

2018 FIRST CONSULTATION

1 July – 30 September 2018

Compiled comments for Draft ISPM on Revision of ISPM 8 Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005)

Summary of comments

Name	Summary
Benin	Accepté
Congo	commentaires approuvés
Cuba	No tenemos comentarios a la propuesta
European Union	Completed on 27 September 2018 by the European Commission on behalf of the European Union and its 28 Member States.
Korea, Republic of	Republic of Korea agrees with the comments made during APPPC Regional workshop.
OIRSA	Proyecto de norma revisada e incorporados los comentarios propuestos por los países.
Peru	completada
Singapore	Singapore also support the APPPC's submitted comments.
Trinidad and Tobago	Trinidad and Tobago is in agreement with the comments made during the 2018 IPPC Regional Workshop in the Caribbean.

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

FAO sequential number	Para	Text	T	Comment
1	G	(General Comment)	C	Benin Pas de commentaire <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
2	G	(General Comment)	C	Guyana Guyana accepts these revisions and supports the adoption of this standard <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
3	G	(General Comment)	C	Zambia No comment <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
4	G	(General Comment)	C	Zambia The Draft ISPM is agreed to and therefore there is no comment to the contrary. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
5	G	(General Comment)	C	Sri Lanka Sri Lanka agrees with all the comments made by APPPC on this standard <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>

6	G	(General Comment)	C	Canada Canada supports the proposed draft revision of ISPM 8. Minor editorial changes are provided. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
7	G	(General Comment)	C	Antigua and Barbuda Antigua and Barbuda is in support of this standard and supports the comments submitted by CAHFS. However, some concern is expressed in a substantive comment as indicated in para [107]. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
8	G	(General Comment)	C	Gambia The term "undetermined" should be added as a pest status as in the case of presence or absence <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
9	G	(General Comment)	C	Peru Peru shares with the final comments of COSAVE <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
10	G	(General Comment)	C	Trinidad and Tobago Trinidad and Tobago is in agreement with the comments made during the 2018 IPPC Regional Workshop in the Caribbean. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
11	G	(General Comment)	C	Grenada The review of ISPM is relevant and welcomed by the NPPO of Grenada <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
12	G	(General Comment)	C	Philippines We agree with the comments made during the APPPC Regional Workshop. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
13	G	(General Comment)	C	Viet Nam The new status for "Absent: pest free area (entire country)" is of concern because of the qualifying statement in brackets "(entire country)". In case where an outbreak of the pest occurs in the area, which is confirm to be "the pest free area" whether the pest status is considered to be absent? <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
14	G	(General Comment)	C	Korea, Republic of Republic of Korea agrees with the comments made during APPPC Regional workshop. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
15	G	(General Comment)	C	PPPO We agree with the comments made during the regional workshop <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
16	G	(General Comment)	C	European Union We suggest (together with EPPO) replacing table 1 with the

			<p>following new table 1 (Categories of pest status – Present) and table 1A (Categories of official control) (see also our comments on paras 77 and 94):</p> <p>Table 1 - Categories of pest status – Present 3 columns - header: [78] Status (Distribution); Detail on distribution/seasonality/prevalence; [79] Status description Line 1: [80] Present: widely distributed; Optional; [81] The pest is present throughout the area where conditions are suitable. Line 2: [88] Present: widely distributed, except in PFAs; Optional; [89] The pest is present in the area except for areas which are free from the pest in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas). These areas may be described alongside the pest status determination for a country. Line 3: [82] Present: not widely distributed; Optional; [83] The pest is present in a part or parts of the area where conditions are suitable. Line 4: Present: localized (specify); Required; The pest is present in a part or parts of the area, but only in specific locations to be specified. Line 5: Present: seasonally (specify); Required; The pest may be present in the area but only in specific seasons and will not survive throughout the year.</p> <p>Table 1A - Categories of official control 3 columns - Header: Category; Aim of official control; Comments Line 1: Not under official control; None; e.g. Pest control measures taken by growers Line 2: Under official control; Eradication; e.g. Prediction that the pest is not expected to establish (transient) Line 3: Under official control; Containment; -- Line 4: Under official control; Suppression; -- Line 5: Under official control; RNQP status; -- <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
17	G	(General Comment)	<p>C Bahrain Paragraph no. 217</p>

			<p>Potential implementation issues</p> <p>This standard needed to be revised because other related ISPMs (e.g. ISPM#6 "Surveillance") has been revised also.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>Since ISPM#6 "Surveillance" and ISPM# 8 "Determination of pest status in an area" and ISPM#17 "Pest Reporting" are steps in the process of surveillance and pest reporting, Bahrain propose to integrate the three standards in single standard to be titled : "Surveillance, Status Determination and Reporting of Pest in an Area"</p> <p>The integration will help to deal with the process in more comprehensive way and shall facilitate its revisions without the need to revise each separate standard of the three standards.</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
18	G	(General Comment)	<p>C Bahrain</p> <p>Paragraph no. 28 "Scope" And 30</p> <p>As it stated in the scope, this standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as recommendations for good reporting practices. The scope mentioned also that this standard is not concerned with reporting obligations.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>The scope mentioned also that this standard is not concerned with reporting obligations.</p> <p>However, from paragraph no: 126 to paragraph no 135 the standard described responsibilities of NPPOs and good practices for determining and reporting pest status.</p> <p>ISPM#17 "Pest Reporting" also outline the requirements for pest reporting.</p> <p>Therefore, Bahrain propose to edit "the scope" text as follows:</p> <p>[28]Scope</p> <p>[29]This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as recommendations for good reporting practices.</p> <p>[30]This standard is not concerned with reporting obligations, but with the quality of information used in determining pest status, and good practices for determining and reporting pest status in addition to the requirements of ISPM#17 "Pest Reporting"</p> <p>Or:</p> <p>Keeping the text of SCOPE as it is and delete paragraphs from 126</p>

				to 135. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
19	G	(General Comment)	C	Botswana No comment at this stage <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
20	G	(General Comment)	C	Jamaica Jamaica is in support of the proposed revision for pest status in an area, particularly as it relates to countries being better able to determine and categorize their pest status. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
21	G	(General Comment)	C	Sierra Leone Sierra Leone agrees to the comment made during the Africa regional workshop <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
22	G	(General Comment)	C	Congo j'approuve les commentaires faits à l'atelier <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
23	G	(General Comment)	C	Congo j'approuve les commentaires faits à l'atelier <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
24	G	(General Comment)	C	Burkina Faso La norme est bien élaborée et bien pertinente. Le Burkina Faso approuve cette norme sans objections. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
25	G	(General Comment)	C	Namibia In agreement with the content of the draft. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
26	G	(General Comment)	C	Iraq Iraq reviewed the drafts and has no comments <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
27	G	(General Comment)	C	South Africa The National Plant Protection Organisation of South Africa (NPPOZA) endorse the comments from the regional workshop <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
28	G	(General Comment)	C	Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency Revision of this Standard is timely and necessary and helps will be useful in providing further clarity to NPPOs on the determination of pest status in an area. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
29	G	(General Comment)	C	Japan If a new pest may be just introduced in an area, a period of time may be sometimes required to determine pest status based on technical evaluation (e.g. PRA, surveillance). Under such a circumstance, we should decide the status should be divided into "present" or "absent". Or we should decide the status

				like “transient” on the existing ISPM8 during conducting technical evaluation (i.e. the status is not decided) should be included in the requirements. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
30	G	(General Comment)	C	New Zealand New Zealand agrees with the APPPC regional comments, and submits comments made by New Zealand as noted in the APPPC submission. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
31	G	(General Comment)	C	Lao People's Democratic Republic Lao PDR has agreed with APPPC as Regional comments. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
32	G	(General Comment)	C	APPPC Category : SUBSTANTIVE (67) Japan (8 Sep 2018 4:23 PM) If a new pest may be just introduced in an area, a period of time may be sometimes required to determine pest status based on technical evaluation (e.g. PRA, surveillance). Under such a circumstance, we should decide the status should be divided into “present” or “absent”. Or we should decide the status like “transient” on the existing ISPM8 during conducting technical evaluation (i.e. the status is not decided) should be included in the requirements. Category : SUBSTANTIVE (53) New Zealand (6 Sep 2018 6:31 AM) ISPM 8 refers to ‘surveillance’ in relation to defining the different categories of “absent”, and in the guidance on reliability of information. It is not specific about the type of surveillance, i.e. whether active surveillance is required, or whether passive surveillance is OK. Perhaps ISPM8 is deliberately vague. Whatever the intention, we understand NPPOs currently apply the category “Absent: pest not recorded” for pests for which they have no record of as a result of passive surveillance.....i.e. not known to occur. There will potentially be significant implementation issues if current practice needs to be changed because of this. Category : SUBSTANTIVE (37) New Zealand (6 Sep 2018 1:07 AM) New Zealand has serious concern about removing "transient" as a category for pest status, as including "transient" in "present" will create problem for market access requirements. Suggest to keep the "transient" category in the current standard: 3.1.3 Transience Pest status is considered transient when a pest is present but establishment is not expected to occur based on technical evaluation. There are three types of transience. Transient: non-actionable The pest has only been detected as an individual occurrence or isolated population not expected to

				<p>survive and no phytosanitary measures have been applied. Transient: actionable, under surveillance The pest has been detected as an individual occurrence or an isolated population that may survive into the immediate future, but is not expected to establish. Appropriate phytosanitary measures, including surveillance are being applied. ISPM 8 Determination of pest status in an area ISPM 8-10 International Plant Protection Convention Transient: actionable, under eradication The pest has been detected as an isolated population which may survive into the immediate future and, without phytosanitary measures for eradication, may establish. Appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied for its eradication. Category : SUBSTANTIVE (10) Malaysia (21 Aug 2018 4:59 AM) Malaysia has reviewed and accepted the draft.</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
33	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>United States of America Suggest moving information from the Appendix 1 to the body of the draft, the same way as presented in the current ISPM 8, from which this table was modified. This is an important guidance for and ISPM dealing with the quality of information used for a pest records and it should be preserved as an official part of the standard. Users should know how reliable the information is and it is helpful to have all this info in one place, not searching for it in multiple places.</p> <p>Reference the 1998 ISPM, where the table was an important part of that document and within the body of that document</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
34	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Malawi We agree with Comments <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
35	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>IPPC Regional Workshop Africa Part 4 of the draft standard seems to contradict this. Need for these sections to be re-visited for purposes of consistency <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
36	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>IPPC Regional Workshop Africa This section is not part of the standard. The Standards Committee in May 2016 requested the Secretariat to gather information on any potential implementation issues related to this draft. Please provide detail and proposal on how to address this potential implementation issue. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>

37	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>IPPC Regional Workshop Africa The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area.</p> <p>Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status MUST be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
38	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Malawi We accept the draft ISPM <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
39	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Costa Rica Traslation: in spanish version chance "situación" for "condición" <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i></p>
40	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>South Africa Propose that the sub categories of "transient" be maintained as reflected in ISPM 8 under the category "present". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
41	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Algeria NO COMMENT <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>
42	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Chile Chile support and agrees with comments of COSAVE <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>
43	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Brazil Brazil supports COSAVE's comments. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
44	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Lao People's Democratic Republic So far, no comments for Lao PDR <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>
45	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Argentina Translation should be revised to use the correct glossary terms in Spanish for instance "pest status" should be translated as "condicion de una plaga" <i>Category : TRANSLATION</i></p>

46	G	(General Comment)	C	Argentina The guidance on reliability of information sources should be kept as an appendix because it provides examples rather than an exhaustive list. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
47	G	(General Comment)	C	Uruguay Guidance on reliability of information sources should be kept as an Appendix because it provides examples rather than an exhaustive list. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
48	G	(General Comment)	C	Uruguay Translation should be revised to use the correct Glossary terms in Spanish, for instance "pest status" should be translated as "condición de una plaga" <i>Category : TRANSLATION</i>
49	G	(General Comment)	C	Malaysia Malaysia has reviewed and accepted the draft. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
50	G	(General Comment)	C	Peru Peru shares the comments made by COSAVE <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
51	G	(General Comment)	C	Guinea-Bissau Categories of pest status – Present Status Status description Present: widely distributed The pest is present throughout the area where conditions are suitable. Present: not widely distributed and not under official control The pest is present in a part or parts of the area in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of "official control" and "not widely distributed") to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms). Present: not widely distributed and under official control The pest is present in the area and subject to "official control" in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of "official control" and "not widely distributed") to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms). The purpose of the official control should be stated alongside the status determination.

				<p>Present: at low prevalence</p> <p>The pest is present in the area but its prevalence is low in accordance with ISPM 22 (Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence).</p> <p>Present: except in specified pest free areas</p> <p>The pest is present in the area except for areas which are free from the pest in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas). These areas must be described alongside the status determination.</p> <p>Present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites</p> <p>The pest is present in an area except for pest free places of production or production sites in accordance with ISPM 10 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites). These places should be described alongside the status determination.</p> <p>Present: not expected to establish</p> <p>The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
52	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Guinea-Bissau</p> <p>Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included. pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.</p> <p><i>Category : EDITORIAL</i></p>
53	G	(General Comment)	C	<p>Guinea-Bissau</p> <p>3.2 Absence</p> <p>A pest is considered to be absent if surveillance and other information indicate that the pest is not found in the area. If a</p>

				pest is absent and reliable information is available, then it must be possible to characterize this status using the categories provided in Table 2. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
54	G	(General Comment)	C	Guinea-Bissau It is possible to conclude that a pest is absent if information on presence is unreliable. Negative results of surveillance may provide knowledge about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence. Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area. Pest status may be "undetermined" if the NPPO cannot provide results from surveillance or any other supporting information. This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification , diagnostic methods are outdated. In such cases, surveillance may be necessary. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
55	G	(General Comment)	C	Indonesia Indonesia propose to add some words in the last point at the second column, fifth row on Table 2, i.e. "- changes in production practices including changes in storage system or in warehousing system". <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
56	G	(General Comment)	C	Indonesia Indonesia propose to add one more point i.e. "- establishing policies concerning pest control or pest management" under NPPOs may use pest status information for: <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
57	G	(General Comment)	C	COSAVE The guidance on reliability of information sources should be kept as an appendix because it provides examples rather than an exhaustive list. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
58	G	(General Comment)	C	COSAVE Translation should be revised to use the correct glossary terms in Spanish for instance "pest status" should be translated as "condicion de una plaga" <i>Category : TRANSLATION</i>
59	G	(General Comment)	C	Congo j'approuve les commentaires faits pendant l'atelier <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
60	G	(General Comment)	C	Colombia En la NIMF 5 "Glosario de términos fitosanitarios" se establece que

				el término correcto y estandarizado es "Condición". Por lo anterior, se hace necesario remplazar el termino "Situación" por "Condición" en todo el texto. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
61	G	(General Comment)	C	Colombia En la NIMF 5 "Glosario de términos fitosanitarios" se establece que el término correcto y estandarizado es "Condición". Por lo anterior, se hace necesario remplazar el termino "Situación" por "Condición" en todo el texto. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
62	G	(General Comment)	C	Costa Rica Traducir en toda la norma: "situación" por "condición", termino usado en la NIMF para referirse a la "condición de plaga" o "pest status" <i>Category : TRANSLATION</i>
63	G	(General Comment)	C	Venezuela Venezuela, no tiene ningun aporte sobre esta propuesta de norma <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
Scope				
64	29	This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as recommendations for good <u>determination and</u> reporting practices.	P	Panama For consistency with the section 4.1 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
65	29	This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as recommendations for good <u>or official</u> reporting <u>practicespractices and information from pest records or other sources should be used in determining pest status.</u>	P	Viet Nam Combine the second paragraph of the scope <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
66	29	This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as <u>recommendations for good</u> <u>practices for determining and</u> reporting <u>practicespest status.</u>	P	European Union To prevent any confusion with ISPM 17 (Pest reporting). The wording suggested comes from the title of section 4.1 (Good practices for determining and reporting pest status). <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
67	29	This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as <u>recommendations for good</u> <u>practices for determining and</u> reporting <u>practicespest status.</u>	P	EPPO To prevent any confusion with ISPM 17 (Pest reporting). The wording suggested comes from the title of section 4.1 (Good practices for determining and reporting pest status). <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
68	29	This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as recommendations for good <u>determination and</u> reporting practices.	P	Costa Rica For consistency with the section 4.1. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
69	29	This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as recommendations for good <u>determination and</u> reporting practices.	P	Argentina <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

70	29	This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as recommendations for good reporting practices.	C	Argentina For consistency with the section 4.1 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
71	29	This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as recommendations for good <u>determination and</u> reporting practices.	P	Uruguay For consistency with section 4.1 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
72	29	This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as recommendations for good reporting practices.	C	COSAVE For consistency with the section 4.1 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
73	29	This standard describes the use of pest records and other information to determine pest status in an area. Descriptions of pest status categories are provided, as well as recommendations for good <u>determination and</u> reporting practices.	P	COSAVE <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
74	29	En la presente norma se describe el uso de registros de plagas y otra información para determinar la <u>situación-condición</u> de una plaga en un área. Se describen las categorías aplicables a la <u>situación-condición</u> de una plaga y se formulan recomendaciones relativas a las buenas prácticas de notificación.	P	Costa Rica Termino correcto usado en la NIMF <i>Category : TRANSLATION</i>
75	30	This standard is not concerned with reporting obligations, but with the quality of information used in determining pest status.	P	Viet Nam The second paragraph of the scope should be deleted as it is redundant <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
76	30	This standard is not concerned with reporting obligations, but with provides <u>guidance on</u> the <u>quality-reliability</u> of information used in determining pest status.	P	European Union The first part of the sentence is contradictory with the second sentence of the previous paragraph. The issue of the reliability of information needs to be addressed in the scope. A new wording is provided to better reflect the scope of Standard. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
77	30	This standard is not concerned with reporting obligations, but with provides <u>guidance on</u> the <u>quality-reliability</u> of information used in determining pest status.	P	EPPO The first part of the sentence is contradictory with the second sentence of the previous paragraph. The issue of the reliability of information needs to be addressed in the scope. A new wording is provided to better reflect the scope of Standard. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
78	30	This standard is not concerned with reporting obligations, but with the quality of information used in determining pest status.	P	APPPC 67) Japan (8 Sep 2018 4:23 PM) If a new pest may be just introduced in an area, a period of time may be sometimes required to determine pest status based on technical evaluation (e.g. PRA, surveillance). Under such a circumstance, we should decide the status should be divided into "present" or "absent". Or we should decide the status like "transient" on the existing ISPM8 during conducting technical evaluation (i.e. the status is not decided) should be included in the

				requirements. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
79	30	This standard is not concerned with reporting obligations, but with the quality of information used in determining pest status.	C	South Africa Request the replacement of the word "quality" with "accuracy" since quality may be relative unlike accuracy which is specific. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
80	30	This standard is not concerned with reporting obligations, but with the quality of information used in determining pest status.	P	Thailand The second paragraph of the scope should be deleted as it is redundant. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
References				
81	32	The present standard refers to ISPMs to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms .	P	Viet Nam <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
82	32	The present standard refers to ISPMs to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms .	P	Ghana <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
83	32	The present standard refers to ISPMs to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms .	P	Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
84	32	The present standard refers to ISPMs to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms .	P	APPPC <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
85	32	The present standard refers to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms .	C	United States of America Spell out "ISPMs" as it is used in the text for the first time. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
86	32	The present standard refers to ISPMs to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms .	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa Separate 'to' and 'ISPMs' <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
87	32	The present standard refers to ISPMs to ISPMs. ISPMs are available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) at https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/ispms .	P	Australia <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
88	33	IPPC, 1997. International Plant Protection Convention. Rome, IPPC, FAO.	P	Argentina For consistency with other adopted ISPM <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
89	33	IPPC, 1997. International Plant Protection Convention. Rome, IPPC, FAO.	P	Uruguay For consistency with other adopted ISPMs <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
90	33	IPPC, 1997. International Plant Protection Convention. Rome, IPPC, FAO.	P	COSAVE For consistency with other adopted ISPM

				Category : EDITORIAL
Definitions				
91	35	Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitaryPhytosanitary terms</i>).	P	Ghana Category : EDITORIAL
92	35	Definitions of phytosanitary Phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitaryPhytosanitary terms</i>).	P	Ghana Category : EDITORIAL
93	35	Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitaryphytosanitary terms</i>).	P	APPPC (10) Malaysia (21 Aug 2018 4:59 AM) Malaysia has reviewed and accepted the draft. Category : SUBSTANTIVE
94	35	Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this standard can be found in ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>).	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa Category : EDITORIAL
Outline of Requirements				
95	36	Outline of Requirements	C	European Union Following the results of the first consultation, the outlines on requirements should be rewritten to be more informative and useful for NPPOs (please see the outlines of requirements of ISPM 8 as adopted in 1998). Category : TECHNICAL
96	36	Outline of Requirements	C	EPPO Following the results of the first consultation, the outlines on requirements should be rewritten to be more informative and useful for NPPOs (please see the outlines of requirements of ISPM 8 as adopted in 1998). Category : TECHNICAL
97	36	Outline of Requirements	C	United States of America Verify that the content of the "outline of requirements" accurately reflects the actual requirements stated in the following sections of the draft. Category : TECHNICAL
98	37	Pest status is determined by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) responsible for the area, for various purposes and using different sources of information as outlined in this standard information. This standard also provides guidance on the purpose of the determination of pest status.	P	European Union ISPM 8 does not provide "guidance" on the purpose of the determination of pest status. Category : TECHNICAL
99	37	Pest status is determined by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) responsible for the area,area for various purposes and using different sources of information as outlined in this standard. This standard also provides guidance on the purpose of the determination of pest status. information.	P	EPPO ISPM 8 does not provide "guidance" on the purpose of the determination of pest status. Category : TECHNICAL
100	37	Pest status is determined by the national plant protection <u>National Plant Protection</u> organization (NPPO) responsible for the area,using sources of information as	P	Ghana Category : EDITORIAL

		outlined in this standard. This standard also provides guidance on the purpose of the determination of pest status.		
101	37	<p>Pest status is determined by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) responsible for the area, using sources of information as outlined in this standard. This standard also provides guidance on the purpose of the determination of pest status.</p> <p><u>Determination of pest status in an area is an important part of many IPPC activities including pest risk analysis, market access requests and establishing and complying with phytosanitary import regulations, planning national, regional or international pest management programmes and exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC. Information from pest records and other sources should be used to determine the pest status categories listed below. Information is available from many sources and is of varying reliability. Appendix 1 provides guidance on the levels of pest record reliability. The categories of present status include: present: not widely distributed; present: not widely distributed and not under official control; present: not widely distributed and under official control; present: at low prevalence; present: except in specified pest free areas; present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites; present: not expected to establish (transcience). The categories of the absent status include: absent: pest not recorded; absent: pest free area (entire country); absent: pest records invalid; absent: pest no longer present; absent: pest eradicated.</u></p> <p><u>Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII 1. (a)) to report “the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests” and should also provide to NPPOs pest records and supporting evidence when requested. Good practices should be used for this including the correct usage of pest status categories, the use of reliable information, the maintenance of pest records and updating other NPPOs and RPPOs of changes in pest status according to ISPM 17.</u></p>	P	<p>APPPC (96) APPPC (11 Sep 2018 2:03 AM) (17) New Zealand (5 Sep 2018 5:00 AM) Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
102	37	<p>Pest status is determined by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) responsible for the area, using sources of information as outlined in this standard. This standard also provides guidance on on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>the purpose of determining pest status,</u> <u>evaluating the determination reliability of information supporting pest status, status determination, and</u> <u>sources of uncertainty in determining the pest status in an area.</u> 	P	<p>Australia Restructuring will make this section easier to read and add clarity to requirements and purpose Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i></p>
103	37	<p>Pest status is determined by the national plant protection organization <u>National Plant Protection Organization</u> (NPPO) responsible for the area, using sources of</p>	P	<p>Australia</p>

		information as outlined in this standard. This standard also provides guidance on the purpose of the determination of pest status.		<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
104	37	Pest status is determined by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) responsible for the area, <u>using</u> sources of information as outlined in this standard. This standard also provides guidance on the purpose of the determination of pest status.	P	NEPPO <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
105	37	Pest status is determined by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) responsible for the area, <u>using, based on the</u> sources of information as outlined in this standard. This standard also provides guidance on the purpose of the determination of pest status.	P	Argentina More appropriate text. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
106	37	Pest status is determined by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) responsible for the area, <u>using, based on the</u> sources of information as outlined in this standard. This standard also provides guidance on the purpose of the determination of pest status.	P	Uruguay more appropriate text <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
107	37	Pest status is determined by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) responsible for the area, <u>using, based on the</u> sources of information as outlined in this standard. This standard also provides guidance on the purpose of the determination of pest status.	P	COSAVE More appropriate text. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
108	38	<u>Des orientations y sont développées et décrites quant à l'évaluation de la fiabilité des informations et les facteurs d'incertitude d'incertitude concernant la détermination de la situation d'un organisme nuisible nuisibles dans une zone y sont décrits zone.</u>	P	Chad reformulation du paragraphe 38 pour une bonne compréhension Des orientations y sont développées et décrites quant à l'évaluation de la fiabilité des informations et les facteurs d'incertitude concernant la détermination d'un organisme nuisible dans une zone. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
109	39	This standard identifies categories for pest status under “presence” or “absence”. It also describes the responsibilities of NPPOs and good practices for determining and reporting pest status. <u>Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII 1. (a)) to report “the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests” and should also provide to NPPOs pest records and supporting evidence when requested. Good reporting practices should be used for this including the correct usage of pest status categories, the use of reliable information, the maintenance of pest records and updating other NPPOs and RPPOs of changes in pest status according to ISPM 17 (Pest reporting).</u>	P	Viet Nam <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
110	39	This standard identifies categories for pest status under “presence” or “absence”. It also describes the responsibilities of NPPOs and good <u>or official reporting</u> practices for determining and reporting pest status.	P	Viet Nam follows scope <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

111	39	This standard identifies categories for pest status under “presence” <u>(in combination with status of official control)</u> or “absence”. It also describes the responsibilities of NPPOs and good practices for determining and reporting pest status.	P	European Union We propose to add this precision in alignment with the changes made to table 1 to indicate that in addition to the pest status also official control is relevant (see EU substantive comment on paragraph 76). <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
112	39	This standard identifies <u>and describes</u> categories for pest status under <u>the two broad categories</u> “presence” or <u>and</u> “absence”. It also describes the responsibilities of NPPOs and good practices for determining and reporting pest status.	P	European Union More precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
113	39	This standard identifies <u>and describes</u> categories for pest status under <u>the two broad categories</u> “presence” or <u>(in combination with status of official control) and</u> “absence”. It also describes the responsibilities of NPPOs and good practices for determining and reporting pest status.	P	EPPO More precise wording. We propose to add this precision in alignment with the changes made to table 1 to indicate that in addition to the pest status also official control is relevant (see EPPO substantive comment on paragraph 76) <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
114	39	This standard identifies categories for pest status under “presence” or “absence”. It also describes the responsibilities of NPPOs and good practices for determining and reporting pest status. This standard also identifies: • <u>categories for pest status under “presence” or “absence”</u> , • <u>responsibilities of NPPOs, and</u> • <u>good practices for determining and reporting pest status.</u>	P	Australia Restructuring will make this section easier to read and add clarity to requirements and purpose <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
115	39	La présente norme établit des catégories de situation d'un organisme nuisible au regard de de la « <u>présence</u> »- <u>présence</u> ou « <u>absence</u> »-de <u>"l'absence"</u> de celui-ci. Elle décrit en outre les responsabilités des ONPV et les bonnes pratiques s'agissant de déterminer la situation d'un organisme nuisible et de communiquer des informations à cet égard.	P	Chad le paragraphe 39 est reformulé pour une bonne compréhension La présente norme établit des catégories de situation d'un organisme nuisible au regard de" la présence" ou de "l'absence" de celui-ci. Elle décrit en outre les responsabilités des ONPV et les bonnes pratiques s'agissant de déterminer la situation d'un organisme nuisible et de communiquer des information à cet égard. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
Background				
116	41	Pest records and other information are used to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area. <u>All-National plant protection organizations of</u> importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, and the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas.	P	Canada Addition to provide clarity. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
117	41	Pest records and other information are used to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area. All importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, and the establishment and maintenance	P	Panama <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

		of pest free areas–, <u>areas of low prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites.</u>		
118	41	Pest records and other information are used to determine the presence or absence of a pest in an area. All importing and exporting countries need information concerning the status of pests for pest risk analysis, the establishment of and compliance with phytosanitary regulations, and the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas–, <u>areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites</u>	P	Costa Rica these conditions it is also important to have information on the status of pest for pest risk analysis. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
119	41	Para determinar la presencia o ausencia de una plaga en un área se utilizan los registros de plagas y otra información. Todos los países importadores y exportadores necesitan información sobre la situación de las plagas para el análisis del riesgo de plagas, el establecimiento y cumplimiento de reglamentaciones fitosanitarias y el establecimiento y mantenimiento de áreas libres de plagas, <u>áreas de baja prevalencia, lugares de producción libres de plagas y sitios de producción libres de plagas.</u>	P	OIRSA Especificar más a detalle que es lo que se necesita. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
120	42	This standard describes how information is used to <u>officially</u> determine the pest status in an area. This <u>The main</u> information includes records from surveillance as described in ISPM 6 (<i>Surveillance</i>). Pest records and pest status are also used by NPPOs in pest reporting as described in ISPM 17 <u>(17 Pest reporting)</u> .	P	Viet Nam <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
121	42	This <u>The purpose of this</u> standard describes how information is used to determine <u>provide guidance on the determination of</u> pest status in an area. This, using in particular information includes records from surveillance <u>and pest records</u> as described in ISPM 6 (<i>Surveillance</i>). Pest records and pest status are also used by NPPOs in <u>is part of the content of</u> pest reporting reports as described in ISPM 17 (<i>Pest reporting</i>).	P	European Union Better wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
122	42	This <u>The purpose of this</u> standard describes how information is used to determine <u>provide guidance on the determination of</u> pest status in an area. This, using in particular information includes records from surveillance <u>and pest records</u> as described in ISPM 6 (<i>Surveillance</i>). Pest records and pest status are also used by NPPOs in <u>is part of the content of</u> pest reporting reports as described in ISPM 17 (<i>Pest reporting</i>).	P	EPPO Better wording <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
123	42	This standard describes how information is used to determine the pest status in an area. This information includes records from surveillance as described in ISPM 6 (<i>Surveillance</i>). Pest records and pest status are also used by NPPOs <u>NPPO's</u> in pest reporting as described in ISPM 17 (<i>Pest reporting</i>).	P	Ghana <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
124	42	This standard describes how information is used to determine the pest status in an area. This information includes <u>The main source of such as that included in pest</u>	P	APPPC (69) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 3:48 AM)

		records <u>derived</u> from surveillance as described in ISPM 6 (<i>Surveillance</i>). Pest records and pest status are also used by NPPOs in pest reporting as described in ISPM 17 (<i>Pest reporting</i>).		(20) New Zealand (5 Sep 2018 5:05 AM) Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>
125	42	This standard describes how information is used to determine the pest status in an area. This information includes records from surveillance as described in ISPM 6 (<i>Surveillance</i>). Pest records and pest status are also used by NPPOs in pest reporting as described in ISPM 17 (<i>Pest reporting</i>).	P	Kenya Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
126	42	This standard describes how information is used to determine the pest status in an area. <u>This information includes Information could be obtained from</u> records from surveillance as described in ISPM 6 (<i>Surveillance</i>). <u>peer reviewed journals, databases, websites and published expert sources</u> . Pest records and pest status are also used by NPPOs in pest reporting as described in ISPM 17 (<i>Pest reporting</i>).	P	Kenya Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT				
127	44	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests that can have an impact on biodiversity and the environment. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and to apply phytosanitary measures <u>contributing</u> to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	Panama To clarify that phytosanitary measures may contribute to protect biodiversity and environment. Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
128	44	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests that can have an impact on biodiversity and the environment. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and to apply phytosanitary measures to protect biodiversity and the environment.	C	Bangladesh For protection of biodiversity and the environment may be count gene flow of transgenic plant or GMO or LMO. Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
129	44	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests <u>that can whose introduction and spread may</u> have an <u>impact on biodiversity and the environment</u> <u>environmental impact</u> . Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and to apply phytosanitary measures to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	EPPO More precise wording. Prevention of a repetition. Deletion of a useless word. Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>
130	44	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests that can have an impact on biodiversity and the environment. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and to apply phytosanitary <u>Phytosanitary</u> measures to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	Ghana Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>

131	44	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests that can have an impact on biodiversity and the environment. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and to apply phytosanitary measures to protect biodiversity and the environment. This standard provides a consistent approach to determining and describing pest status. It can be used to determine the status of pests that can negatively impact on biodiversity and the environment. This process can be used to help countries identify risks associated with such pests and to apply phytosanitary measures that can help protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	Australia Restructuring of this section creates clarity and removes repetition. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
132	44	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests that can have an impact on biodiversity and the environment. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and to apply phytosanitary measures <u>contributing</u> to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	Costa Rica To clarify that phytosanitary measures may contribute to protect biodiversity and environment. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
133	44	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests that can have an impact on biodiversity and the environment. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and to apply phytosanitary measures <u>contributing</u> to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	Argentina To clarify that phytosanitary measures may contribute to protect biodiversity and environment. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
134	44	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests that can have an impact on biodiversity and the environment. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and to apply phytosanitary measures <u>contributing</u> to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	Uruguay To clarify that phytosanitary measures may contribute to protect biodiversity and environment. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
135	44	This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by helping countries to determine the status of pests that can have an impact on biodiversity and the environment. Determining and describing pest status in a consistent manner may help countries identify risks associated with such pests and to apply phytosanitary measures <u>contributing</u> to protect biodiversity and the environment.	P	COSAVE To clarify that phytosanitary measures may contribute to protect biodiversity and environment. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
1. Purpose of Pest Status Determination				
136	46	1. Purpose of Pest Status Determination	C	European Union The section 1. (Purpose of pest status determination) should not be part of the requirements. Its content should therefore be moved to the Background section as was done for ISPM 6 (Surveillance).

				Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
137	46	1. Purpose of Pest Status Determination	C	EPPO The section 1. (Purpose of pest status determination) should not be part of the requirements. Its content should therefore be moved to the Background section as was done for ISPM 6 (Surveillance). Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
138	47	Determination of pest status <u>in an area</u> is a vital component of a number of activities covered under the IPPC and by the principles noted in ISPM 1 (<i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade</i>) and the international standards for phytosanitary measures that have been developed from them. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area.	P	Viet Nam Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
139	47	Determination of pest status is a vital component of a number of activities covered under the IPPC and by the principles noted in ISPM 1 (<i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade</i>) and the international standards for phytosanitary measures that have been developed from them. Pest status <u>is-should only be</u> determined by the NPPO responsible for the area.	P	European Union To make clearer that it is a requirement and that it is the NPPO responsible for the area that sets the pest status. Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
140	47	Determination of pest status is a vital component of a number of activities covered under the IPPC and by the principles <u>noted-described</u> in ISPM 1 (<i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade</i>) and <u>the international standards for phytosanitary measures that have been developed from them</u> <u>elaborated in other ISPMs</u> . Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area.	P	European Union 1) Better wording coming from the scope of ISPM 1. 2) The abbreviation ISPM is used for ISPM 1 in the same sentence. 3) The crucial requirement "Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area" should be given a more prominent position through the creation of a new paragraph. Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>
141	47	Determination of pest status is a vital component of a number of activities covered under the IPPC and by the principles noted in ISPM 1 (<i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade</i>) and the international standards for phytosanitary measures that have been developed from them. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area.	C	Bangladesh Agree to review of all pest status issues. Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
142	47	Determination of pest status is a vital component of a number of activities covered under the IPPC and by the principles <u>noted-described</u> in ISPM 1 (<i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade</i>) and <u>the international standards for phytosanitary measures that have been developed from them</u> <u>elaborated in other ISPMs</u> . Pest status <u>is-should only be</u> determined by the NPPO responsible for the area.	P	EPPO 1) Better wording coming from the scope of ISPM 1. 2) The abbreviation ISPM is used for ISPM 1 in the same sentence. 3) The crucial requirement "Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area" should be given a more prominent position through the creation of a new paragraph. To make clearer that it is a requirement and that it is the NPPO responsible for the area that sets the pest status. Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>

143	47	Determination of pest status is a vital component of a number of activities covered under the IPPC and by the principles noted in ISPM 1 (<i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary Phytosanitary measures in international trade</i>) and the international standards for phytosanitary <u>Phytosanitary</u> measures that have been developed from them. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area.	P	Ghana Category : EDITORIAL
144	47	Determination of pest status <u>in an area</u> is a vital component of a number of activities covered under the IPPC and by the principles noted in ISPM 1 (<i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade</i>) and the international standards for phytosanitary measures that have been developed from them. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area. <u>Pest status is determined for each targeted area i.e. a country, a part of a country or all or parts of several countries.</u>	P	China Area is officially defined as a country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries. Category : SUBSTANTIVE
145	47	Determination of pest status <u>in an area</u> is a vital component of a number of activities covered under the IPPC and by the principles noted in ISPM 1 (<i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade</i>) and the international standards for phytosanitary measures that have been developed from them. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area. <u>Pest status is determined for each targeted area, i.e. a country, a part of a country or all or parts of several countries.</u>	P	Japan Area can be officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries. To clarify that pest status in a part of a country does not apply to the whole country (i.e. The status which a pest is present in a part of the country does not directly mean that the pest status in the country is "presence") and pest status is determined for each targeted area, i.e. a country, a part of a country or all or parts of several countries. This proposed change is supported by APPPC as well as by Japan. Category : SUBSTANTIVE
146	47	Determination of pest status <u>in an area</u> is a vital component of a number of activities covered under the IPPC and by the principles noted in ISPM 1 (<i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade</i>) and the international standards for phytosanitary measures that have been developed from them. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area. <u>Pest status is determined for each targeted area i.e. a country, a part of a country or all or parts of several countries.</u>	P	APPPC (75) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 4:53 AM) To include the reference to areas in a country under pest status i.e proposed additions and that the pest status should not only be apply to the whole country only - Area is officially defined as a country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries. (66) Japan (8 Sep 2018 3:49 PM) area is officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries. To clarify that pest status in a part of a country does not apply to the whole country (i.e. The status which a pest is present in a part of the country does not directly mean that the pest status in the country is "presence") and pest status is determined for each targeted area, i.e. a country, a part of a country or all or parts of several countries. Category : SUBSTANTIVE
147	47	Determination of pest status is a vital component of a number of activities covered under the IPPC and by the principles noted in ISPM 1 (<i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in</i>	P	Montenegro Category : TECHNICAL

		international trade) and the international standards for phytosanitary measures that have been developed from them. Pest status is determined <u>only</u> by the NPPO responsible for the area.		
148	47	La détermination de la situation d'un organisme nuisible est indispensable pour <u>la mise en œuvre de</u> plusieurs des activités prévues par la Convention internationale pour la protection des végétaux (CIPV) et par la NIMP 1 (<i>Principes phytosanitaires pour la protection des végétaux et l'application de mesures phytosanitaires dans le cadre du commerce international</i>), ainsi que par les autres normes internationales qui en découlent. La situation d'un organisme nuisible est déterminée par l'ONPV responsable de la zone considérée.	P	Chad La première phrase du paragraphe 47 est reformulée pour une bonne compréhension La détermination de la situation d'un organisme nuisible est indispensable pour la mise en œuvre de plusieurs activités prévues par la Convention Internationale pour la Protection des Végétaux (CIPV) Category : EDITORIAL
149	47	La determinación de la situación de una plaga es un componente crucial de diversas actividades comprendidas en la CIPF, de los principios de la NIMF 1 (<i>Principios fitosanitarios para la protección de las plantas y la aplicación de medidas fitosanitarias en el comercio internacional</i>) y de las normas internacionales para medidas fitosanitarias que se han elaborado basándose en estos principios. La situación de una plaga <u>en un área</u> la determina la ONPF responsable del área responsable.	P	OIRSA Mejor comprensión del texto Category : EDITORIAL
150	48	NPPOs may use pest status <u>in an area</u> information for:	P	Viet Nam Category : SUBSTANTIVE
151	48	NPPOs may use pest status information <u>information, for instance</u> for:	P	European Union The list is not exhaustive and other uses should not be excluded. Category : TECHNICAL
152	48	NPPOs may use pest status information <u>information, for instance</u> for:	P	EPPO The list is not exhaustive and other uses should not be excluded. Category : TECHNICAL
153	48	Las ONPF podrán usar la información relativa a la situación de una plaga para: <u>Confirmación de la presencia de plagas nativas, base para el establecimiento del listado de las plagas de importancia cuarentenaria.</u> <u>Elaboración de mapas de riesgo de diseminación por condiciones agroecológicas propicias para su desarrollo (hospedantes)</u> <u>Establecer planes de contingencia ante la Aparición de un brote de plagas reglamentadas en las ONPF importadoras(destino) y exportadoras (origen).</u>	P	OIRSA El nuevo modelo de producción de Lugar de Producción Libres de Plagas y Sitios de Producción Libres de Plagas. Category : TECHNICAL
154	48	Las ONPF podrán usar la información relativa a la situación <u>condición</u> de una plaga para:	P	Costa Rica Category : TRANSLATION
155	49	pest risk analysis <u>- establishing or updating list of regulated pest</u>	P	Korea, Republic of Republic of Korea would like to propose an additional bullet "establishing or updating a list of regulated pests" as it is also relevant to use of pest status information.

				<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
156	49	pest risk analysis-analysis <u>establishing or updating list of regulated pest</u>	P	China Add "establishing or updating a list of regulated pests" as it is also relevant to use of pest status information. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
157	49	pest risk analysis-analysis <u>list of regulated pests</u>	P	APPPC 21) New Zealand (5 Sep 2018 5:12 AM) The NPPO should have access to information on the presence of pests in its country (preferably as pest lists), to facilitate the categorization of pests during pest risk analysis. The NPPO should also maintain lists of all its regulated pests. Detailed information on lists of regulated pests is contained in ISPM No. 19: Guidelines on lists of regulated pests. APPPC (10 Sep 2018 3:52 AM) : Closed: Another change was accepted which conflicts with this one <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
158	49	pest risk analysis-analysis <u>establishing or updating list of regulated pest</u>	P	APPPC 31) Thailand (5 Sep 2018 12:49 PM) Thailand would like to propose an additional bullet "establishing or updating a list of regulated pests" as it is also relevant to use of pest status information. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
159	49	pest risk analysis <u>- establishing or updating list of regulated pest</u>	P	APPPC Thailand would like to propose an additional bullet "establishing or updating a list of regulated pests" as it is also relevant to use of pest status information. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
160	49	pest risk analysis-analysis <u>- establishing or updating list of regulated pest</u>	P	Thailand Thailand would like to propose an additional bullet "establishing or updating a list of regulated pests" as it is also relevant to use of pest status information. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
161	50	market access requests <u>Generating pest lists</u>	P	Kenya <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
162	51	planning national, regional or international pest <u>surveillance and</u> management programmes	P	Viet Nam addition planning pests surveillance programme <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
163	51	planning national, regional or international pest <u>surveillance and</u> management programmes	P	Korea, Republic of to include planning surveillance with pest management programme. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
164	51	planning national, regional or international pest management-surveillance <u>andmanagement</u> programmes	P	China The planning of pest surveillance is referred from pest status information.

				<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
165	51	planning national, regional or international pest <u>surveillance and</u> management programmes	P	APPPC (70) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 3:55 AM) to include planning surveillance with pest management programme 32) Thailand (5 Sep 2018 12:50 PM) Thailand would like to add a term "surveillance" in this bullet because in addition to pest management program, planning pest surveillance program is also referred from pest status information <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
166	51	planning national, regional or international pest <u>surveillance and</u> management programmes	P	Thailand Thailand would like to add a term "surveillance" in this bullet because in addition to pest management program, planning pest surveillance program is also referred from pest status information. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
167	52	establishing and complying with phytosanitary regulations <u>- establishing national pests lists</u>	P	European Union Add "establishing national pests lists" which is recorded in the current version of ISPM 8. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
168	52	establishing and complying with phytosanitary regulations <u>regulations</u> <u>- establishing national pests lists</u>	P	EPPO Add "establishing national pests lists" which is recorded in the current version of ISPM 8. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
169	52	establishing and complying with phytosanitary regulations <u>to prevent the entry, establishment and spread of a pest</u>	P	Kenya <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
170	53	establishing and maintaining pest free <u>areas</u> , areas and areas of low pest prevalence <u>prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites.</u>	P	Panama For consistency. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
171	53	establishing and maintaining pest free <u>areas</u> , areas and areas of low pest prevalence <u>and pest free sites of production</u>	P	European Union For consistency with ISPM 10 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites) and paragraph 74. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
172	53	establishing and maintaining pest free <u>areas</u> , areas and areas of low pest prevalence <u>and pest free sites of production</u>	P	EPPO For consistency with ISPM 10 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites) and paragraph 74. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
173	53	establishing and maintaining pest <u>list, pest</u> free areas and areas of low pest prevalence	P	APPPC 14) Singapore (4 Sep 2018 1:34 AM) To include the establishment and maintenance of national pest lists under usage of pest status information as this is a current

				usage by NPPOs. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
174	53	establishing and maintaining pest free <u>areas</u> , areas and areas of low pest prevalence <u>prevalence, pest free places of production and pest free production sites</u>	P	Costa Rica consistent with what is indicated in the paragraph 41 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
175	53	establishing and maintaining pest <u>lists, pest</u> free areas and areas of low pest prevalence	P	Singapore To include the establishment and maintenance of national pest lists under usage of pest status information as this is a current usage by NPPOs. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
176	53	el establecimiento y mantenimiento de áreas libres de plagas y áreas de baja prevalencia de plagas; <u>lugares de producción libres de plagas y sitios de producción libres de plagas.</u>	P	OIRSA Términos correctos <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
177	53	el establecimiento y mantenimiento de áreas libres de plagas y áreas de baja prevalencia de <u>plagas y lugares de producción libres de plagas y Sitios de producción libres de plagas;</u>	P	OIRSA términos correctos <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
178	54	exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC. <u>- establishing or updating list of regulated pest</u>	P	Viet Nam additional more an bullet <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
179	54	exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC; <u>updating national regulated pest list</u>	P	Libya <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
180	54	exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC. <u>- planing for future action.</u>	P	APPPC) Nepal (9 Aug 2018 5:32 PM) <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
181	54	exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC. <u>updating national regulated pest list</u>	P	NEPPO <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
182	54	exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC.	C	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa Proposal by Kenya that “undetermined” be made a third category of pest status <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
183	54	exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC.	C	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa -Pest listing to be included in this list on the use of pest status information <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
184	54	exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC. <u>- establishing national pest lists.</u>	P	Iran <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
185	54	exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC. <u>- properly design pest surveillance</u>	P	Eritrea <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

186	54	exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC. <u>- Forecasting of the pest</u>	P	Nepal <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
187	55	Information on the status of a pest in areas may be used to establish the global distribution of a pest.	P	European Union Sentence to be deleted as it might create confusion, not clear by whom the information may be used. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
188	55	Information on the status of a pest in areas may be used to establish the global distribution of a pest.	P	EPPO Sentence to be deleted as it might create confusion, not clear by whom the information may be used. This comment was also made at the IPPC Regional Workshop in Bykovo. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
189	55	Information on the status of a pest in areas may be used to establish the global distribution of a pest.	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Central Asia & Central Europe It is proposed to delete as this sentence creates confusion Удалено, так как этот пункт создает путаницу. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
190	55	Information on the status of a pest in areas may be used to establish the global distribution of a pest.	C	Montenegro By who? NPPO or.... <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
2. Information Used to Determine Pest Status				
191	57	Information from pest records or other sources should be used to inform as a basis <u>for</u> decisions on the appropriate selection of pest status categories as described in section 3.	P	European Union This is basic information, not 'to inform decisions'. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
192	57	Information from pest records or other sources should be used to inform as a basis <u>for</u> decisions on the appropriate selection of pest status categories as described in section 3.	P	EPPO This is basic information, not 'to inform decisions'. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
193	57	Information from pest records or other <u>credible</u> sources should be used to inform decisions on the appropriate selection of pest status categories as described in section 3.	P	PPPO inclusion of the word credible <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
194	57	Information from pest records or other sources should be used to inform decisions on the appropriate selection of determine pest status categories as described in section 3.	P	APPPC (22) New Zealand (5 Sep 2018 5:14 AM) <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
195	57	Information from pest records or other sources should be used to inform make <u>informed</u> decisions <u>or make decisions</u> on the appropriate selection of pest status categories as described in section 3.	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa Please clarify the sentence. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
196	57	Information from pest records or other sources should be used to inform decisions on the for appropriate selection of pest status categories as described in section 3.	P	Iran

				<i>Category : TRANSLATION</i>
197	57	Information from pest records or other sources should be used by NPPO to inform decisions on the appropriate selection of pest status categories as described in section 3.	P	Montenegro <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
198	58	The information that should be included in pest records is described in ISPM 6.	C	United States of America Move paras 70-71 immediately after para 58. This will ensure more logical flow of information. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
199	59	Sometimes pest status can be difficult to determine because of uncertainty <u>lack of information or uncertainties</u> . Sources of uncertainty may include:	P	European Union The lack of information is an important element (see paragraph 125). <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
200	59	Sometimes pest status can be difficult to determine because of uncertainty <u>lack of information or uncertainties</u> . Sources of uncertainty may include:	P	EPPO The lack of information is an important element (see paragraph 125). <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
201	59	Sometimes pest status can be difficult to determine because of uncertainty <u>uncertainty of the available information</u> . Sources of uncertainty may include:	P	APPPC 23) New Zealand (5 Sep 2018 5:15 AM) <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
202	59	Sometimes pest status can be difficult to determine because of uncertainty. Sources of <u>Reasons for</u> uncertainty may include:	P	APPPC (24) New Zealand (5 Sep 2018 5:16 AM) <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
203	59	Sometimes pest status can be difficult <u>due to determine because varying sources and reliability of</u> uncertainty <u>information</u> . Sources of uncertainty <u>Reasons for these difficulties</u> may include:	P	APPPC 71) Philippines (10 Sep 2018 4:05 AM) <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
204	59	A veces la determinación de la situación de una plaga resulta difícil a causa de la incertidumbre. Las fuentes de incertidumbre podrán incluir: <u>-Falta de fiabilidad de los datos de geolocalización</u>	P	OIRSA En la NIMF No. 6, en el acápite 5. Mantenimiento de Registros, se establece como información para el mantenimiento de registros <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
205	59	A veces la determinación de la situación de una plaga resulta difícil a causa de la incertidumbre. Las fuentes de incertidumbre podrán incluir: <u>-Falta de fiabilidad de los datos de geolocalización</u>	P	Nicaragua En el acápite 2. Información utilizada para determinar la situación de una plaga, agregar el siguiente párrafo: -Falta de fiabilidad de los datos de geolocalización En la NIMF No. 6, en el acápite 5. Mantenimiento de Registros, se establece como información para el mantenimiento de registros <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
206	60	limited critical information on pest biology <u>- formation of different strains after few generations</u>	P	Sri Lanka <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
207	60	limited critical information on pest biology	P	European Union It is not clear what 'critical' information mean. It is proposed to delete.

				<i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
208	60	limited critical information on pest biology	P	EPPO It is not clear what 'critical' information mean. It is proposed to delete. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
209	60	limitada información crucial <u>limitada</u> sobre la biología de la plaga;	P	OIRSA Mejor comprensión del texto <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
210	60	limitada información crucial <u>limitada</u> sobre la biología de la plaga;	P	Costa Rica Mejora compresión y clarifica <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
211	61	revisiones de la taxonomía o ambigüedad taxonómica;	P	OIRSA Mejor comprensión del texto <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
212	61	revisiones de la taxonomía o ambigüedad taxonómica;	P	Costa Rica Clarifica y simplifica <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
213	62	conflicting , contradictory or outdated information	P	European Union 'Conflicting' is redundant with 'contradictory'. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
214	62	conflicting , contradictory or outdated information	P	EPPO 'Conflicting' is redundant with 'contradictory'. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
215	62	información <u>conflictiva</u> discorde, contradictoria o no actualizada <u>desactualizada</u> ;	P	OIRSA Mejor comprensión del texto <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
216	63	dificultades con las <u>aplicación</u> metodologías de encuesta <u>la encuesta (diseño, metodología, capacidad técnica, método de aplicación)</u> ;	P	OIRSA Mejor comprensión del texto <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
217	65	insufficient understanding of information on host associations	P	European Union Better wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
218	65	insufficient understanding of information on host associations	P	EPPO Better wording <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
219	65	insufficient understanding of host associations <u>associated with pest</u>	P	Libya <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
220	65	insufficient understanding of host associations <u>associated with a pest</u>	P	NEPPO Fore more clarity <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
221	65	insufficient understanding of host associations <u>associated with the pest</u>	P	Egypt <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
222	66	unknown aetiology	C	Mozambique Consider to include "enclosed structures" in the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

223	66	unknown aetiology	C	Mozambique Consider to include "aetiology" in the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
224	66	unknown aetiology <u>etiology</u>	P	Egypt <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
225	66	unknown aetiology	C	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa to BE DEFINED <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
226	66	unknown aetiology	C	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa It is suggested to include third category of pest status to be called , undetermined to take care of unknown pest status; this will be subcategory 3.3 <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
227	66	unknown aetiology	C	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa Use simpler term for easy understanding <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
228	67	findings of signs of organisms or symptoms without finding live the pest or pest damage	P	European Union More precise wording. Pests do not have to be alive to be determined. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
229	67	findings of signs of organisms or symptoms without finding the live pest or pest damage pest	P	EPPO More precise wording. Pests do not have to be alive to be determined. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
230	67	findings of signs of organisms without finding live pest or pest damage . <u>- no observable specific symptoms of pest damage.</u>	P	PPPO additiional sub point: no observable specific symtoms of pest damage. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
231	67	findings of finding signs of organisms without finding live pest or pest damage	P	Egypt <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
232	67	findings of signs-symptoms or damage of organisms-the pest, but without finding live-pest-presence of the organism or pest damage-causal agent.	P	Costa Rica if a sign is found, it is already in the presence of parts or product of the pathogen, so it would already be with the plague. If what is observed are symptoms or damage very likely that they can be associated with several organisms so it would be difficult to determine and the uncertainty is greater <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
233	67	findings of signs of organisms without finding live pest or pest damage <u>without findings live pests</u>	P	Argentina To clarify the uncertainty when live pests are not found. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
234	67	findings of signs of organisms without finding live pest or pest damage <u>without finding live pests</u>	P	Uruguay To clarify the uncertainty when live pests are not found <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

235	67	findings of signs of organisms without finding live pest or pest damage <u>without finding live pests</u>	P	COSAVE To clarify the uncertainty when live pests are not found. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
236	68	insufficient understanding of information on the <u>pest</u> distribution in an area	P	European Union Better wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
237	68	insufficient understanding of information on the <u>pest</u> distribution in an area	P	EPPO Better wording <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
238	68	insufficient understanding of the distribution in an area	C	Egypt the sentence was confusion <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
239	68	insufficient understanding of the distribution <u>of the pest</u> in an area	P	Egypt <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
240	68	insufficient understanding of the <u>pest</u> distribution in an area	P	Kenya <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
241	69	unreliability of the information sources used to determine pest status <u>sources.</u>	P	European Union Useless words. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
242	69	unreliability of the information sources used to determine pest status <u>sources.</u>	P	EPPO Useless words. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
243	69	unreliability of the information sources used to determine pest status. <u>- Unavailability of trained manpower in a particular area.</u>	P	APPPC 2) Nepal (9 Aug 2018 5:34 PM) <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
244	70	Information is available from many sources and has varying levels of reliability. <u>Old information is less likely to be reliable about the current status of a pest than recent information because of changes in pest distribution, taxonomy and detection methods.</u> Appendix 1 provides guidance that may be used by the responsible NPPO to assess the reliability of different information sources.	P	European Union Age of information is an important aspect of the reliability that needs to be covered by the Standard. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
245	70	Information is available from many sources and has varying levels of reliability. Appendix 1 provides <u>Old information is less likely to be reliable about the current status of a pest than recent information because of changes in pest distribution, taxonomy and detection methods. Appendix 1 provides</u> guidance that may be used by the responsible NPPO to assess the reliability of different information sources.	P	EPPO This is an an important aspect related to reliability of information that needs to be covered by the Standard <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
246	70	Information is available from many sources and has varying levels of reliability. Appendix 1 provides <u>1 provides</u> guidance that may be used by the responsible NPPO to assess the reliability of different information sources.	P	APPPC <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
247	70	Information is available from many sources and has varying levels of reliability. Appendix 1 provides <u>1 provides</u> guidance that may be used by the responsible NPPO to assess the reliability of different information sources.	P	Australia <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>

248	70	Information is available from many sources and has varying levels of reliability. Appendix 1 <u>provides-1 provides</u> guidance that may be used by the responsible NPPO to assess the reliability of different information sources.	P	NEPPO <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
249	70	Information is available from many sources and has varying levels of reliability. Appendix 1 <u>provides-1 provides</u> guidance that may be used by the responsible NPPO to assess the reliability of different information sources.	P	Kenya <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
250	71	Ideally, highly reliable sources should be used to determined-determine pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (ISPM 6).	P	European Union English grammar. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
251	71	Ideally, highly reliable <u>and current</u> sources should be used to determined pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also <u>help</u> identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (ISPM 6).	P	European Union Precision added. Better wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
252	71	Ideally, highly reliable sources should be used to determined pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (ISPM <u>(see ISPM 6)</u>).	P	European Union For consistency. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
253	71	Ideally, highly reliable <u>and current</u> sources should be used to determined-determine pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (ISPM <u>(see ISPM 6)</u>).	P	EPPO For consistency. Precision added. Better wording. English grammar <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
254	71	Ideally, highly reliable sources should be used to determined-determine pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (ISPM 6).	P	Egypt <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
255	71	Ideally, highly reliable sources should be used to determined-determine pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (ISPM 6).	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
256	71	Ideally, highly reliable sources should be used to determined pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (ISPM 6 <u>6</u>) <u>and pest diagnostic</u> .	P	Costa Rica This element is equally important in determining pest status and providing highly reliable information. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
257	71	Ideally, highly <u>Highly</u> reliable sources should be used to determined pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be	P	Argentina To provide more guidelines.

		used. This may increase uncertainty but can also identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (ISPM 6).		<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
258	71	Ideally, highly Highly reliable sources should be used to determined pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (ISPM 6).	P	Uruguay To provide more guidance <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
259	71	Ideally, highly reliable sources should be used to determined determine pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (ISPM 6).	P	Eritrea <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
260	71	Ideally, highly Highly reliable sources should be used to determined pest status. However, when such sources are not available, lower reliability sources may be used. This may increase uncertainty but can also identify information gaps which can be addressed through surveillance (ISPM 6).	P	COSAVE To provide more guidelines. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
261	71	Para determinar la situación de una plaga, lo ideal sería utilizar fuentes de gran confiabilidad. No obstante, cuando tales fuentes no estén disponibles, podrán utilizarse fuentes de fiabilidad menor menor fiabilidad . Esto podrá aumentar la incertidumbre, pero también puede indicar carencias de información que es posible corregir mediante la vigilancia (NIMF 6).	P	OIRSA <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
262	71	Para determinar la situación de una plaga, lo ideal sería utilizar fuentes de gran confiabilidad. No obstante, cuando tales fuentes no estén disponibles, podrán utilizarse fuentes de fiabilidad menor. Esto podrá aumentar la incertidumbre, pero también puede indicar carencias de información que es posible corregir mediante la vigilancia (NIMF 6 6) y diagnóstico de plagas .	P	OIRSA Este elemento es igualmente importante en la determinación de situación de plaga y proveer información altamente confiable. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
263	71	Para determinar la situación de una plaga, lo ideal sería utilizar fuentes de gran confiabilidad fiabilidad . No obstante, cuando tales fuentes no estén disponibles, podrán utilizarse fuentes de fiabilidad menor menor fiabilidad . Esto podrá aumentar la incertidumbre, pero también puede indicar carencias de información que es posible corregir mediante la vigilancia (NIMF 6).	P	Costa Rica Mejor comprensión, mejora la redacción <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
3. Describing Pest Status in an Area				
264	72	3. Describing Pest Status in an Area	C	Mozambique Include "Undetermined" as a sub chapter to represent the instance of not being sure due to lack of supporting information resulting from lack of surveillance <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
265	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under	P	Korea, Republic of <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

		quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes <u>purposes, or pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention</u> do not affect the pest status in an area.		
266	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests <u>Presence of pests</u> only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do <u>does</u> not affect the pest status in an area.	P	European Union 'Pests ... do not affect pest status': wording to be improved. Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>
267	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area <u>area (e.g. pests in laboratories).</u>	P	European Union Useful example. Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
268	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance <u>surveillance (see ISPM 6).</u> Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	European Union Precision given. Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>
269	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance <u>surveillance (see ISPM 6).</u> Pests <u>Presence of pests</u> only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do <u>does</u> not affect the pest status in an area <u>area (e.g. pests in laboratories).</u>	P	EPPO Precision given. Useful example Wording improved. Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>
270	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under <u>in</u> quarantine <u>facility</u> for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	PPPO replace under with in and inclusion of the word facility after quarantine Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
271	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area. <u>-If a pest just introduced in an area, a certain period of time is required to determine pest status.</u>	P	China Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
272	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests <u>used</u> only present under	P	Libya Pest present may lead to confusion. These pests are used as positive test in diagnostic or for research purpose. Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>

		quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area.		
273	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area. <u>If a pest may be just introduced in an area, a certain period of time is required to determine pest status.</u>	P	Japan If a new pest may be just introduced in an area, a period of time may be required to determine pest status based on technical evaluation (e.g. PRA, surveillance). This proposed change is supported by APPPC as well as by Japan. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
274	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area. <u>If a pest may be just introduced in an area, a period of time may be sometimes required to determine pest status based on technical evaluation (e.g. PRA, surveillance).</u>	P	APPPC (68) Japan (8 Sep 2018 4:30 PM) If a new pest may be just introduced in an area, a period of time may be required to determine pest status based on technical evaluation (e.g. PRA, surveillance). <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
275	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests <u>only present under that are being held in quarantine conditions</u> for diagnostic or research purposes <u>are not regarded as being present in a country and so</u> do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	APPPC (25) New Zealand (5 Sep 2018 5:24 AM) <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
276	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area. <u>If a pest may be just introduced in an area, a certain period of time is required to determine pest status.</u>	P	APPPC (95) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 10:35 AM) To include practical consideration for time required. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
277	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research <u>purposes-purposes, or pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention,</u> do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	Thailand <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
278	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an	P	Thailand To include practical consideration for time required. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

		area. <u>If a pest may be just introduced in an area, a certain period of time is required to determine pest status.</u>		
279	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes <u>purposes, or pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention</u> do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	APPPC <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
280	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present only under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	Costa Rica A pest introduced for the purpose of research or diagnosis by definition would not be considered "present" as it is confined. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
281	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests <u>used</u> only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	NEPPO Pest present may lead to confusion. These pests are used as positive test in diagnostic or for research purpose. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
282	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	Kenya <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
283	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status are <u>considered to be absent</u> in an area.	P	Argentina To clarify the pest status of pests under quarantine conditions. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
284	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status are <u>considered to be absent</u> in an area.	P	Uruguay To clarify the pest status of pests under quarantine conditions. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
285	73	The NPPO should decide upon the most appropriate description of the pest status in an area, based on information from various sources such as those described in Appendix 1. This includes results from surveillance. Pests only present under	P	COSAVE To clarify the pest status of pests under quarantine conditions. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

		quarantine for diagnostic or research purposes do not affect the pest status are <u>considered to be absent</u> in an area.		
286	73	L'ONPV devrait choisir la description la plus pertinente de la situation d'un organisme nuisible dans une zone en se fondant sur les informations émanant de diverses sources, notamment celles qui sont indiquées dans l'appendice 1; notamment, sur les informations issues de la surveillance. On ne prend pas en compte, pour Pour déterminer la situation d'un organisme nuisible dans une zone donnée zone, <u>on ne prend pas en compte</u> les organismes nuisibles qui sont <u>uniquement présents en de</u> quarantaine à des fins qui font l'objet de diagnostic ou de recherche.	P	Chad la reformulation du paragraphe 73 pour une bonne compréhension <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
287	73	La ONPF debería decidir la descripción más adecuada de la situación de una plaga en un área basándose en información obtenida de varias fuentes, como las descritas en el Apéndice 1. Esto incluye los resultados de la vigilancia. Las plagas presentes únicamente en bajo cuarentena con fines de diagnóstico o investigación no-Ni Las intercepciones de plagas en envíos importados mientras se <u>encuentran detenidos en los puntos de entrada</u> no afectan a la situación de una plaga en un área.	P	OIRSA Clarificar que la presencia de plagas bajo estas condiciones no debe considerarse en la situación de plaga., ya que está confinada Viene del párrafo 124, para indicarse que estas condiciones <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
288	73	La ONPF debería decidir la descripción más adecuada de la situación de una plaga en un área basándose en información obtenida de varias fuentes, como las descritas en el Apéndice 1. Esto incluye los resultados de la vigilancia. Las plagas presentes únicamente en cuarentena con fines de diagnóstico o investigación no afectan a la situación de una plaga en un área.	P	OIRSA Una plaga introducida para el propósito de investigación o diagnóstico por definición no se consideraría "presente" ya que esta confinada. Esta sección solamente podría crear confusión. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
289	73	La ONPF debería decidir la descripción más adecuada de la situación de una plaga en un área basándose en información obtenida de varias fuentes, como las descritas en el Apéndice 1. Esto incluye los resultados de la vigilancia. Las plagas presentes únicamente en cuarentena con fines de diagnóstico o investigación no afectan a la situación de una plaga en un área. <u>Las plagas presentes únicamente en cuarentena con fines de diagnóstico o investigación no afectan a la situación de una plaga en un área.</u>	P	OIRSA Especificar que si una plaga se encuentra en un puesto cuarentenado no afecta al estado fitosanitario de la plaga en el país. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
290	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical pest records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported <u>determined</u> , the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included <u>indicated</u> . Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	Panama Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical pests records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reportedis determinated, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined

				should be included. recorded. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
291	74	Determination of pest status (<u>in an area</u>) requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources . Both sources (including current and historical records) , where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on <u>described according to the basis of an area</u> . When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (categories identified below, including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	Viet Nam "When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included", this sentence follow ISPM 17, so this sentence propose to delete <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
292	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it <u>it or areas of low pest prevalence</u>) and the date the pest status was determined should be included. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	Korea, Republic of The term "area of low pest prevalence" should be added to cover all status specified in table 1. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
293	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of for <u>an area which should be identified and specified by the NPPO</u> . When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	European Union From the original sentence it was not clear that the NPPO identifies and specifies the area for which the pests status is applicable. To make it a requirement and better readable. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
294	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any and the date the pest free areas or pest	P	European Union Reporting of the PFAs, and especially places of production or production sites should not be mandatory but be included as an option. The reporting of places of production and production sites may be very comprehensive and expand reporting in an unjustified manner. ISPM 4 states that the information can be communicated to all

		free places of production or production sites within it status was determined should be included. and the date the Pest free areas, pest free places of production or pest free production sites may also be reported on request, if appropriate. Pest status was determined should be included described according to the categories identified below. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.		interested NPPOs on request (1.3) <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
295	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date <u>on which</u> the pest status was determined should be included. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	European Union Creation of a distinct paragraph to express a new idea and more precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
296	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of for an area <u>area which should be identified and specified by the NPPO</u> . When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any and the date on which the pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) status was determined should be included. Pest free areas and the date the pest free places of production or production site may also be reported on request, if appropriate. Pest status was determined should be included described according to the categories identified below. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	EPPO Reporting of the PFAs, and especially places of production or production sites should not be mandatory but be included as an option. The reporting of places of production and production sites may be very comprehensive and expand reporting in an unjustified manner. ISPM 4 states that the information can be communicated to all interested NPPOs on request (1.3) Creation of a distinct paragraph to express a new idea and more precise wording. In the original sentence it was not clear that the NPPO identifies and specifies the area for which the pests status is applicable. To make it a requirement and better readable. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
297	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other <u>credible</u> sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	PPPO inclusion of credible sources <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

298	74	Determination of pest status requires <u>evidence and</u> expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	United States of America Actual evidence is important part for making any decision on a pest status. Expert judgement is needed to correctly interpret such evidence. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
299	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it <u>it or areas of low pest prevalence</u>) and the date the pest status was determined should be included. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	APPPC (76) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 7:19 AM) The term "area of low pest prevalence" should be added to cover all status specified in table 1. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
300	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	C	APPPC (87) Korea, Republic of (10 Sep 2018 9:39 AM) "A synthesis of" is not necessary. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
301	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical <u>pest</u> records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported <u>determined</u> , the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined <u>should be included/indicated</u> . Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	Costa Rica <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
302	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available	P	Montenegro

		pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of for an area. When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.		<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
303	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported, the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) it or areas of low pest prevalence) and the date the pest status was determined should be included. Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	Thailand The term "area of low pest prevalence" should be added to cover all status specified in table 1. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
304	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical pest records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported determined , the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included indicated . Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	Argentina "Pest record" is a glossary term and should be used. The fourth sentence deleted because is redundant. Changes in the last sentence made for consistency and to avoid misunderstanding with pest reporting. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
305	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical pest records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported determined , the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included indicated . Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.	P	Uruguay "Pest record" is a glossary term and should be used. Fourth sentence deleted because is redundant. Changes in the last sentence made for consistency and to avoid misunderstanding with pest reporting. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
306	74	Determination of pest status requires expert judgement on the current distribution of a pest in an area. This judgement should be based on a synthesis of available pest records and information from other sources. Both current and historical pest records, where available, should be used in assessing the pest status. Pest status	P	COSAVE "Pest record" is a glossary term and should be used. The fourth sentence deleted because is redundant. Changes in the last sentence made for consistency and to avoid misunderstanding with pest reporting.

		should be determined on the basis of an area. When pest status is recorded or reported determined , the area in question (including any pest free areas or pest free places of production or production sites within it) and the date the pest status was determined should be included indicated . Pest status should be described according to the categories identified below.		Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
307	74	La détermination de la situation d'un organisme nuisible requiert l'avis d'experts sur la répartition actuelle d'un organisme nuisible dans une zone donnée. Cet avis devrait reposer sur une synthèse des signalements de l'organisme nuisible et des informations provenant d'autres sources qui sont disponibles. Des signalements tant anciens que récents—récents , s'il en existe—existe , devraient être utilisés pour évaluer la situation des organismes nuisibles. La situation de l'organisme nuisible devrait être déterminée pour une zone donnée. Les signalements ou rapports concernant la situation d'un organisme nuisible devraient préciser la zone en question (y compris les zones exemptes d'organismes nuisibles ou les lieux ou sites de production exempts qui y sont situés s'y trouvent) et la date de la détermination. La situation d'un organisme nuisible devrait être décrite à l'aide des catégories définies ci-après.	P	Chad quelques corrections sur le paragraphe 74 Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>
308	74	La determinación de la situación de una plaga en un área requiere un juicio criterio experto sobre la distribución actual de la plaga en dicha área. Este juicio criterio debería basarse en una síntesis de los registros de plagas disponibles y la información de otras fuentes. Para evaluar la situación de una plaga deberían utilizarse tanto los registros actuales como los históricos, cuando existan. La situación de una plaga debería determinarse sobre la base de un área. Cuando se registre o notifique la situación de una plaga, debería indicarse el área en cuestión (incluidas las áreas libres de plagas o los lugares de producción o sitios de producción libres de plagas dentro de ella) y la fecha en que se determinó la situación de la plaga. La situación de una plaga debería describirse conforme a las categorías indicadas a continuación.	P	OIRSA Mejor comprensión del texto Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>
309	74	La determinación de la situación de una plaga en un área requiere un juicio criterio experto sobre la distribución actual de la plaga en dicha área. Este juicio criterio debería basarse en una síntesis de los registros de plagas disponibles y la información de otras fuentes. Para evaluar la situación de una plaga deberían utilizarse tanto los registros actuales como los históricos, cuando existan. La situación de una plaga debería determinarse sobre la base de un área. Cuando se registre o notifique la situación de una plaga, debería indicarse el área en cuestión (incluidas las áreas libres de plagas o los lugares de producción o sitios de producción libres de plagas dentro de ella) y la fecha en que se determinó la	P	Costa Rica Este termino se ajusta mejory brinda mejor comprensión del texto Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>

		situación de la plaga. La situación de una plaga debería describirse conforme a las categorías indicadas a continuación.		
3.1 Presence				
310	76	A pest is deemed to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous, introduced or transient. If a pest is present and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize its distribution using the categories provided in Table 1. <u>In addition to the pest status (distribution), also the status and the objective of the official control are relevant. These are described in different categories in table 1A.</u>	P	European Union The description of category pest status is at present a combination of pest distribution and status of official control, although this is not consistently applied as some categories do not include the status of official control. It would be good to include the status of official control in all cases. For simplicity, the proposal is to keep this table restricted to the different pest distribution status (table 1) and then to separately describe the status of official control in a separate table (table 1A). If this is done a few sentences are needed in paragraph 76 to refer to the two proposed tables. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
311	76	A pest is deemed to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous, introduced or transient. If a pest is present and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize its distribution using the categories provided in Table 1.	P	European Union It simplifies text and clearly explains idea. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
312	76	A pest is deemed to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous, introduced or transient. If a pest is present and reliable-sufficient information is available, then it should be possible to characterize its distribution using the categories provided in Table 1.	P	European Union In some cases less reliable information is the basis for determining the pest status. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
313	76	A pest is deemed to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous, introduced or transient. If a pest is present and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to <u>further</u> characterize its distribution the pest status using the categories provided in Table 1.	P	European Union Not only distribution but also prevalence is used to define pest status categories for presence (see paragraph 86: "Present: at low prevalence") <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
314	76	A pest is deemed to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous, introduced or transient. If a pest is present and reliable-sufficient information is available, then it should be possible to <u>further</u> characterize its distribution the pest status using the categories provided in Table 1. <u>In addition to the pest status (distribution), also the status and the objective of the official control are relevant. These are described in different categories in table 1A.</u>	P	EPPO In some cases less reliable information is the basis for determining the pest status. Not only distribution but also prevalence is used to define pest status categories for presence (see paragraph 86: "Present: at low prevalence") It simplifies the text and clearly explains the idea The description of category pest status is at present a combination of pest distribution and status of official control, although this is not consistently applied as some categories do not include the status of official control. It would be good to include the status of official control in all cases.

				For simplicity, the proposal is to keep this table restricted to the different pest distribution status (table 1) and then to separately describe the status of official control in a separate table (table 1A). If this is done a few sentences are needed in paragraph 76 to refer to the two proposed tables. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
315	76	A pest is deemed to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous, introduced or transient. If a pest is present and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize its distribution using the categories provided in Table 1.	C	APPPC (29) New Zealand (5 Sep 2018 6:23 AM) Reminder: to discuss "transient" <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
316	76	A pest is deemed to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous, introduced or transient-not expected to be established If a pest is present and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize its distribution using the categories provided in Table 1.	P	Costa Rica in this modification of ISPM 8, the transient pest status is eliminated, so this term would not be used <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
317	76	A pest is deemed to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous indigenous and not extinct, introduced or transient. If a pest is present and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize its distribution using the categories provided in Table 1.	P	Saint Kitts And Nevis <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
318	76	A pest is deemed to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous, introduced or transient introduced. If a pest is present and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize its distribution using the categories provided in Table 1.	P	Guatemala quitar el termino transitorio <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
319	76	A pest is deemed-considered to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous, introduced or transient. If a pest is present and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize its distribution using the categories provided in Table 1.	P	Argentina For consistency with paragraph 101. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
320	76	A pest is deemed-considered to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous, introduced or transient. If a pest is present and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize its distribution using the categories provided in Table 1.	P	Uruguay For consistency with paragraph 101 <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
321	76	A pest is deemed-considered to be present if records indicate that it is indigenous, introduced or transient. If a pest is present and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize its distribution using the categories provided in Table 1.	P	COSAVE For consistency with paragraph 101. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
322	76	Se considera que una plaga está presente si los registros indican que es autóctona nativa, introducida o transitoria presente sin que se prevea su establecimiento. Si una plaga está presente y se dispone de información fiable,	P	OIRSA Uso correcto de términos <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

		debería ser posible caracterizar su distribución utilizando las categorías indicadas en el Cuadro 1.		
323	76	Se considera que una plaga está presente si los registros indican que es autóctona, introducida o transitoria <u>presente sin que se prevea su establecimiento</u> . Si una plaga está presente y se dispone de información fiable, debería ser posible caracterizar su distribución utilizando las categorías indicadas en el Cuadro 1.	P	OIRSA Para estar acorde con la norma, dado que se está solicitando eliminar de la situación de plaga el término "Transitoria" <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
324	77	Table 1. Categories of pest status – Present	C	European Union See our general comment - to replace table 1 with new tables 1 and 1A. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
325	77	Table 1. Categories of pest status – Present	C	EPPO EPPO is proposing changes in table 1 (see comment above on para 76). the OCS system unfortunately does not allow to upload separate documents so the revised Table 1 is described as follows. A word document with the new Table 1 and Table 1A can be provided upon request (hq@epo.int): The revised table is composed by three columns by heading: "Status (Distribution)", "Detail on distribution/seasonality/prevalence", and "Status description". The table would include the following 5 lines: 1) "Present: widely distributed", "Optional", "The pest is present throughout the area where conditions are suitable". 2) "Present: widely distributed, except in PFAs", "Optional", "The pest is present in the area except for areas which are free from the pest in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas). These areas may be described alongside the pest status determination for a country." 3) "Present: not widely distributed", "Optional", "The pest is present in a part or parts of the area where conditions are suitable". 4) "Present: localized (specify)", "Required", "The pest is present in a part or parts of the area, but only in specific locations to be specified". 5) "Present: seasonally (specify)", "Required", "The pest may be present in the area but only in specific seasons and will not survive throughout the year". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
326	77	Table 1. Categories of pest status – Present	C	APPPC (38) New Zealand (6 Sep 2018 1:08 AM) It would be preferable if the table and main text are in the same font. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
327	78	<u>StatusPest status</u>	P	Argentina For consistency. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

328	78	<u>Pest Status</u>	P	Uruguay For consistency <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
329	78	<u>StatusPest status</u>	P	COSAVE For consistency. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
330	79	<u>Status-Pest status</u> description	P	Argentina For consistency. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
331	79	<u>Pest Status</u> description	P	Uruguay For consistency <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
332	79	<u>Status-Pest status</u> description	P	COSAVE For consistency. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
333	80	<u>Present:</u> <u>Present widely distributed under official control</u> widely distributed	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Central Asia & Central Europe It was suggested to add a new category: "Present widely distributed under official control", a new line need to be added into Table 1. Добавлены строки в Таблице 1: Присутствует: широко распространен ,является объектом официальной борьбы <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
334	80	Present: widely distributed <u>distributed not under official control</u>	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Central Asia & Central Europe This revised category is in Russian: Присутствует: широко распространён не является объектом официальной борьбы <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
335	81	The pest is present throughout the area where conditions are suitable .	P	PPPO removing , 'where conditions are suitable' <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
336	81	The pest is present throughout the area where conditions are suitable. <u>The pest is present throughout the area where conditions are suitable and under official control.</u>	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Central Asia & Central Europe This is the description proposed for the new category "Present widely distributed and under official control" <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
337	81	The pest is present throughout the area where conditions are suitable <u>suitable and is not under official control</u>	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Central Asia & Central Europe This is the description proposed for the new category "Present: widely distributed and not under official control" <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
338	81	The pest is present throughout the area where conditions are suitable <u>area</u> .	P	Argentina Redundant, if it is widely distributed conditions are suitable. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
339	81	The pest is present throughout the area where conditions are suitable <u>area</u> .	P	Uruguay Redundant, if the pest is widely distributed conditions are suitable. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
340	81	The pest is present throughout the area where conditions are suitable <u>area</u> .	P	COSAVE Redundant, if it is widely distributed conditions are suitable.

				<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
341	81	La plaga está presente en toda el área donde las condiciones <u>ambientales y rango de hospederos</u> son adecuadas.	P	OIRSA Adicionar ya que estos son los elementos más importantes para la condición. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
342	83	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary Phytosanitary terms</i>).	P	Ghana <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
343	83	The pest is present in a part or parts of the area <u>and is not under official control</u> in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>).	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Central Asia & Central Europe With the modification proposed the paragraph reads in Russian: Вредный организм присутствует в части или в частях зоны и не является объектом официальной борьбы в соответствии с Добавлением 1 к МСФМ № 5 («Глоссарию фитосанитарных терминов»): «Руководством по интерпретации и применению концепции "официальной борьбы" и понятия "ограниченно распространённый"». <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
344	85	The pest is present in the area and subject to “official control” in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on <u>Guidelines on</u> the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>). The purpose of the official control should be stated alongside the status determination.	P	Canada <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
345	85	The pest is present in <u>a part or parts of</u> the area and subject to “official control” in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on <u>Guidelines on</u> the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>). The purpose of the official control should be stated alongside the status determination.	P	European Union For consistency with paragraph 83 and supplement 1 to ISPM 5. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
346	85	The pest is present in <u>a part or parts of</u> the area and subject to “official control” in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on <u>Guidelines on</u> the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>). The purpose of the official control should be stated alongside the status determination.	P	EPPO For consistency with paragraph 83 and supplement 1 to ISPM 5. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
347	85	The pest is present in the area and subject to “official control” in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary Phytosanitary terms</i>). The purpose of the official control should be stated alongside the status determination.	P	Ghana <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
348	85	The pest is present in the area and subject to “official control” in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on <u>Guidelines on</u> the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>). The purpose of the official control should be stated alongside the status determination.	P	NEPPO <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
349	85	The pest is present in the area and subject to “official control” in accordance with Supplement 1 (Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”) to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>). The purpose of the official control should be stated alongside the <u>pest</u> status determination.	P	Uruguay For consistency <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

350	86	Present: at low <u>pest</u> prevalence	P	Viet Nam ISPM 22 <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
351	86	Present: at in an area of low <u>pest</u> prevalence	P	Korea, Republic of <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
352	86	Present: at <u>Present in an area of</u> low <u>pest</u> prevalence	P	APPPC 77) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 7:22 AM) (26) New Zealand (5 Sep 2018 5:28 AM) prevalence is only used in the term "low pest prevalence" as in the IPPC – deriving from the SPS agreement. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
353	86	Presente: con prevalencia baja <u>baja prevalencia</u> .	P	OIRSA Mantener el orden en las definiciones, tal como se establece en la NIMF 22 (Requisitos para el establecimiento de áreas de baja prevalencia de plagas). <i>Category : TRANSLATION</i>
354	87	The pest is present in the area but its prevalence is low in accordance with ISPM 22 (Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence). <u>The pest is present at low levels in an area in accordance with ISPM 22 (Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence).</u>	P	APPPC 27) New Zealand (5 Sep 2018 5:30 AM) <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
355	87	The pest is present in the area but its prevalence is low in accordance with ISPM 22 (Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence). <u>The pest is present at low levels in an area in accordance with ISPM 22 (Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence).</u>	P	APPPC <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
356	88	Present: except in specified pest free areas	C	Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency This description requires some revision as some countries comprise more than one land space; for example, Antigua and Barbuda is one country but are both islands and consists of two geographically separate land masses with different pest status. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
357	88	Presente: excepto en áreas libres de plagas especificadas.	P	OIRSA Eliminarlo para mantener coherencia con el párrafo 108 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
358	89	The pest is present in the area except for areas which are free from the pest in accordance with ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>). These areas should be described alongside the <u>pest</u> status determination <u>determination for a country</u> .	P	European Union More precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
359	89	The pest is present in the area except for areas which are free from the pest in accordance with ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>). These areas should be described alongside the <u>pest</u> status determination <u>determination for country</u> .	P	EPPO More precise wording <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
360	89	The pest is present in the area except for areas which are free from the pest in accordance with ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>). These areas should be described alongside the <u>pest</u> status determination.	P	Argentina For consistency. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
361	89	The pest is present in the area except for areas which are free from the pest in accordance with ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>). These areas should be described alongside the <u>pest</u> status determination.	P	Uruguay For consistency <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

362	89	The pest is present in the area except for areas which are free from the pest in accordance with ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>). These areas should be described alongside the pest status determination.	P	COSAVE For consistency. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
363	89	La plaga está presente en el área, excepto en las áreas que están libres de la plaga, de conformidad con la NIMF 4 (<i>Requisitos para el establecimiento de áreas libres de plagas</i>). Estas áreas deberían describirse junto con la determinación de la situación.	P	OIRSA Eliminarlo para mantener coherencia con el párrafo 108 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
364	90	Present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites	P	European Union This category was not kept in the new table 1 proposed because it was considered as covered by the status 'present widely distributed'. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
365	90	Present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites	P	EPPO This category was not kept in the new table 1 proposed because it was considered as covered by the status 'present widely distributed'. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
366	91	The pest is present in an area except for pest free places of production or production sites in accordance with ISPM 10 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites</i>). These places should be described alongside the status determination.	P	European Union This category was not kept in the new table 1 proposed because it was considered as covered by the status 'present widely distributed'. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
367	91	The pest is present in an area except for pest free places of production or production sites in accordance with ISPM 10 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites</i>). These places should be described alongside the status determination.	P	EPPO This category was not kept in the new table 1 proposed because it was considered as covered by the status 'present widely distributed'. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
368	91	The pest is present in an area except for pest free places of production or production sites in accordance with ISPM 10 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites</i>). These places should be described alongside the status determination.	C	Mauritius These areas should be described alongside the status determination. it might be necessary to provide additional information on the area <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
369	91	The pest is present in an area except for pest free places of production or production sites in accordance with ISPM 10 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites</i>). These places should be described alongside the pest status determination.	P	Argentina For consistency. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
370	91	The pest is present in an area except for pest free places of production or production sites in accordance with ISPM 10 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites</i>). These places should be described alongside the pest status determination.	P	Uruguay For consistency <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
371	91	The pest is present in an area except for pest free places of production or production sites in accordance with ISPM 10 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites</i>). These places should be described alongside the pest status determination.	P	COSAVE For consistency. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
372	92	Present: transient , not expected to establish	P	Panama For consistency with paragraph 76. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

373	92	Present: not expected to <u>establish or transience of</u> establish	P	Viet Nam similar meaning <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
374	92	Present: not expected to establish <u>establish(transience)</u>	P	Korea, Republic of To clarify the status that "not expected to establish" is transience <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
375	92	Present: not expected to establish	P	European Union This status includes a prediction and can be covered for example in the proposed table 1A if eradication is expected to be successful or under the proposed status 'present seasonally (specify)'. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
376	92	Present: not expected to establish	P	EPPO This status includes a prediction and can be covered for example in the proposed table 1A if eradication is expected to be successful or under the proposed status 'present seasonally (specify)'. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
377	92	Present: not expected to establish <u>establish (transience)</u>	P	Japan To clarify the status that "not expected to establish" is transience This proposed change is supported by APPPC as well as by Japan. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
378	92	Present: not expected to establish	C	APPPC 39) New Zealand (6 Sep 2018 3:05 AM) New Zealand suggests to reinstate the "transient" category as that in the current ISPM 8. This new category substitutes all previous categories under 'Transience', and it seems that details on the measures in place are lost (i.e. about being non-actionable, or actionable: under surveillance or under-eradication). A practical issue with this change is that current pest status of certain organisms that were recorded as 'transient', will need to be changed to fit the new wording with this change. Also the change of wording now may no longer aligns with other ISPMs, For example, for reporting in ISPM 17 section 5.2 it still states that "An outbreak should be reported when its presence corresponds at least to the status of "Transient: actionable" in ISPM 8." <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
379	92	Present: not expected to establish <u>establish (transience)</u>	P	APPPC (78) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 7:23 AM) To clarify the status that "not expected to establish" is transience <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
380	92	Present: not expected to establish <u>establish (transience)</u>	P	Thailand To clarify the status that "not expected to establish" is transience <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
381	92	Present: <u>transient</u> , not expected to establish	P	Costa Rica In this nimf the condition of transitory pest is being eliminated, however the proposed definition is related to this condition

				<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
382	92	Present: <u>transient</u> , not expected to establish	P	Argentina For consistency with paragraph 76. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
383	92	Present: <u>transient</u> , not expected to establish	P	Uruguay For consistency with paragraph 76. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
384	92	Present: <u>transient</u> , not expected to establish	P	COSAVE For consistency with paragraph 76. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
385	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest is not expected to establish because <u>unsuitable conditions or</u> appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	Panama To clarify the transient pest status and provide more guidelines for the conditions of establishment of the pest <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
386	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area <u>area or natural migration of a pest</u>).	P	Viet Nam For example: yellow bamboo locusts in Southeast ASIA which was natural migration of a pest <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
387	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area <u>area</u>) <u>or natural conditions do not allow the pest to establish.</u>	P	Korea, Republic of <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
388	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	European Union This status includes prediction and can be covered for example in the proposed table 1A if eradication is expected to be successful or under the proposed status 'present seasonally (specify)'. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
389	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	EPPO This status includes a prediction and can be covered for example in the proposed table 1A if eradication is expected to be successful or under the proposed status 'present seasonally (specify)'. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
390	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	C	PPPO revisit the glossary term on the term transient <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
391	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area <u>area</u>) <u>or natural conditions do not allow the pest to establish.</u>	P	Japan Add the concept of the status "transient: non-actionable" of current ISPM 8. This proposed change is supported by APPPC as well as by Japan. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
392	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient <u>transient</u> , or the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	United States of America Suggest that TPG revise the Glossary to address "transience" vs. "transient". Transient is appropriately used here, but glossary includes only the word "transience". <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

393	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area area) <u>or natural conditions do not allow the pest to establish</u>	P	APPPC (79) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 7:49 AM) 55) Japan (8 Sep 2018 5:03 AM) Add the concept of the status "transient: non-actionable" of current ISPM 8. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
394	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area area) <u>or natural conditions do not allow the pest to establish</u> .	P	Thailand to add more condition of transience condition. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
395	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest is not expected to establish because appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area). <u>Or no environment conditions to establish.</u>	P	Haiti <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
396	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest temporarily presente <u>because</u> is not expected to establish because based on technical evaluation or application of appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	Costa Rica To clarify the transient pest status and provide more guidellines. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
397	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest temporarily present <u>because</u> is not expected to establish because based on technical evaluation or application of appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	Argentina To clarify the transient pest status and provide more guidellines. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
398	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest temporarily present <u>because</u> is not expected to establish because based on technical evaluation or application of appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	Uruguay To clarify the "transient" pest status and to provide more guidance <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
399	93	The pest is evaluated and determined to be transient, or the pest temporarily present <u>because</u> is not expected to establish because establish based on technical evaluation or application of appropriate phytosanitary measures have been applied (e.g. during outbreaks in a pest free area).	P	COSAVE To clarify the transient pest status and provide more guidellines. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
400	93	La plaga se evalúa y se determina que es transitoria, o no se prevé que la plaga se establezca porque se han aplicado medidas fitosanitarias apropiadas (por ejemplo, durante brotes ocurridos en un área libre de plagas) <u>lugares de producción libres de plagas y sitios de producción libres de plagas</u>).	P	OIRSA Factores agroclimáticos y condiciones agroecológicas adversas. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
401	93	La plaga se evalúa y se determina que es transitoria, o no se prevé que la plaga se establezca porque se han aplicado medidas fitosanitarias apropiadas (por ejemplo, durante brotes ocurridos en un área libre de plagas). <u>lugares de producción libres de plagas y sitios de producción libres de plagas</u>) <u>or environmental conditions and host range may not be suitable.</u>	P	OIRSA es importante colocar varios ejemplos Este es otro elemento posiblemente más común. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
402	93	La plaga se evalúa y se determina que es transitoria, o no se prevé que la plaga se establezca porque se han aplicado medidas fitosanitarias apropiadas <u>apropiadas, lugares de producción libres de plagas y sitios de producción libres de plagas</u> (por ejemplo, durante brotes ocurridos en un área libre de plagas).	P	Guatemala <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
403	94	In some cases, it might be necessary to provide additional information about pest presence, for instance that the pest has only been reported under limited conditions, such as:	C	European Union Addition of Table 1A before paragraph 94: see our general comment. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

404	94	In some cases, it might be necessary to provide additional information about pest presence, for instance that the pest has only been reported under <u>limited-specific</u> conditions, such as:	P	European Union "Environment" is not "limited". Here we speak about specific conditions. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
405	94	In some cases, it might be necessary to provide additional information about pest presence, for instance that the pest has only been reported under <u>limited-specific</u> conditions, such as:	P	EPPO More appropriate wording <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
406	94	In some cases, it might be necessary to provide additional information about pest presence, for instance that the pest has only been reported under limited conditions, such as:	C	EPPO EPPO is proposing to add a new table 1A (see comment on para 76). OCS system unfortunately does not allow to upload separate documents so the new proposed table 1A is described as follows. A word document with the new table one and table 1A can be provided upon request (hq@eppo.int): The table is composed by three columns by heading: "Category", "Aim of official control", "Comments". The table would include the following 5 lines: 1) "Not under official control", "None", "e.g. Pest control measures taken by growers" 2) "Under official control", "Eradication", "e.g. Prediction that the pest is not expected to establish (transient)" 3) "Under official control", "Containment" 4) "Under official control", "Suppression" 5) "Under official control", "RNQP status" <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
407	96	in enclosed structures structures (e.g. in a <u>green house</u>)	P	Korea, Republic of To provide an example of enclosed structures. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
408	96	in enclosed structures, <u>e.g. glasshouse</u>	P	PPPO inclusion of an example e.g glasshouse <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
409	96	in enclosed structures structures (e.g. in a <u>green house</u>)	P	Japan Add an example according to tasks (10) of specification. This proposed change is supported by APPPC as well as by Japan. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
410	96	in enclosed structures structures (e.g. in a <u>green house</u>)	P	APPPC 80) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 7:50 AM) To provide an example of enclosed structures. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
411	96	in enclosed structures structures (e.g. in a <u>green house</u>)	P	Thailand To provide an example of enclosed structures. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
412	96	en estructuras cerradas; (<u>invernaderos de malla, de vidrio, laboratorios, entre otros</u>);	P	OIRSA Clarificar dando ejemplos de lo que se podría considerar como cerradas <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

413	97	in botanical gardens	P	Korea, Republic of To delete "botanical gardens" as research and quarantine have been excluded from this standard ie weeds in gardens. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
414	97	in botanical gardens	P	PPPO deletion. the other sub points relate to the containment of the pest rather than the site that's being detected. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
415	97	in botanical gardens	P	APPPC 81) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 7:56 AM) To delete "botanical gardens" as research and quarantine have been excluded from this standard ie weeds in gardens. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
416	97	in botanical gardens	P	Thailand To delete "botanical gardens" as research and quarantine have been excluded from this standard ie weeds in gardens. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
417	98	in the environment but not associated with on a plant host (e.g. soil or water)	P	EPPO Better wording <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
418	99	at certain times of the year. - In a transportation carrier	P	Nepal <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
419	99	en ciertas épocas del año. - Adaptibilidad	P	Guatemala se agrega el termino adaptibilidad <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
3.2 Absence				
420	100	3.2 Absence	C	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa It is suggested that after 3.2 category we add "3.3 to read " Undetermined" this will cover in the case where surveillance has not be done. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
421	100	3.2 Absence	C	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa we suggest to add new sub category be called undetermined to take care of the unknown pest status <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
422	101	A pest is considered to be absent if surveillance and other information indicate that the pest is not found in the area. If a pest is absent and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to further characterize this-the pest status using the categories provided in Table 2.	P	European Union More precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
423	101	A pest is considered to be absent if surveillance (see ISPM 6) and other information indicate that the pest is not found in the area. If a pest is absent and	P	European Union For consistency. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>

		reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize this status using the categories provided in Table 2.		
424	101	A pest is considered to be absent if surveillance (see ISPM 6) and other information indicate that the pest is not found in the area. If a pest is absent and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to further characterize this the pest status using the categories provided in Table 2.	P	EPPO For consistency. More precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
425	101	A pest is considered to be absent if surveillance and other information indicate that the pest is not found in the area. If a pest is absent and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize this status using When NPPO considered that pest is absent according surveillance and other information who indicate that the pest is not found in the area. If a pest is absent and reliable information is available, then it should be possible to characterize this status using the categories provided in Table 2.	P	Montenegro <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
426	102	Table 2. Categories of pest status – Absent	C	United States of America Insert a break between the previous text and Table 2. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
427	102	Table 2. Categories of pest status – Absent	C	Kenya It is proposed that the commonly used terminology "Not known to " should be included in defining status of Absent: Where no surveillance has been carried out to confirm absence. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
428	103	Status Absent - conditions not suitable	P	European Union It is proposed to add a new important category missing from the table. This covers the situation when the pest has not been recorded and climatic or host factors are clearly such that occurrence is not possible. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
429	103	Status	C	EPPO New category to be added: "Absent - conditions not suitable" It is proposed to add a new important category missing from the table. This covers the situation when the pest has not been recorded and climatic or host factors are clearly such that occurrence is not possible. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
430	103	Status Pest status	P	Argentina For consistency <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
431	103	Pest Status	P	Uruguay For consistency <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
432	103	Status Pest status	P	COSAVE For consistency <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

433	104	Status description <u>The pest has not been recorded and climatic or host factors are clearly such that occurrence is not possible.</u>	P	European Union This is the status description for the new category 'Absent - conditions not suitable' which is proposed to be added (see comment on para 103). <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
434	104	Status description	C	EPPO the Status description for the new proposed category "Absent - conditions not suitable" (see comment on para 103) is "The pest has not been recorded and climatic or host factors are clearly such that occurrence is not possible". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
435	104	Status-Pest status description	P	Argentina For consistency <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
436	104	Pest Status description	P	Uruguay For consistency <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
437	104	Status-Pest status description	P	COSAVE For consistency <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
438	106	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has never not been recorded.	P	European Union Never recorded is too strict. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
439	106	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has never been recorded recorded (see ISPM 6 (Surveillance)).	P	European Union ISPM 6 should be mentioned like the other ISPMs. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
440	106	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has never not been recorded recorded (see ISPM 6 (Surveillance)).	P	EPPO ISPM 6 should be mentioned like the other ISPMs. Never recorded is too strict. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
441	106	Surveillance (<u>according to ISPM 6</u>) supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has never been recorded.	P	Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
442	106	Surveillance supports the conclusion that the pest is absent and has never been recorded.	C	Jamaica Add according to ISPM 6 to the sentence for consistency. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
443	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country country, or part of a country in situations where a country comprises more than one distinctly separate land space).	P	Antigua and Barbuda <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
444	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country)	C	Antigua and Barbuda This description requires some revision as some countries comprise more than one land space; for example, Antigua and Barbuda is one country but are both islands and consists of two

				geographically separate land masses with different pest status. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
445	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country) <u>area, pest free places of production or production sites</u>	P	Panama The term area is not applicable only to an entire country. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
446	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country)	P	Viet Nam In case where the outbreak in pest free area whether the pest status consider to be absent? Vietnam propose to delete the row in table 2 <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
447	107	Absent: <u>whole country is</u> pest free area (entire country) <u>area</u>	P	European Union Clearer. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
448	107	Absent: <u>whole country is</u> pest free area (entire country) <u>area</u>	P	EPPO Clearer <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
449	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country)	P	Libya <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
450	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country)	P	NEPPO <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
451	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country)	P	Egypt <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
452	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country) <u>area</u> <u>Absent: pest free places of production or pest free production sites</u>	P	Costa Rica The term area is not applicable only to an entire country. For consistency with table 1 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
453	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country) <u>area</u>	P	Argentina The term area may refer to an entire country. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
454	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country) (New row) <u>Absent: pest free places of production or production sites</u>	P	Argentina (New row) For consistency with table 1. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
455	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country) (Add new row) <u>Absent: pest free places of production or production sites</u>	P	Uruguay For consistency with Table 1 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
456	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country) <u>area</u>	P	Uruguay The term "area" is not applicable only to an entire country.

				<i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
457	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country) (New row) Absent: pest free places of production or production sites	P	COSAVE (New row) For consistency with table 1. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
458	107	Absent: pest free area (entire country)	P	COSAVE The term area may refer to an entire country. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
459	107	Ausente: área libre de plagas (país entero) <u>o parte de éste</u> .	P	OIRSA Mantener la coherencia con la NIMF 4 y NIMF 26, ya que país completo es uno de los tres tipos de ALP reconocidos, no el único. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> En la NIMF 4 se establecen tres tipos arbitrarios de áreas libres de plagas (ver: 2. Requisitos Específicos de los diferentes tipos de ALP). En la NIMF 26 se hace referencia a que en la NIMF 4 se describen los diferentes tipos de áreas libres de plaga (ver: Antecedentes). <p>Además, en el párrafo 74 de este borrador se indica que "...la situación de una plaga debería determinarse sobre la base de un área." (ver: 3. Descripción de la situación de una plaga en un área; y la definición de área en la NIMF 5).</p> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
460	108	The entire country pest free area is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM- ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) . <u>The pest free places of production and pest free production sites are established and maintained in accordance with ISPM 10 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites).</u>	P	Panama The term area is not applicable only to an entire country. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
461	108	The entire country is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas).	P	Viet Nam In case where the outbreak in pest free area whether the pest status consider to be absent? Vietnam propose to delete the row in table 2 <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
462	108	The entire country is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) <u>) (PFAs smaller than the entire country are covered under presence).</u>	P	European Union To clarify the situation of PFA's smaller than the entire country. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
463	108	The entire country is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) <u>) (PFAs smaller than the entire country are covered under presence)</u>	P	EPPO To clarify the situation of PFA's smaller than the entire country. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
464	108	The entire country <u>Part of the country: defined area</u> is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas). <u>Entire country: y is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas).</u>	P	Libya To take into consideration the current PFA <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
465	108	The entire country <u>Part of the country: defined area</u> is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM to ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of a pest free area)	P	NEPPO To take into consideration the current PFA <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

		<u>Entire country:y is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas).</u>		
466	108	The entire -Part of the country :the defined area is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas). -The entire country :the entire country is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas).	P	Egypt to allow using the "absent" status on PFA in specified parts of the country Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
467	108	The entire country-pest free area is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas). (New row) The pest free places of production and pest free production sites are established and maintained in accordance with ISPM 10 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites).	P	Costa Rica For consistency with table 1. Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
468	108	The entire country-pest free area is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas).	P	Argentina The term area is not applicable only to an entire country. Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
469	108	The entire country is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas). (New row) The pest free places of production and pest free production sites are established and maintained in accordance with ISPM 10 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites).	P	Argentina For consistency with table 1. Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
470	108	The entire country is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas). (Add new row) The pest free places of production and pest free production sites are established and maintained in accordance with ISPM 10 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites).	P	Uruguay For consistency with Table 1 Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
471	108	The entire country-area is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas).	P	Uruguay The term area may refer to an entire country Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
472	108	The entire country is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas). (New row) The pest free places of production and pest free production sites are established and maintained in accordance with ISPM 10 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites).	P	COSAVE For consistency with table 1. Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
473	108	The entire country-The pest free area is established and maintained as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas).	P	COSAVE The term area is not applicable only to an entire country. Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>

474	108	El país entero-entero, área libre, lugar de producción libre y sitio de producción se establece y se mantiene como área libre de plagas, de conformidad con la NIMF 4 (<i>Requisitos para el establecimiento de áreas libres de plagas</i>).	P	OIRSA Las NIMF 04 Y NIMF 10 <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
475	108	El país entero-área libre de plagas se establece y se mantiene como área libre en todo el país o parte de plagas, este de conformidad con la NIMF 4 (<i>Requisitos para el establecimiento de áreas libres de plagas</i>).	P	OIRSA Mantener la coherencia con la NIMF 4 y NIMF 26, ya que país completo es uno de los tres tipos de ALP reconocidos, no el único. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> En la NIMF 4 se establecen tres tipos arbitrarios de áreas libres de plagas (ver: 2. Requisitos Específicos de los diferentes tipos de ALP). En la NIMF 26 se hace referencia a que en la NIMF 4 se describen los diferentes tipos de áreas libres de plaga (ver: Antecedentes). <p>Además, en el párrafo 74 de este borrador se indica que "...la situación de una plaga debería determinarse sobre la base de un área." (ver: 3. Descripción de la situación de una plaga en un área; y la definición de área en la NIMF 5).</p> <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
476	109	Ausente: los registros de la plaga no son válidos.	C	OIRSA Interpretación de que casos se aplica, (ampliación de fronteras), ver si aplica en casos de unión aduanera <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
477	111	- changes in taxonomy have occurred	P	Iran <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
478	112	- misidentification has occurred	P	Iran <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
479	113	- there are errors in the record or records	P	Iran <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
480	114	- re-interpretation of the record or records may be needed as a result of changes in national borders borders have occurred.	P	European Union Simpler wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
481	114	- re-interpretation of the record or records may be needed as a result of changes in national borders borders have occurred.	P	EPPO Simpler wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
482	114	- re-interpretation of the record or records may be needed as a result of changes in national borders. <u>Information based on symptoms leading to false identification</u>	P	Libya Case of the old documents of 40 or 50s. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
483	114	- re-interpretation of the record or records may be needed as a result of changes in national borders. <u>- Information based on symptoms leading to false idnetification</u>	P	NEPPO Case of the old documents of 40 or 50s. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

484	114	- podrá ser necesaria la reinterpretación del registro o registros como resultado de cambios en las fronteras nacionales.	C	Guatemala Interpretación de que casos se aplica, (ampliación de fronteras), ver si aplica en casos de unión aduanera <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
485	116	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past, but surveillance indicates that the pest is no longer present present (see ISPM 6 (Surveillance)). The reason or reasons may include:	P	European Union ISPM 6 should be quoted like the other standards. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
486	116	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past, but surveillance indicates that the pest is no longer present present (see ISPM 6 (Surveillance)). The reason or reasons may include:	P	EPPO ISPM 6 should be quoted like the other standards. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
487	117	- climate or other natural limitation to pest perpetuation perpetuation <u>the original species disappeared because of the invasion of other competing species.</u>	P	China There is a possibility of the absent of the pest. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
488	117	- climate or other natural limitation to pest perpetuation perpetuation (e.g invasion of other competing species)	P	APPPC Category : SUBSTANTIVE (83) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 8:09 AM) to provide an illustration example. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
489	118	- changes in hosts cultivated species cultivated or in cultivars	P	European Union WE suggest to merge paragraphs 118 and 119 which are both about plant species or cultivars. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
490	118	- changes in hosts cultivated species cultivated or in cultivars	P	EPPO Suggest to merge paragraphs 118 and 119 which are both about plant species or cultivars. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
491	118	- changes in hosts cultivated cultivated such as cultivars	P	PPPO add , such as cultivars <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
492	119	- changes in cultivars	P	European Union We suggest to merge paragraphs 118 and 119 which are both about plant species or cultivars. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
493	119	- changes in cultivars	P	EPPO Suggest to merge paragraphs 118 and 119 which are both about plant species or cultivars. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
494	119	- changes in cultivars	P	PPPO a subset of 118, add on such as cultivars and remove changes in cultivars <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
495	120	- changes in production practices. <u>the original species disappeared because of the invasion of other competing species.</u>	P	APPPC (11) China (23 Aug 2018 8:58 AM) There is a possibility of the absent of the pest. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

496	122	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past. A documented <u>Documented</u> pest eradication programme was conducted-measures were implemented and was-were successful (see ISPM 9 (<i>Guidelines for pest eradication programmes</i>)). Surveillance confirms continued absence.	P	European Union More appropriate wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
497	122	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past. A documented pest eradication programme was conducted and was successful (see ISPM 9 (<i>Guidelines for pest eradication programmes</i>)). Surveillance confirms continued absence <u>absence (see ISPM 6 (Surveillance))</u> .	P	European Union ISPM 6 should be quoted like the other ISPMs. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
498	122	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past. A documented <u>Documented</u> pest eradication programme was conducted-measures were implemented and was-were successful (see ISPM 9 (<i>Guidelines for pest eradication programmes</i>)). Surveillance confirms continued absence <u>absence (see ISPM 6 (Surveillance))</u> .	P	EPPO ISPM 6 should be quoted like the other ISPMs. More appropriate wording <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
499	122	Pest records indicate that the pest was present in the past. A documented pest eradication programme was conducted and was successful (see ISPM 9 (<i>Guidelines for pest eradication programmes</i>)). Surveillance confirms continued absence.	C	Mauritius SHOULD THE PERIOD OF ABSENCE BE DEFINED SO AS TO BE ABLE TO CONFIRM ABSENCE <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
500	123	It is possible to conclude that a pest is absent if information on presence is unreliable. Negative results of surveillance may provide knowledge <u>and evidence</u> about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for <u>official</u> determining pest absence.	P	Viet Nam <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
501	123	It is possible to conclude that a <u>Surveillance records (where target pest is absent if information on presence is unreliable. Negative results of surveillance may provide has not been found provides</u> knowledge <u>and evidence</u> about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	P	Korea, Republic of <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
502	123	It is possible <u>No findings of a pest during specific surveillance may be the basis for an NPPO to conclude-determine</u> that a this pest is absent if <u>absent</u> . <u>If</u> information on presence is unreliable. Negative results of surveillance may provide knowledge about unreliable the absence of <u>NPPO may conclude that a pest</u> pest is <u>absent</u> . However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	P	European Union To make it clearer what decisions an NPPO may take. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
503	123	It is possible <u>No findings of a pest during specific surveillance may be the basis for an NPPO to conclude-determine</u> that a this pest is absent if <u>absent</u> . <u>If</u> information on presence is unreliable. Negative results of surveillance may provide knowledge about unreliable the absence of <u>NPPO may conclude that a pest</u> pest is <u>absent</u> . However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	P	EPPO To make it clearer what decisions an NPPO may take. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
504	123	It is possible to conclude that a pest is absent if information on presence is unreliable. Negative results of surveillance may provide <u>has not been found</u>	P	China That's description more clearly. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

		<u>provides knowledge and evidence</u> about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does not <u>necessarily</u> constitute a basis for determining pest absence.		
505	123	It is possible to conclude that a pest is absent if information on presence is unreliable. Negative results of surveillance may provide knowledge about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does or unreliable information should not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence <u>determination of the absence of the pest.</u>	P	United States of America Delete the first sentence as the statement is confusing. Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
506	123	It is possible to conclude that a <u>Surveillance records (where target pest is absent if information on presence is unreliable. Negative results of surveillance may provide has not been found) provides</u> knowledge <u>and evidence</u> about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	P	APPPC 84) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 8:31 AM) Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
507	123	It is possible to conclude that a pest is absent if information on presence is unreliable. Negative results of surveillance may provide knowledge about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence <u>absence or presence.</u>	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa NOTE: lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence or presence. Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
508	123	It is possible to conclude that a pest is absent if information on presence is unreliable. Negative results of surveillance may provide knowledge about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	P	Philippines Category : <i>SUBSTANTIVE</i>
509	123	It is possible to <u>NPPO can</u> conclude that a pest is absent if information on presence is unreliable. Negative results of surveillance may provide knowledge about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	P	Montenegro Category : <i>TECHNICAL</i>
510	123	It is possible to conclude that <u>Lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest is absent if absence. Unreliable information on the presence of a pest may allow to conclude that a pest is unreliable</u> absent. Negative results of surveillance may provide <u>knowledge information</u> about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	P	Argentina For better understanding. Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>
511	123	It is possible to conclude that <u>Lack of information does not necessarily consitute a basis for determining pest is absent if absence. Unreliable information on the presence of a pest may allow to conclude that a pest is unreliable</u> absent. Negative results of surveillance may provide <u>knowledge information</u> about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	P	Uruguay Paragraph reworded for better understanding Category : <i>EDITORIAL</i>

512	123	It is possible to conclude that Lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest is absent if absence. Unreliable information on the presence of a pest may allow to conclude that a pest is unreliable. absent. Negative results of surveillance may provide knowledge information about the absence of a pest. However, lack of information does not necessarily constitute a basis for determining pest absence.	P	COSAVE For better understanding. Category : EDITORIAL
513	123	Es No posible concluir que una plaga está ausente si la información sobre su presencia no es confiable. Los resultados negativos de la vigilancia podrán proporcionar información sobre la ausencia de una plaga. No obstante, la falta de información no constituye necesariamente una base para determinar la ausencia de una plaga. La falta de información no constituye una base para determinar la ausencia de una plaga	P	OIRSA Este párrafo no está muy claro, mejorar la redacción. La situación de una plaga podrá ser "indeterminada" si la ONPF no puede proporcionar los resultados de la vigilancia u otra información pertinente y confiable. En tales casos, podrá ser necesaria la vigilancia Category : SUBSTANTIVE
514	123	Es posible concluir que una plaga está ausente si la información sobre su presencia no es confiable. Los resultados negativos de la vigilancia podrán proporcionar información sobre la ausencia de una plaga. No obstante, la falta de información no constituye necesariamente constituye una base para determinar la ausencia de una plaga.	P	Guatemala mejorar redaccion de este parrafo Category : EDITORIAL
515	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	Sri Lanka Category : TECHNICAL
516	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	Korea, Republic of Category : SUBSTANTIVE
517	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry or initial destination while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections If some individuals of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population pest are found and subsequent immediate specific surveillance shows that no population is present, the findings do not affect the pest status in an this area.	P	European Union Important precision coming from current version of ISPM 8. The second sentence could easily be misunderstood. The clarity has now been improved. Category : TECHNICAL
518	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry or initial destination while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections If some individuals of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population pest are found and subsequent specific surveillance shows that no population is present, the findings do not affect the pest status in an this area.	P	EPPO Important precision coming from current version of ISPM 8. The second sentence could easily be misunderstood. The clarity has now been improved. Category : TECHNICAL

519	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area.	C	PPPO split into separate paragraphs because they are different things being discussed; pest interceptions and detection of pests. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
520	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	PPPO The 2nd sentence of this paragraph should be a paragraph itself. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
521	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area.	C	Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency Reference ISPM 6 in relation to population. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
522	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area. <u>Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area.</u>	P	United States of America Meaning of this statement is not clear. Perhaps more relevant guidance here is to refer to ISPM 6 for delimiting surveys? Additionally, this sentence doesn't follow the first sentence. If this situation is about a pest that is found in a port environment, then this should be clarified in this para/sentence. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
523	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections (i.e. the importing country, or an area of the importing country). Detection of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	APPPC (42) New Zealand (6 Sep 2018 4:50 AM) Some words of clarification to remove ambiguity <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
524	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area.	C	APPPC (43) New Zealand (6 Sep 2018 4:51 AM) Re. "Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area." Why so? What if the original PFA status is Absent: pest not recorded. Then there is an outbreak of a pest but it is not expected to establish. Why wouldn't the status change to Present: transient [old terminology], or Present: not expected to establish [new terminology]. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
525	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area,	P	APPPC 56) Japan (8 Sep 2018 5:08 AM)

		shown by surveillance not to represent a population <u>population level expected to lead to establishment</u> , do not affect the pest status in an area.		Add specific explanation of "population". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
526	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	APPPC 74) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 4:18 AM) <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
527	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population, do not affect the pest status in an area.	C	Jamaica shown by surveillance not to represent a population (clarification needed for better understanding) <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
528	124	Pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry while under detention do not affect the pest status of the area. Detections of pests in an area, shown by surveillance not to represent a population <u>population of pests</u> , do not affect the pest status in an area.	P	Montenegro <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
529	124	Las intercepciones de plagas en envíos importados mientras se encuentran detenidos en los puntos de entrada no afectan a la situación de la plaga en el área. Las detecciones de plagas en un área que, según ha mostrado la vigilancia, no constituyen una población no afectan a la situación de una plaga en un área.	P	OIRSA Resaltar <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
530	125	Pest status may be “undetermined” if the NPPO cannot provide results from surveillance or any other supporting information. This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification or diagnostic methods are outdated. In such cases, surveillance may be necessary. <u>3.3. No pest status determined</u> <u>There may be insufficient information available from surveillance or from other sources to determine the pest status. The NPPO may then state that the pest has no pest status. This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification or diagnostic methods are outdated. In such cases, surveillance may be necessary to meet obligations under the IPPC so that information can be provided upon request.</u>	P	European Union The undetermined pest status should be clearly distinguished from "absence" pest status. It also needs to make clear that the NPPO determines the pest status but may in some cases state that it is not possible to determine the status of a pest. It is therefore proposed to refer to no pest status to cover the situation when insufficient information is available from surveillance or from other sources. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
531	125	Pest <u>3.3. No pest</u> status <u>determined</u> <u>There may be “undetermined” if the NPPO cannot provide results insufficient information available from surveillance or any—from other supporting informationsources to determine the pest status. The NPPO may then state that the</u>	P	EPPO The undetermined pest status should be clearly distinguished from "absence" pest status. It also needs to make clear that the NPPO determines the pest status but may in some cases state that it is not possible to determine the status of a pest. It is therefore proposed to refer to no pest status to cover the situation when insufficient information is available from

		<u>pest has no pest status.</u> This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification or diagnostic methods are outdated. In such cases, surveillance may be necessary <u>necessary to meet obligations under the IPPC so that information can be provided upon request.</u>		surveillance or from other sources. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
532	125	Pest 3.3. No pest status may be “undetermined” if the determined A NPPO cannot provide results may decide that insufficient information is available from surveillance or any from other supporting information sources to determine the pest status. The NPPO may then state that the pest has “No pest status”. This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification or diagnostic methods are outdated. In such cases, surveillance may be necessary. <u>to meet obligations under the IPPC so that information can be provided under request.</u>	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Central Asia & Central Europe With the changes proposed the section reads in Russian as follows: 3.3. Статус вредного организма не определен НОКЗР может решать об отсутствии достаточной информации для осуществления надзора или определять по другим источникам статус вредного организма Это может включать случаи, когда, например, сведения о вредном организме указывают на его присутствие, но таксономическая номенклатура неоднозначна, или применяемые методы идентификации и диагностики устарели. В таких случаях может потребоваться надзор для выполнения обязательств в рамках МККЗР таким образом, чтобы данная информация могла предоставляться по запросу <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
533	125	Pest status may be “undetermined” if the NPPO cannot provide cannot obtain results from surveillance or any other supporting information. This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification or diagnostic methods are outdated outdated . In such cases, surveillance may be necessary necessary .	P	United States of America Should it be "cannot" or "will not" - as the meaning is very different. There are also two ideas that are being conflated in the following sentence: -Survey hasn't been done because it can't be done because there is no agreed survey methodology or adequate lures are not available; or - Survey either simply hasn't been done or it has been done, but results are no longer valid for a variety of reasons. Therefore, clarify that there may be cases where surveys cannot be completed, i.e., justification of why there are no data. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
534	125	Pest status may be “undetermined” if the NPPO cannot provide results from surveillance or any other supporting information. This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification or diagnostic methods are outdated. In such cases, surveillance may be necessary.	C	APPPC (44) New Zealand (6 Sep 2018 4:54 AM) Re. "may be “undetermined”". There's a lack of clarity about when this pest status would or should be applied (despite the fact that an example has been provided). The use of the word 'may' indicates that it is optional, but for what situations is it optional? Is the ambiguity intentional? Is there an expectation that this pest status is applied to situations where there's an absence of evidence about pest status/pest presence, i.e. situations where there is no record, but recognising that it is not known if anyone has looked and that is

				the reason why there are no records or surveillance reports. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
535	125	Pest status may be “undetermined” if the NPPO cannot provide results from surveillance or any other supporting information. This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification or diagnostic methods are outdated. In such cases, surveillance <u>Surveillance</u> may be necessary.	P	APPPC (86) Korea, Republic of (10 Sep 2018 9:36 AM) This is not relevant and redundant with paragraph [109]. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
536	125	Pest status may be “undetermined” if the NPPO cannot provide results from surveillance or any other supporting information. This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification or diagnostic methods are outdated. In such cases, surveillance may be necessary.	C	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa Proposal by Kenya for “undetermined” to be a third category of pest status <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
537	125	Pest status may be “undetermined” if the NPPO cannot provide results from surveillance or any other supporting information. This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification or diagnostic methods are outdated. In such cases, surveillance <u>and pest diagnosis</u> may be necessary.	P	Costa Rica <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
538	125	Pest status may be “undetermined” if the NPPO cannot provide results from surveillance or any other supporting information. This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification or diagnostic methods are outdated. In such cases, surveillance <u>Surveillance</u> may be necessary.	P	Korea, Republic of This is not relevant and redundant with paragraph [109] <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
539	125	Pest status may be “undetermined” if the by NPPO cannot provide if there is not results from surveillance or any other supporting information. This could include cases, for example, where pest records indicate the presence of a pest, but the taxonomic nomenclature is ambiguous or the identification or diagnostic methods are outdated. In such cases, surveillance may be necessary.	P	Montenegro <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
540	125	La situación de una plaga podrá ser “indeterminada” si la ONPF no puede proporcionar los resultados de la vigilancia u otra información pertinente. Esto podrían incluir, por ejemplo, los casos en que los registros de plagas indican la presencia de una plaga, pero la nomenclatura taxonómica es ambigua o los métodos de identificación o diagnóstico son anticuados. En tales casos, podrá ser necesaria la vigilancia <u>vigilancia y diagnóstico</u> .	P	OIRSA Por cuanto tiempo, podría una ONPF mantener esta situación. Para otras ONPF la condición de la plaga para efectos de la aplicación de medidas se consideraría como presente. Se dice que esta condición se debe a que no se puede proporcionar los resultados de vigilancia pero a la vez dice que es necesaria la vigilancia. Diagnóstico es anticuado, de debe a que los datos de la ONPF fueron realizados hace ya algún tiempo o porque las metodologías utilizadas no están actualizadas. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
541	125	La situación de una plaga podrá ser “indeterminada” <u>“indeterminada”</u> si la ONPF no puede proporcionar los resultados de la vigilancia u otra información	P	OIRSA Pasar al parrafo 73

		pertinente. Esto podrían incluir, por ejemplo, los casos en que los registros de plagas indican la presencia de una plaga, pero la nomenclatura taxonómica es ambigua o los métodos de identificación o diagnóstico son anticuados. En tales casos, podrá ser necesaria la vigilancia.		Eliminación: Párrafo es algo confuso, en qué casos se podría considerar que no son poblaciones. Si nos basamos en la definición de brote dice que una población, así también control de plagas las medidas de supresión, control y erradicación se realizan a una población de plagas. Encuesta es un procedimiento para determinar las características de un población, y así en otras definiciones del glosario como también si nos basamos en otro tipo de definiciones un espécimen pertenece a una población <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
542	125	La situación de una plaga podrá ser “indeterminada” si la ONPF no puede proporcionar los resultados de la vigilancia u otra información pertinente y confiable. Esto podrían incluir, por ejemplo, los casos en que los registros de plagas indican la presencia de una plaga, pero la nomenclatura taxonómica es ambigua o los métodos de identificación o diagnóstico son anticuados. En tales casos, podrá ser necesaria la vigilancia.	P	Guatemala <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
4. Responsibilities of NPPOs and Good Reporting Practices				
543	126	4. Responsibilities of NPPOs and Good Reporting PracticesNPPOs	P	European Union Reporting is part of the NPPO's responsibility and risk of confusion with ISPM 17 (Pest reporting). <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
544	126	4. Responsibilities of NPPOs and Good Reporting PracticesNPPOs	P	EPPO Reporting is part of the NPPO's responsibility and risk of confusion with ISPM 17 (Pest reporting). <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
545	126	4. Responsibilities of NPPOs and Good Reporting Practices	C	APPPC (45) New Zealand (6 Sep 2018 4:58 AM) In shortening this section it seems that some good reporting practices previously recommended are lost. Such as: -Correcting erroneous records as soon as possible; -When becoming aware of an otherwise unreported record of a pest in a country, to inform (and where possible consult) the NPPO of that country before reporting it to other countries or RPPOs. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
546	126	4. Responsibilities of NPPOs and Good Reporting Practices	C	Philippines We suggest we refer to ISPMs 8 and 17 regarding "Good reporting practices" instead of repeating the contents of the said ISPMs in this revision. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
547	126	4. Responsibilities of NPPOs and Good Reporting Practices	C	Kenya This standard has a disclaimer that it does not cover pest reporting obligations covered under ISPM 17 therefore "Good

				reporting practices" should be deleted and contents taken to ISPM 17 clause 6.4. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
548	126	4. Responsibilities of NPPOs and Good Reporting Practices	P	Kenya <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
549	126	4. Responsibilities of NPPOs and Good Reporting PracticesNPPOs	P	Argentina There is an entire section below on good practices (section 4.1) <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
550	126	4. Responsibilities of NPPOs and Good Reporting PracticesNPPOs	P	Uruguay There is an entire section below on good practices (section 4.1) <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
551	126	4. Responsibilities of NPPOs and Good Reporting Practices	P	COSAVE There is an entire section below on good practices (section 4.1) <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
552	127	Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII.1(a)) to report "the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests". Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest reports reports (see ISPM 17). Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned using pest records and other information from different sources. It is the responsibility of an NPPO to provide pest records and supporting evidence upon request from another NPPO.	P	European Union It is important to quote ISPM 17 (Pest reporting) when speaking of pest reports. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
553	127	Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII.1(a)) to report "the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests". Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest reports. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned using pest records and other information from different sources. It is the responsibility of an NPPO to provide pest records and <u>other</u> supporting evidence <u>on pest status</u> upon request from another NPPO.	P	European Union More precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
554	127	Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII.1(a)) to report "the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests". Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest reports reports (see ISPM 17). Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned using pest records and other information from different sources. It is the responsibility of an NPPO to provide pest records and <u>other</u> supporting evidence <u>on pest status</u> upon request from another NPPO.	P	EPPO More precise wording. It is important to quote ISPM 17 (Pest reporting) when speaking of pest reports. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
555	127	Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII.1(a)) to report "the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests". Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest reports. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned using pest records and other information from different sources. <u>If the status in the area is changed (e.g. the eradication can be accomplished), the NPPO should report the status immediately.</u> It is the	P	Japan There is no description about report of the change of the pest status by the NPPO. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

		responsibility of an NPPO to provide pest records and supporting evidence upon request from another NPPO.		
556	127	Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII.1(a)) to report “the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests”. Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest reports. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned using pest records and other information from different sources. It is the responsibility of an NPPO to <u>correct erroneous records as soon as possible, and to</u> provide pest records and supporting evidence upon request from another NPPO.	P	APPPC (46) New Zealand (6 Sep 2018 5:01 AM) Some points are still important and should be integrated within this section. for example it could read: <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
557	127	Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII.1(a)) to report “the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests”. Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest reports. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned using pest records and other information from different sources. <u>If the status in the area is changed (e.g. the eradication can be accomplished), the NPPO should report the status immediately.</u> It is the responsibility of an NPPO to provide pest records and supporting evidence upon request from another NPPO.	P	APPPC 64) Japan (8 Sep 2018 6:19 AM) No informamtion about ditributing the pest status by the NPPO <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
558	127	Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII.1(a)) to report “the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests”. Information pertaining to pest status in an area contributes to pest reports. Pest status is determined by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned using pest records and other information from different sources. It is the responsibility of an NPPO to provide pest records and supporting evidence upon request from another NPPO.	P	Kenya <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
559	127	La notification de la présence, de l'apparition ou de la dissémination d'organismes nuisibles fait partie des obligations des parties contractantes en vertu de la CIPV (Article VIII.1.a)). Les informations relatives à la situation d'un organisme nuisible dans une zone contribuent aux signalements sur cet organisme. La situation d'un organisme nuisible est déterminée par l'ONPV responsable de la zone en question à l'aide des signalements de l'organisme et d'autres informations émanant de différentes sources. Sur demande d'autres ONPV, il incombe à l'ONPV de <u>la zone concernée de</u> communiquer les signalements d'un organisme <u>ainsi que avec</u> les preuves à l'appui.	P	Chad quelques corrections dans le paragraphe 127 <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
560	127	Las partes contratantes tienen la obligación, en virtud de la CIPF (artículo VIII.1 a)), de comunicar “la presencia, el brote o la diseminación de plagas”. La información relativa a la situación de una plaga en un área se incorpora a los informes sobre plagas. La situación de una plaga la determina la ONPF responsable del área en cuestión utilizando los registros de plagas y otra información de	C	OIRSA A que se refiere con la información relacionada <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

		diferentes fuentes. Es responsabilidad de la ONPF proporcionar, a solicitud de otra ONPF, los registros de plagas y las pruebas en la que se basan.		
561	127	Las partes contratantes tienen la obligación, en virtud de la CIPF (artículo VIII.1 a)), de comunicar “la presencia, el brote o la diseminación de plagas”. La información <u>relativa-re</u> a la <u>relacionada a la</u> situación de una plaga en un área se incorpora a los informes sobre plagas. La situación de una plaga la determina la ONPF responsable del área en cuestión utilizando los registros de plagas y otra información de diferentes fuentes. Es responsabilidad de la ONPF proporcionar, a solicitud de otra ONPF, los registros de plagas y las pruebas en la que se basan.	P	Guatemala <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
562	128	There may be some instances in which a pest status declared by an NPPO is questioned by another NPPO (e.g. when there are repeated interceptions <u>by importing countries</u> or contradictory pest records). In these situations, bilateral contacts between NPPOs should be made to clarify the situation, and if needed the pest status may be revised by the NPPO responsible for the area.	P	European Union More precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
563	128	There may be some instances in which a pest status declared by an NPPO is questioned by another NPPO (e.g. when there are repeated interceptions <u>by importing countries</u> or contradictory pest records). In these situations, bilateral contacts between NPPOs should be made to clarify the situation, and if needed the pest status may be revised by the NPPO responsible for the area.	P	EPPO More precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
564	128	There may be some instances in which a pest status declared by an NPPO is questioned by another NPPO (e.g. when there are repeated <u>interceptions or interceptions,</u> contradictory pest records <u>records, or if becoming aware of an otherwise unreported record of a pest in that country</u>). In these situations, bilateral contacts between NPPOs should be made to clarify the situation, and if needed the pest status may be revised by the NPPO responsible for the area. <u>This should occur before reporting to other countries or RPPOs.</u>	P	APPPC (47) New Zealand (6 Sep 2018 5:03 AM) Following on the previous comment. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
565	128	En ciertos casos, una ONPF podrá cuestionar la situación de una plaga declarada por otra ONPF (por ejemplo, cuando se producen intercepciones reiteradas <u>en un periodo de un año</u> o hay registros de plagas contradictorios). En estas situaciones, las ONPF deberían mantener contactos bilaterales para aclarar la situación y, en caso necesario, la ONPF responsable del área podrá revisar la situación de la plaga.	P	OIRSA Indicador de presencia en el otro país. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
4.1 Good practices for determining and reporting pest status				
566	129	4.1 Good <u>reporting</u> practices for determining and reporting pest status	P	Viet Nam Follow as section Outline of Requirements <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
567	129	4.1 Good practices for determining and reporting pest status	P	Korea, Republic of To delete the title 4.1 as this is not relevant. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

568	129	4.1 Good practices for determining and reporting pest status	P	China <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
569	129	4.1 Good practices for determining and reporting pest status	P	APPPC 12) China (31 Aug 2018 11:09 AM) There is no inclusion relationship between the two topic. It was suggested to list 4.1 separately as 5. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
570	129	4.1 Good practices for determining and reporting pest status	P	APPPC (88) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 9:43 AM) To delete the title 4.1 as this is not relevant. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
571	129	4.1 Good practices for determining <u>pest status</u> and <u>reporting developing pest status</u> reports	P	Kenya <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
572	129	4.1.5 Good practices for determining and reporting pest status	P	Argentina Consequential change as per comments in paragraph 126. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
573	129	4.1.5. Good practices for determining and reporting pest status	P	Uruguay Consequential change as per comment in paragraph 126 <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
574	129	4.1.5. Good practices for determining and reporting pest status	P	COSAVE Consequential change as per comments in paragraph 126. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
575	131	use the categories of <u>“presence” and “absence” pest status</u> set out in this standard when exchanging pest status information, to promote harmonization and transparency	P	European Union More precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
576	131	use the categories of <u>“presence” and “absence” pest status</u> set out in this standard when exchanging pest status information, to promote harmonization and transparency	P	EPPO More precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
577	132	<u>base determinations of determine</u> pest status in an area <u>based</u> on the most reliable and timely information available	P	APPPC (85) Korea, Republic of (10 Sep 2018 9:34 AM) The sentence should be rewritten. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
578	132	<u>base determinations of determine</u> pest status in an area <u>based</u> on the most reliable and timely information available	P	Korea, Republic of The sentence should be rewritten. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
579	133	maintain pest records and <u>other</u> supporting evidence, taking into account that they may be needed to support the determination of pest status	P	European Union More precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
580	133	maintain pest records and <u>other</u> supporting evidence, taking into account that they may be needed to support the determination of pest status	P	EPPO More precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>

581	133	maintain pest records and supporting evidence, taking into account that they may be needed to support the determination of pest status	C	United States of America Verify that the evidence supporting pest record is consistent with ISPM 6. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
582	134	re-evaluate-revise pest status if <u>a re-evaluation of the available information indicates that this is</u> appropriate	P	European Union More precise wording. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
583	134	re-evaluate- Revise pest status if <u>a re-evaluation of the available information indicates that this is</u> appropriate	P	EPPO More precise wording <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
584	135	inform other NPPOs and their regional plant protection organization, where appropriate, of relevant changes in pest status according to ISPM 17: -provide pest records and supporting evidence to another NPPO upon request.	P	European Union Missing point about NPPO responsibilities (as in 4.section of this standard, 1st paragraph, last sentence). <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
585	135	inform other NPPOs and their regional plant protection organization, where appropriate, of relevant changes in pest status according to ISPM 17: -provide pest records and supporting evidence to anothe NPPO upon request.	P	EPPO Missing point about NPPO responsibilities (as in 4.section of this standard, 1st paragraph, last sentence). <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
586	135	inform other NPPOs and their regional plant protection organization, where appropriate, of relevant changes in pest status according to ISPM 17. <u>Recommended Reporting Practices</u>	P	China It is more reasonable to add the topic and the content. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
587	135	inform other NPPOs and their regional plant protection organization, where appropriate, of relevant changes in pest status according to ISPM 17. <u>correct erroneous records as soon as possible</u>	P	APPPC (13) China (3 Sep 2018 10:46 AM) It is more reasonable to add the topic and the content. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
588	135	inform other NPPOs and their regional plant protection organization, where appropriate, of relevant changes in pest status according to ISPM 17.	C	APPPC (48) New Zealand (6 Sep 2018 5:06 AM) The wordings in ISPM 17 (e.g. section 5.2 of ISPM 17) and this ISPM should align with each other <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
589	135	informer rapidement les autres ONPV et les organisations régionales de la protection des végétaux sous leur tutelle , le cas échéant, des changements relatifs à la situation des organismes nuisibles au sens de la NIMP 17.	P	Chad correction du paragraphe 135 pour la compréhension <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
590	135	informar a otras ONPF y a su organización regional de protección fitosanitaria, cuando corresponda, de los cambios pertinentes en la situación de una plaga de conformidad con la NIMF 17.	C	OIRSA Debe ser la primera prioridad Indicador uno de transparencia <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
APPENDIX 1: Guidance on reliability of information sources				
591	138	APPENDIX 1: Guidance on reliability of information sources	C	United States of America This information is a valuable guidance and a part of

				communication between countries. As such, it should be an official part of the ISPM. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
592	138	APÉNDICE 1: Orientación sobre la fiabilidad de las fuentes de información	P	<p>Colombia</p> <p>El apéndice 1 debe ser eliminado teniendo en cuenta las siguientes razones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No es conveniente clasificar la fiabilidad de la información en tantas categorías. Bastaría con decir que la confiabilidad es alta o baja. - El sistema nacional de vigilancia fitosanitaria de un país no debe contemplar procesos de captura de información y verificación inciertos. - El sistema nacional de vigilancia fitosanitaria de una ONPF no debe contemplar la presencia de personal con competencia incierta en el desarrollo de acciones de vigilancia. - No hay claridad sobre quien realiza la acreditación de las bases de datos o sitios web. - Fuentes de información que señalan la presencia de plagas en un área determinada pero no documentan cómo se realizó la detección, ni la identificación taxonómica, ni las fuentes primarias, no pueden ser incluidas como información confiable en un sistema nacional de vigilancia confiable. <p>Lo más pertinente es dejar los lineamientos básicos sobre que debe tener un registro para que sea confiable.</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
593	139	Information source	C	<p>Japan</p> <p>Information sources should be ranked in terms of their reliability.</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
594	139	Information source	C	<p>APPPC</p> <p>(13) China (3 Sep 2018 10:46 AM)</p> <p>It is more reasonable to add the topic and the content.</p> <p><i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i></p>
595	142	Information gathered from surveillance <u>Surveillance</u>	P	<p>European Union</p> <p>Consistency with the other information sources.</p> <p><i>Category : EDITORIAL</i></p>
596	142	Information gathered from surveillance	C	<p>European Union</p> <p>Suggestion: adding "as described in ISPM 6" (although it is indicated in the text, it would be suitable remarking it also here).</p> <p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>
597	142	Information gathered from surveillance	C	<p>EPPO</p> <p>Suggestion: adding "as described in ISPM 6" (Although it is indicated in the text, it would be suitable remarking it also here)</p> <p><i>Category : TECHNICAL</i></p>

598	142	Information gathered from surveillance <u>Surveillance</u>	P	EPPO Consistency with the other information sources. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
599	145	- documented protocols - voucher specimens	P	Korea, Republic of To include the need for voucher specimens as a support to high reliability of information gathered from surveillance. Voucher specimens are strong evidence of the presence of the correctly identified pests that are verifiable as required. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
600	145	- documented protocols <u>protocols</u> <u>voucher specimens</u>	P	China Voucher specimens are evidence of the presence of the correctly identified pests that are verifiable as required. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
601	145	- documented protocols <u>protocols</u> - voucher specimens	P	Australia To include the need for voucher specimens as a support to high reliability of information gathered from surveillance. Voucher specimens are strong evidence of the presence of the correctly identified pests that are verifiable as required. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
602	145	- documented protocols <u>protocols</u> - voucher specimens	P	APPPC 89) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 9:55 AM) To include the need for voucher specimens as a support to high reliability of information gathered from surveillance. Voucher specimens are strong evidence of the presence of the correctly identified pests that are verifiable as required. (15) Singapore (4 Sep 2018 1:36 AM) To include the need for voucher specimens as a support to high reliability of information gathered from surveillance. Voucher specimens are strong evidence of the presence of the correctly identified pests that are verifiable as required. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
603	145	- documented protocols - voucher specimen	P	Thailand To include the need for voucher specimens as a support to high reliability of information gathered from surveillance. Voucher specimens are strong evidence of the presence of the correctly identified pests that are verifiable as required. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
604	145	- documented protocols <u>protocols</u> - voucher specimens	P	Singapore To include the need for voucher specimens as a support to the high reliability of information gathered from surveillance. Voucher specimens are strong evidence of the presence of the correct pests. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
605	146	- diagnostics <u>diagnostic</u> laboratories with a high degree of expertise and high-quality infrastructure	P	Australia <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

606	148	- use of information management systems to capture and manage data in a consistent manner	C	APPPC (61) Japan (8 Sep 2018 5:42 AM) It should be clarified the meaning of "information management systems" <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
607	149	-trained personnel	P	European Union To be moved as the last indent for consistency with the following example. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
608	149	-trained personnel	P	EPPO To be moved as the last indent for consistency with the following example. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
609	150	- implementation of quality management systems <u>- availability of voucher specimens properly identified by a eminent taxonomist</u>	P	Sri Lanka <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
610	150	- implementation of quality management systems <u>- trained personnel</u>	P	European Union Moved from paragraph 149 for consistency with the following example. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
611	150	- implementation of quality management systems <u>- trained personnel</u>	P	EPPO Moved from paragraph 149 for consistency with the following example. <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
612	150	-implementation of quality management systems	P	APPPC <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i> (34) Thailand (5 Sep 2018 12:51 PM) ISPM6 has already specified that NPPO should develop administrative procedures for maintaining official documentation and undertaking surveillance and managing or having access to specimen collections in section 3.5 documentation. Therefore, the implementation of quality management system may be higher than necessary. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
613	150	- implementation of quality management systemssystems <u>systems (when entities are authorized by the NPPOs)</u>	P	APPPC 59) Japan (8 Sep 2018 5:38 AM) Quality management system is implemented only when entities are authorized by the NPPOs. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
614	150	-implementation of quality management systems	P	Thailand ISPM6 has already specified that NPPO should develop administrative procedures for maintaining official documentation and undertaking surveillance and managing or having access to specimen collections in section 3.5 documentation. Therefore, the

				implementation of quality management system may be higher than necessary. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
615	150	- implementation of quality management systems Comparative results from credible alternative/reference labs	P	Kenya <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
616	155	- diagnostics diagnostic laboratories with recognized expertise	P	Australia <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
617	156	- use of information management systems to capture and manage data in a consistent manner	C	APPPC (60) Japan (8 Sep 2018 5:41 AM) It should be clarified the meaning of "information management systems" <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
618	157	- trained personnel - availability of voucher specimens	P	Sri Lanka <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
619	165	Low	P	APPPC (91) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 10:10 AM) To delete low. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
620	169	- training and expertise are minimal or variable Contradictory reports from alternative/reference labs.	P	Kenya <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
621	172	Multiple original research papers with detailed description of the methodological approach or approaches used; approaches are widely accepted; published in high impact factor journals;	P	European Union Impact factor depends on the topic and scope of the journal (for example: journals on topics relating to molecular issues have higher impact factor than those on entomological issues). It is preferable to delete. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
622	172	Multiple original research papers with detailed description of the methodological approach or approaches used; approaches are widely accepted; published in high impact factor journals;	P	EPPO Impact factor depends on the topic and scope of the journal (for example: journals on topics relating to molecular issues have higher impact factor than those on entomological issues). It is preferable to delete. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
623	180	Only one or a few original research papers; any found-finding or methodology used is not widely accepted; published in low impact-factor journals	P	Japan <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
624	182	Low	P	Korea, Republic of To delete low. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
625	182	Low	P	Thailand To delete this " low" as it is inconsistent to be under this para on peer reviewed journal..

				<i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
626	183	No peer-reviewed literature available	P	Korea, Republic of To delete this " low" as it is inconsistent to be under this para on peer reviewed journal. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
627	183	No peer-reviewed literature available	P	Japan "No peer-reviewed literature available" is inconsistent with "Peer-reviewed journals". This proposed change is supported by APPPC as well as by Japan. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
628	183	No peer-reviewed literature available	P	United States of America Delete this row: This is category on peer-reviewed journals, if no peer-reviewed literature is available, then this category should be removed. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
629	183	No peer-reviewed literature available	C	APPPC (62) Japan (8 Sep 2018 6:05 AM) "No peer-reviewed literature available" is inconsistent with "Peer-reviewed journals" <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
630	183	No peer-reviewed literature available	P	APPPC 90) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 10:10 AM) To delete this " low" as it is inconsistent to be under this para on peer reviewed journal.. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
631	183	No peer-reviewed literature available	P	Thailand <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
632	184	Databases and websites	C	Japan Databases and websites are one of information sources, but they are tools to store or provide information gathered from other information sources. As the nature Databases and websites on Appendix1 is different from ones of other information sources, databases and websites as information source should be separated from this table and placed to another table which includes reliability and examples of databases and websites. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
633	184	Databases and websites	C	APPPC (58) Japan (8 Sep 2018 5:30 AM) Databases and websites are one of information sources, but they are tools to store or provide information gathered from other information sources. Database and websites are one of information sources, but they are tools to store or provide information gathered from other information sources. As the meaning of DB and websites on Appendix1 are different from ones of other information sources, databases and websites as

				information source should be separated from this table and place another table which includes reliability and examples of databases and websites. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
634	198	Many <u>articles or</u> reports from independent sources; well understood methodology; general consensus between information sources	P	European Union For consistency with paragraphs 201 and 204. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
635	198	Many <u>articles or</u> reports from independent sources; well understood methodology; general consensus between information sources	P	EPPO For consistency with paragraphs 201 and 204. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
636	201	Several independent articles or reports based <u>ed on</u> independent information; methodology <u>is</u> described	P	Canada <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
637	201	Several independent articles or reports based <u>ed on</u> independent information; methodology <u>is</u> described	P	Japan <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
638	201	Several independent articles or reports based <u>ed on</u> independent information; methodology <u>is</u> described	P	APPPC <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
639	201	Several independent articles or reports based <u>ed on</u> independent information; methodology <u>is</u> described	P	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
640	201	Several independent articles or reports based <u>ed on</u> independent information; methodology <u>is</u> described	P	Australia <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
641	201	Several independent articles or reports based <u>ed on</u> independent information; methodology <u>is</u> described	P	NEPPO <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
642	204	A few articles <u>as</u> and reports that may or may not have <u>ee</u> each been based on independent (different) information sources	P	Canada <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
643	204	A few articles <u>as</u> and reports that may or may not have <u>ee</u> each been based on independent (different) information sources	P	APPPC <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
644	204	A few articles <u>as</u> and reports that may or may not have <u>ee</u> each been based on independent (different) information sources	P	Australia <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
645	204	A few articles and reports that may or may not have <u>ee</u> each been based on independent (different) information sources	P	Iran <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
646	204	A few articles <u>as</u> and reports that may or may not have <u>ee</u> each been based on independent (different) information sources	P	NEPPO <i>Category : EDITORIAL</i>
647	207	- Single <u>reports</u> ; if <u>report</u> or more than one report, <u>those that are found may or may not be but based only on independent (different) one primary information source</u>	P	European Union If this is the idea. Otherwise the difference with paragraph 204 would not be really understood. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>

648	207	- Single reports; if report or more than one report, those that are found may or may not be report but based <u>only</u> on independent (different) one primary information source <u>source</u>	P	EPPO If this is the idea. Otherwise the difference with paragraph 204 would not be really understood. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
649	208	-No supporting evidence found-	P	United States of America See US comment on paragraph 183, meaning here that no reliable record exists. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
650	209	Unpublished communications from sources other than NPPO	P	Korea, Republic of To delete " other than NPPO". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
651	209	Unpublished communications from sources other than NPPO <u>sources</u>	P	Japan To delete " other than NPPO". This proposed change is supported by APPPC as well as by Japan. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
652	209	Unpublished communications from sources other than NPPO	P	APPPC 93) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 10:25 AM) To delete " other than NPPO". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
653	210	Moderate <u>Moderately low</u>	P	European Union For consistency and comparison with the other information sources. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
654	210	Moderate <u>Moderately low</u>	P	EPPO For consistency and comparison with the other information sources. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
655	211	- Opinion from a recognized expert that has been documented by the NPPO and can be provided upon request	P	Korea, Republic of "That has been documented by the NPPO" should be deleted because the category on information sources is "Unpublished communications from sources other than NPPO". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
656	211	- Opinion from a recognized expert that has been documented by the NPPO and can be provided upon request	P	APPPC (63) Japan (8 Sep 2018 6:10 AM) "That has been documented by the NPPO" should be deleted because the information sources is "Unpublished communications from sources other than NPPO" <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
657	211	- Opinion from a recognized expert that has been documented by the NPPO and can be provided upon request	C	APPPC (92) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 10:20 AM) "That has been documented by the NPPO" should be deleted because the category on information sources is "Unpublished

				communications from sources other than NPPO". <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
658	216	<u>The above table ranks the categories of information source in descending order of relative reliability, however it must be recognized that these are not rigid and only designed to provide guidance in assessing the reliability.</u>	P	Japan Provide the rank of reliability of information source. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
659	217	Potential implementation issues	C	Nigeria No additional comments .previous comments by Nigeria stands <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
660	217	Potential implementation issues <u>- Lack of capacity to provide the required training to establish pest status;</u> <u>- The necessity to consider time required to establish pest status i.e transient cases - status is deemed as undetermined - not covered here. Propose for the standard to recognise this.</u>	P	Korea, Republic of Examples of potential implementation issues as follow: <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
661	217	Potential implementation issues	C	Jamaica Exporting country might want to under report while importing country might want to over report. Capacity of developing countries to conduct surveillance and provide information on pest presence or absence ,determining the current pests status; limited technical or human capacity and expertise and the absence of diagnostic or documented protocols are issues of concern as it relates to implementation of this standard. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
662	217	Potential implementation issues	C	Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency -Capacity of developing countries to conduct surveillance and provide information on pest presence or absence in a country. -Exporting country might want to under report while importing country might want to over report. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
663	217	Potential implementation issues	C	Mozambique Limited capacity in surveillance and diagnosis Insufficient communication infrastructure <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
664	217	Potential implementation issues <u>- Lack of capacity to provide the required training to establish pest status;</u> <u>- The necessity to consider time required to establish pest status i.e transient cases - status is deemed as undetermined - not covered here. Propose for the standard to recognise this.</u>	P	APPPC 94) APPPC (10 Sep 2018 10:32 AM) Examples of potential implementation issues as follow: <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>

665	217	Potential implementation issues	C	IPPC Regional Workshop Africa no comment at this stage on implementation issues <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
666	218	This section is not part of the standard. The Standards Committee in May 2016 requested the Secretariat to gather information on any potential implementation issues related to this draft. Please provide details and proposals on how to address these potential implementation issues.	C	European Union Practically it is sometimes hard to choose between categories. Guidelines with examples would help. <i>Category : TECHNICAL</i>
667	218	This section is not part of the standard. The Standards Committee in May 2016 requested the Secretariat to gather information on any potential implementation issues related to this draft. Please provide details and proposals on how to address these potential implementation issues.	C	EPPO In practice, it is sometimes hard to choose between categories. Guidelines with examples would help. <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>
668	218	This section is not part of the standard. The Standards Committee in May 2016 requested the Secretariat to gather information on any potential implementation issues related to this draft. Please provide details and proposals on how to address these potential implementation issues. <u>- The necessity to consider time required to establish pest status i.e. transient cases - status is deemed as undetermined - not covered here. Propose for the standard to recognise this.</u>	P	Japan f a new pest may be just introduced in an area, a period of time may be required to determine pest status based on technical evaluation (e.g. PRA, surveillance). <i>Category : SUBSTANTIVE</i>