.
2. [46]Consider whether the situations and requirements set out in ISPM 12, section 6 (particularly section 6.1), are sufficiently comprehensive, or whether there is benefit in expanding on some additional typical re-export situations in ISPM 12, or in giving additional guidance on more specific situations in a manual. If it is considered that expanded or additional guidance is needed, provide recommendations for the SC or the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) to consider.
3. [47]Consider whether the revised ISPM could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft revision to the ISPM.
4. [48]Consider implementation of the revised standard by contracting parties and identify potential operational and technical implementation issues. Provide information and possible recommendations on these issues to the SC.

[49]Provision of resources

[50]Funding for the meeting may be provided from sources other than the regular programme of the IPPC (FAO). As recommended by ICPM-2 (1999), whenever possible, those participating in standard setting activities voluntarily fund their travel and subsistence to attend meetings. Participants may request financial assistance, with the understanding that resources are limited and the priority for financial assistance is given to developing country participants. Please refer to the *Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the* posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (see <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/>).

[51]Collaborator

[52]To be determined.

[53]Steward

[54]Please refer to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) (see <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards>).

[55]Expertise

[56]Two or three experts with a combined knowledge of and experience in regulating and implementing phytosanitary certification related to re-export; and one or two current or former members of the TPG with particular understanding of terminology related to the phytosanitary certification of consignments.

[57]Participants

[58]To be determined.
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[64]Discussion papers

[65]Participants and interested parties are encouraged to submit discussion papers to the IPPC Secretariat ([ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org)) for consideration by the EDG.