Consolidated reconciliation report for review "2017 First consultation: Draft Specification Proposed Revision of ISPM 12"

**T** (Type) - B = Bullet, C = Comment, P = Proposed Change, R = Rating

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sequential number | Para | Text | T | Comment |
| 1 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Costa Rica** It should give clear guidance on the situations in which a shipment comes from an "A" country, it arrives in a "B" country, which re-exports it to a "C" country, all with respect to the phytosanitary requirements that must be certified by A or B as appropriate for compliance with the requirements of "C"  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 2 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Guyana** Guyana accepts this draft specification in its entirety.  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 3 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Lao People's Democratic Republic** LaoPDR has no comment on DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ISPM, Focused revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) in relation to re-export (2015-011)  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 4 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Japan** The revision of the definitions of “phytosanitary security (of a consignment)”and “integrity (of consignment)” in ISPM5 is significant for this revision of ISPM12. This revision of ISPM12 should be fully consistent with revised definitions of these terms carefully considering effective use of limited resources.  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 5 | G | (General Comment) | C | **COSAVE** No comments to this specification.  *Category : TECHNICAL* |
| 6 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Tajikistan** I support the document as it is and I have no comments  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 7 | G | (General Comment) | C | **China** China agreed with the proposed draft specification.  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 8 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Singapore** Singapore is agreeable to the proposed specifications for revision.  *Category : EDITORIAL* |
| 9 | G | (General Comment) | C | **United States of America** The United States has no comments on this proposed specification.  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 10 | G | (General Comment) | C | **South Africa** The National Plant Protection Organisation of South Africa has no comments on this draft specification.  *Category : EDITORIAL* |
| 11 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Samoa** no further comments  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 12 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Algeria** -   For phytosanitary re-export certificate: phytosanitary services must declare what types of changes have been made to the goods (packaging, phytosanitary treatment, .......)  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 13 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Nepal** No Comment  *Category : EDITORIAL* |
| 14 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Uruguay** We agree with the proposal as it is  *Category : TECHNICAL* |
| 15 | G | (General Comment) | C | **PPPO** No further comments. Agree with the contents.  *Category : EDITORIAL* |
| 16 | G | (General Comment) | C | **OIRSA** Debería considerarse solamente desarrollar una definición de "Identidad" misma debería de considerarse y explicarse en la NIMF No. 12 que es donde se utiliza y no en la NIMF No. 5; porque no seria de gran utilidad.  *Category : TECHNICAL* |
| 17 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Colombia** Con respecto al tema de expedición de certificados fitosanitarios para exportación o reexportación es importante que el grupo de expertos revise lo relacionado con las condiciones y el perfil del profesional que firma el documento en mención.  *Category : TECHNICAL* |
| 18 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Argentina**  No comments to this darft.  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 19 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Cuba**  Mostramos conformidad con lo planteado en el proyecto de especificación  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 20 | G | (General Comment) | C | **Samoa**  agreed to the draft specification  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| Scope | | | | |
| 21 | 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 be described, using correct terminology. | P | **Kenya**  *Category : EDITORIAL* |
| Tasks | | | | |
| 22 | 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 | C | **Nicaragua** Nicaragua esta de acuerdo que estos conceptos sean utilizados hasta que se hayan adoptado por los países y así mismo las consideraciones deben ser descritas de forma clara. Se sugiere al comité de normas que una vez aprobados el uso de los conceptos posteriormente incluirse en el glosario fitosanitario.  *Category : EDITORIAL* |
| 22 | 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.  - consider revising text of section 3.2 to reiterate the obligation of NPPOs to maintain an electronic database of phytosanitary import requirements for seeds either on its official website where they can be accessed by exporters or on the IPPC portal. | P | **International Seed Federation**  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 23 | 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.  - consider the further harmonization of the text for additional declarations and whether to make Appendix 2 an Annex to further promote this harmonization. | P | **International Seed Federation**  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 24 | 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.  - consider text to further promote efficient procedures to obtain additional declarations for re-export. | P | **International Seed Federation** For example, the encouragement of NPPOs to exchange additional declarations needed for re-export and to contact NPPOs requiring additional declarations in case of doubt about technical justification.  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| 25 | 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 Implementation and Capacity Development Committee ~~(CDC)~~ (IC) to consider. | P | **European Union** The title of the committee should be updated.  *Category : EDITORIAL* |
| 26 | 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. | C | **EPPO** Reference to CDC needs to be uptaded  *Category : EDITORIAL* |
| 27 | 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. For example:  - Where product has been re-exported multiple times, should the re-export certificate from importing country be listing each country that the product has been re-exported from and the original country of origin? Also, should the re-export certificate also reference each re-export phyto that has been used for the consignment or just the certificate used to enter the importing country?  - Where product has been sourced from multiple countries and re-exported together, should the certificate identify the product origin for each line?  - Where product is exported to a country and processed further (example, peppercorns imported, crushed and re-exported), does the origin of the product still need to list the country where the product was imported from or does the product then become origin of the country of recieval despite being sourced from another country?  If it is considered that expanded or additional guidance is needed, provide recommendations for the SC or the Capacity Development Committee (CDC) to consider. | P | **Australia** The addition of these specific examples where there is not currently guidance will help the expert working group consider guidance needs.  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |
| Collaborator | | | | |
| 28 | 52 | To be determined. | P | **Kenya**  *Category : EDITORIAL* |
| 29 | 52 | ~~To be determined.~~E-Phyto steering group | P | **Australia** It’s critical that any changes to ISPM 12 (export or re-export Phytos) are acknowledged in the ePhyto workplan.  *Category : SUBSTANTIVE* |